

Name	Comments
Bill Brown	Please check section 33.1 (a) (x). The plan states:"not exceeding an area of 200 metres (sic)..." It should probably be"200 square metres"
Carolynn Moon	Aside from what has been already requested and told to us about the developments that will take place...seniors residence, boutique hotel, school please tell us what other building will be permitted once this particular zoning is granted
Carolynn Moon	<p>When purchasing this property back in 2014 I was told that all of the landing be fine was protected. The larger concern of course being the estuary, water levels etc.</p> <p>More to the point I would like to know what studies, outside studies, from a neutral party are required and how all of this development will be supported by our services.</p> <p>Already, I have contacted our town in regards to the continued sewage smell in our downtown community. This seems to be a strong indicator that we are already beyond capacity in our water treatment capabilities. What is required to implement more capacity BEFORE adding to the density here.</p> <p>There are actually when the Snell from the sewage drain comes into my foyer and garage</p> <p>What is the responsibility of this developer in regards to any of this?</p>
Dean Skalski	There is a proposed connection from Mamquam Road, up to the university. I would like to see further clarification as to what this "Proposed Major Route" is. Currently this route is used fairly extensively, however it lacks any reasonable separation or control between bicycle/ pedestrian traffic and vehicles.
Patricia Lightburn	<p>Hi there!</p> <p>I have been reviewing the OCP and noticed in the K3 Ditch Schedule that there is a ditch listed as highly productive habitat that I think is a mistake. I live at 1014 Robin Drive and there has not been a ditch along our eastern property line for many years (I wish there was since it would help with drainage!). Is it possible to get the map updated? I would be happy to send photos if it would help. Cheers,</p> <p>Patricia</p>
A. Cairns	<p>I support the current OCP green space classification as applied to the BCP lands adjacent to the estuary downtown Squamish. I oppose development in this area.</p> <p>These lands (including the estuary) make up the only large naturalized green space in the downtown core; and is the only green space on the western side of the highway accessible by foot for citizens in the downtown core. With some careful restoration these lands can become an ecological success story, and continue to support habitat for the current wildlife populations.</p> <p>The estuary and surrounding lands also provide a natural flood buffer, important for downtown Squamish.</p>
Brigitte Suter	<p>I would like to voice my objection to the sale of the 28 acres of BCR Properties adjacent to Bailey Street for the potential development of a hotel, seniors' housing, "affordable housing", and a school. I live in the Eaglewind townhouses and when we purchased we were assured this land was not developable. I've now lived in the area for 6 years and for 6 years I have witnessed a multitude of wildlife in the trails and land that is up for sale. Everything from bears to birds to coyotes to deer live and use that area and cutting down the trees for urban development would push the wildlife into higher concentration in the estuary. While I recognize that Squamish is growing and that there is a need for day care facilities and true affordable housing, I also know that our responsibility as environmental stewards to the land adjacent to a protected estuary is to ensure that it stays wild, natural and free from urban development. As someone who is in need of day care, I can safely say that I would rather keep my child at home and have to find another way to earn a living than send my child to a new facility at the expense of a vital ecosystem in our neighbourhood. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

<p>Nick Westeinde</p>	<p>Mayor and Council,</p> <p>It is a serious, some would argue, impossible challenge to set the rules for Squamish's future for the next quarter century. Although there needs to be a plan, any attempt to impose limitations and constraints based only on what you can see today is doomed to get it wrong. Certainly the risks that exist should be acknowledged and managed, infrastructure needs to be responsibly paid for and not all development proposals would necessarily be a benefit to this growing community. But you cannot promote a healthy and growing community by building walls and other restrictions on growth.</p> <p>The iPhone is barely a decade old; no one could have predicted where we would be today back in 2006, just 12 years ago, yet the OCP wants to impose restrictions and limit opportunities for the next 25 years.</p> <p>Squamish may be a bit behind the rest of the Lower Mainland but is nevertheless facing a housing situation that appears about to become a crisis. The message to take from this clear demonstration that past policies and actions have had the wrong impact is to learn from the mistakes and not repeat them. This OCP treats housing as something to be constrained and controlled and caged rather than the great opportunity to make Squamish the better community that it should be.</p> <p>Instead of proposing solutions, instead of providing more flexibility and opportunity, the new OCP proposes more District control, greater restrictions, caps on release of land for housing and slower and fewer approvals based in large part on historical growth rates rather than future demand, all of which will exacerbate the shortage of housing, create higher housing costs, will guarantee that the affordability crisis will get worse and will stagnate the local economy. These policies will also reduce the number of potential employees and employers that will move to Squamish and will retard business and economic growth.</p>
<p>Nick Westeinde</p>	<p>It is the new developments, developments for Squamish's future residents, residents that are not yet here but who are vital to Squamish's future, that the District will restrict and curtail with its proposed OCP.</p> <p>Squamish does not have an unlimited supply of land but much more of its land can be developed than the OCP plans to allow.</p> <p>For example, while it is a fact that much of Squamish lies within a flood zone that carries enhanced risks for development, through sound engineering these risks can be managed and reduced to well below what most of Squamish's existing housing actually faces. It is the existing development that is most at risk as new developments can be constructed and fortified to withstand the risks listed in the IFHMP while the existing housing that lacks the flood mitigation protection of new construction, could be severely damaged.</p> <p>None of this is new, in fact the comments that have been provided to the District in response to the OCP draft are overwhelmingly critical of the current housing situation and of the OCP's impact on future housing and the economy of Squamish and unanimously request that the OCP be changed and improved from the current proposal. Mingled within these comments are some well articulated recommendations that council must include in a professional planning exercise to set a housing and development policy the meets the needs of its existing and future community.</p> <p>I would like to add my voice to the overwhelming number of demands that the OCP proposals with respect to future housing in Squamish be improved to provide more land for housing development, sooner, that the District approvals process be made less onerous and expensive and that a variety of development restrictions that lack a sound scientific basis be removed.</p> <p>The Mayor and Council have been elected to represent the will and the needs of their constituents, not just the existing community but the future as well. The OCP should be amended.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments.</p> <p>Nick Westeinde</p>

Marc d'Entremont	<p>Regarding pedestrian access to the west side of the Squamish river shore, it would be great to have access, but I think it's very important to have it be eco-friendly in what areas are opened up, i.e. more needs to be considered than the passage over the water.</p> <p>Considerations should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What trails could be linked in. What ski terrain could be linked in. Land rights. <p>Minimizing impact on wild life, as animals could potentially start using the passages as well.</p>
Richard Zimmer	<p>Council keeps increasing the development threshold numbers. You dont want to expand but increase density like allowing development near gun club which will cause serious issues. Allow Mr Cheema to develop his land. I would put a fence up too if i was him.</p>
John Hitsman	<p>In regards to the OCP and the goal of limiting geographic growth until population thresholds have been reached. This strategy, including the Cheema lands and others that are considered outside of the growth management boundary need to be reconsidered in order to add additional supply of new housing options. The limited supply that we are adding is contributing to unsustainable prices for lots and housing, and limiting options for families. I believe that we are managing this too tightly and we need to increase the supply of available lands for development.</p>
Kristen Courtney	<p>I am concerned that the proposed land use designations reduce the area designated Parks & Ecological Reserves and Greenway Corridors and Recreation in the single most important area to Garibaldi Estates residents for hiking, dog walking, and mountain biking, and the only access for valley bottom residents to access higher lands and trails through mature forest. In the 2009 OCP, greenway designation extended south of Garibaldi Springs (in order to connect with Coho Park), as well as along watercourses draining from higher elevations east of Garibaldi Springs. Under the current proposal in Schedule B, those greenways have been eliminated and instead the entire area is designated residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>This area of forest (the forest that many residents think of and refer to as "Coho Park" namely the very small Coho Park itself, and the forest south of and east of the Garibaldi Springs golf course), as it is, is already very narrow in several areas, with the golf course clearly visible to the west and houses on Skyline and Ayr Drive clearly visible to the east. The availability of intact mature forest within walking distance from home, and the continuity of mature forest with other forested areas is of prime importance for so many things: quality of life, property values, physical activity, habitat protection, ecological integrity, rainwater management, minimizing traffic and reduced need for parking at major trailheads that people would otherwise have to drive to, etc.</p>

Kristen Courtney	<p>While some small amount of that upside-down triangle south of the Cheema land, west of Jay Crescent and East of Garibaldi Springs, ending in the point down in Coho Park might be appropriate for residential development, an amount of this forested land sufficient to protect the above values (and that connects valley-bottom mature forest to mature forest and trails at higher elevations) should be set aside as permanent greenways. The area designated greenways should include Coho Park and a connection east to Merrill Park, and the forest north of Coho Park between Garibaldi Springs and Seven Up. On a related note, trails within this area should be identified and protected as the critical connector trails they are to valley-bottom residents. Schedule G omits Cherub, which is the primary climb trail that valley bottom residents use to access the Highlands/Perth (after climbing Coho Park Trail to Trestle), and Committed and Seven Up are the primary descent trails used by valley bottom residents to return back down to Coho Park. Coho Park Trail, Trestle and the Covenant, while important trails for dog walking and family strolls, are not suitable for mountain bike descents simply because these trails are already used so heavily by walkers. At present, user groups have managed to mostly avoid these conflicts as cyclists use these trails primarily for climbing and re-direct themselves to other trails that see fewer hikers for descending. However, if the District fails to protect the connectivity of the mountain bike descent trails, this will likely result in a combination of increased user conflicts (high speed mountain bike descents on very busy hiking trails), and/or increased parking pressure at trailheads, as valley-bottom mountain bikers will simply drive up to trailheads if they cannot ride up and down on trails through mature forest from valley bottom. As the trailheads (i.e. at Perth and Diamond Head) are already over capacity, and out-of-town mountain bikers are only increasing, the District needs to do all it can to encourage valley-bottom residents to ride from home by protecting these important connector trails.</p>
ted prior	<p>Any development that changes zoning in a big way should have to offer some design element that improves the area. Trail connections, public space and building design. on top of uses like affordable housing purpose built rentals . Proforma s should be also required when up zoning that do high density</p>
Chris Ludwig	<p>A foot crossing of the Squamish River, if managed properly, would be highly beneficial to the outdoor community and to Squamish itself. It would provide access to the Tantalus range and other areas and would attract outdoor enthusiasts that would otherwise continue past Squamish to Whistler. These people would spend their money in Squamish instead of Whistler.</p>
Chris Ludwig	<p>A foot crossing of the Squamish River, if managed properly, would be highly beneficial to the outdoor community and to Squamish itself. It would provide access to the Tantalus range and other areas and would attract outdoor enthusiasts that would otherwise continue past Squamish to Whistler. These people would spend their money in Squamish instead of Whistler.</p>
Chris Ludwig	<p>A foot crossing of the Squamish River, if managed properly, would be highly beneficial to the outdoor community and to Squamish itself. It would provide access to the Tantalus range and other areas and would attract outdoor enthusiasts that would otherwise continue past Squamish to Whistler. These people would spend their money in Squamish instead of Whistler.</p>
Rob Andres	<p>I'm against the population threshold and think it should be removed from the OCP. This artificially puts limits on supply which is forcing the cost of homes up.</p>
Rose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council I appreciate you guys writing the OCP but i think you have missed the mark on addressing housing affordability. There should be development allowed on future residential lands as i believe it will help with affordability. All the caps should be removed and the precursor policies need to be removed as well. Thanks!</p>
Marc dEntremont	<p>The Air Quality section, 10.20 f, could include building designs where cooling can be done by opening windows instead of requiring HVAC at all and passive window screening.</p>

Marc dEntremont	With respect to Residential Infill, section 12.6. Sound and light pollution need to be considered. Already there are some building with HVAC units that limit people opening their windows, most notably in the summer. With high density, there will be scenarios there neighbouring lights negatively impact peoples enjoyment of their own residential units.
Marc dEntremont	With respect to section 36.6 on Parking, Transport + Loading. I think we need to consider that parking needs to be tall enough to support the vehicles that people will use. Many of parking areas are too short to allow vans and larger trucks to parks, so the end up on the street. Obviously, there needs to be some reasonable limit as some vehicles are inordinately large
Tatum	i want to make one simple request. Allow development to happen on Cheema lands. Is this so hard to ask? Why is council trying to put new hoops for them to jump through? Just get rid of this ridiculous red tape of having 6 policies.
yasmine	i love mountain biking and my kids love it too! roller coaster is on their favorites, it would be sad to see access closed off to this land because council was unable to work with the developer to reach agreement I want to voice my support for removing the 6 precursor policies.
Gurvir	there is future residential land that is outside of the flood zone and natural hazard area, yet council wants to focus on infill in flood lands area, why? is'nt the safety and security of the people from this town more important? council should focus on developing land that is in a safe area and the only way this can be done is by removing the population caps and eliminating the 6 precursor policies
federico	the developer of DL 509/10 has offered to guve 50% of his land to the public so that the trails can become a community assets. i hope council does not throwaway such an amazing opportunity. please remove all the 6 policies from the Ocp and secure this land!
Ronnie	Infill development sounds like a good idea but how can any average citizen buy land for millions of dollars and build higher density? There needs to be a variety of options to support other housing markets. I don't agree with the focus on infill development and i want the ocp to also create more land supply by allowing development of future residential land. get rid of the 6 precursor policies.
Alexander	There is so much development happening in town yet prices continue to go up for townhouses, detached homes and condos. there is so much townhouse development, its time to pull it back and allow for more single family development. I strongly oppose councils efforts to prevent development of future residential lands. I don't agree with what council is doing with the OCP. I want all the 6 precursor policies deleted from being a blockade to development.
Satpreet	Remove all the 6 precursor policies for future residential neighbourhoods. This makes no sense how the city is putting these roadblocks in place to prevent development.
Manlene	I live in the highlands and everyday i drive down to the highway by taking highlands way. What if there was to be an accident along the blvd? Traffic would come to a standstill and no one would be able to access the university or go up into the highlands from perth dr. There is an opportunity now to get another road built. Council is taking the wrong step by not allowing development to occur on future residential lands. Please listen to the community and remove all population caps and remove all 6 policies from 9.2h.
Jogi	I want express my clear opposition to infill development, I do not support it nor does my family. we need more development and more land to develop. I want council to remove the 6 policies from the ocp and allow future residential land development
Shawn	Dear Council, i honestly believe that the interests of the public is not being heard. This website says "This is your plan. We want to know what you like in the plan, and what you donâ€™t like in the plan. Your input is vital as Council considers this bylaw for our future. yet this is not the case, many people have found out about the censorship and how peoples voices are being silenced through data manipulation and emails being lost and not presented to council. this is surprising for me to hear and i do not want to believe that this is true but sadly i am convinced that its true. My voice probably wont be heard but i will state it for the public record. I do not want infill to be a priority and i want all the 6 delay tactics precursor policies deleted from the ocp.

Ben	<p>i totally 110% disagree with what council is doing to the Cheema Family. I've read the entire story on the situation and how the hundreds and hundreds of comments from the public have been disregarded and ignored by council. I am ashamed at how our elected officials are disregarding the democratic voices of so many people. The community wants to have more development but apparently council is being told that there is much more support for infill development. yet when i saw the statistics i was shocked at how untrue this claim is. It is clear the community wants development on their land because they are offering so many community benefits. If i could upload an attachment i would show you the bar graphs according to their data. I want to say that i fully support removing ALL the population thresholds and I also want all the 6 precursor policies to be removed the OCP as well.</p>
Harash Nathani	<p>We need more residential development in our city. The population cap is unwarranted. It doesn't make sense with the growing demand in the city.</p>
Rohan Yuin	<p>There is an abundance of traffic between Perth and Pia on a daily basis. Something must be done to address this issue.</p>
Michael Chan	<p>We have a lack of affordable housing, it is apparent that supply needs to meet the high demand in our city.</p>
Angie	<p>I have been told what happened at the council ocp meeting yesterday. And honestly I have to say that I am shocked to hear that council continues to want to prevent development of future residential lands. When the community is being offered so much land for bike trails why is council trying to do everything in its power to deny such a sweet deal????</p> <p>this council is out of touch with what the public wants. We need more housing, we need more land to build. Listen to the public for once! I want you to remove the 6 policies from the OCP. Remove them ALL.</p>
Elena Butler	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
victor	<p>Hello,</p> <p>i was notified late this evening that council is still against allowing any development on future residential lands. This is shocking to hear especially since i've been told there are close to 200 comments in support of removing the population cap. this ridiculous, does my comment have a voice or is this just another statistic that will be presented to council?</p> <p>I want all caps to be removed and i want the adopted limited policies to be removed from the OCP.</p>
Don	<p>I have been updated via a mailing list on the situation from today's OCP meeting and quite frankly i am disappointed that council is not listening to the voices of the community. I DO NOT want ANY population caps. REMOVE THEM ALL and get rid of the adopted policies section and allow development of future residential land.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
Anita	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>Remove both population caps and consider adopting policies instead of adopting them.</p> <p>I sent comments many months ago and many of my friends have done so as well. Why are you not listening to our input?</p>

Henry	I would like to voice my opinion in opposition to the current wording of the ocp that relates to growth management. I want all population caps to be removed and i also want council to consider the benefits that can be achieved by developing future residential lands. We will be able to secure bike trails for public use. It boggles my mind why council is against this. So, please remove the caps.
Jennifer Eng	<p>Squamish is a growing community. It is a diverse community. The public schools are bursting at the seams with record Number of children and the birth rate is only climbing. We as a community can only benefit by providing our future generation with schools That meet The needs of the changing world And the many ways children learn. On another note, we can keep children and families (and bring families) working and learning here if we build structures (including schools) that are desireable. The Waldorf school offers and incredible Education... one We As a society are missing out in in this digital age. I hope that the district will do their best to support the development and growth of a new waldorf school</p>
Ciarra Douglas	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to: Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Ciarra Douglas	
robert kirchmeier	
Arturo Arcos	I fully support the initiative of building a new Waldorf School in Garibaldi highlands, it's an excellent school with professional and committed faculty. I think it's important that they have better facilities to provide children with the space they need. I also believe that the Waldorf community is ecologically responsible, and they will protect the nature around.

Kirsten Andrews	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2) Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kirsten Andrews</p>
Georgia Richards	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Timothy A	<p>It has been brought to my attention that certain housing development projects would aid in providing safe routes in the time of emergencies. Climate change is real and it is unfathomable to me that my elected officials would not take that into consideration. Safety should be the number one priority, especially when there is land that is outside of every type of natural hazard zone. It would be of great value to have housing in areas outside of the floodplain, please consider removing the 22,500 population cap and change the wording adopted policies to consider items in 9.2h.</p>
Connel	<p>Vancouver has been suffering from housing affordability as a result of old policies by the City. We should review and change policies to remove population caps with not just the present in mind but look at the future of long term housing stability. Another policy to be changed as well is that council should consider items in 9.2h rather than adopting them.</p>
taranjit kaur	<p>my family and myself all support removing population caps and development allowing for future residential area. especially ones that increase the number of schools.</p>

Elise Perreault-Lariviere	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Amanda	<p>Traffic is a huge huge problem in the highlands. I hope council understands that currently there is only one way to get down to the hwy. We need another route to relieve the traffic congestion. During the summer on the weekends cars zip by down perth dr, it is a safety risk for our children. Another access route can be created from perth or pia to doward dr, just make the developers pay for it. Please reconsider the wording in the OCP and allow for both 34k and 22.5k population caps to be removed. Also include the future residential land within the growth management boundary.</p>
Dan Biln	<p>Housing, housing, housing, this key to developing a strong local economy. With new development local jobs in trades will be created. We need to focus on multifamily, duplexes, townhouses, social housing. If we grow our city, jobs will follow and small business will set up shop here. The money people earn will then be spent on other local businesses. It times to move away from policies made decades ago and remove the population caps on future residential lands and also to allow council to consider 9.2h policies rather than having to adopt them.</p>
Evan Anderson	<p>I am proud to support development that allows more affordable priced housing and schools. The future residential lands should be included inside the growth management boundary</p>
Brian Roberts	<p>Increasing our neighbourhoods in size will only benefit our community. It means investors interjecting money in our economy. Small neighbourhood businesses would also get a boost. There is no downside so allow future Residential Neighbourhood development by decreasing population caps.</p>
Brett Ineson	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Shannon johnson	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>Thank you Mayor and Council for allowing us to review the newest draft version of the OCP.</p> <p>As I shared at earlier stages of this process, I am concerned that the OCP does not adequately allow for our community to maintain a diversity in education options. By limiting land development there is no allowance for independent schools - which are vital to supporting a diverse population - to grow. This makes it difficult for any independent school, but even more so for a Waldorf school where accessibility, regardless of income, is a major pillar. Additionally, I believe that the focus on play, nature and movement in Waldorf schools best serves the whole child and exceeds what is routinely available in the public system. The different focus allows for far greater social and physical development in the early years and builds the foundation for a love for learning that lasts a lifetime.</p> <p>It is my understanding the Bob Cheema has confirmed in writing on multiple occasions, his commitment to provide portions of DL 509&510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and larger Squamish Waldorf School location and 2. Donate the high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These initiative support multiple goals of the OCP and part of what makes Squamish such a great place to live.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization I am in support of revising section 9.2.f of the OCP toe remove the population cap and proceed with the development of a portion of these lands so that the community can capture these huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Thank you for your listening to your constituents.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Shannon Johnson Past Faculty Member Squamish Waldorf School</p>
Shawn Lewenza	<p>We support the building of a new Squamish Waldorf school in the Garibaldi Highlands and to remove the population cap that is currently limiting development.</p> <p>The school is growing and was among the most important reasons we moved to Squamish. We think it as an excellent school for younger children, and as the school is expanding due to continual interest, there is an urgent need to build a new one.</p> <p>Thanks, Shawn Lewenza</p>
Christy	<p>We would be very pleased to see a waldorf school be built in our neighbourhood. We are extremely fond of the waldorf program and would be great to see another option within the commmunity. I believe it would open the doors for more families to have their children attend waldorf. .</p>
Yui Kamata	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Bethel Land	<p>Hi Matt and Sarah: I am working on a comprehensive review of the OCP, but with the size of the document and the Christmas holidays, we have not found the time to provide the District with detailed comments. Further at your meeting last Thursday night, there was mention that a report was going to Council regarding the Growth Management Strategy on January 16th.</p> <p>Please accept Bethel Corp.'s comments/questions with regard to the current draft of the Growth Management Strategy:</p> <p>Housing Needs</p> <p>At the Q&A session a good question was asked (we also asked a similar question in our September 2017 comments) with regard to whether the District is planning for actual resident housing needs or just the population threshold. It appears that with the current growth management policies that growth will depend on population rather than housing need.</p> <p>As noted with population forecasting done in the SLRD, the Sea to Sky Corridor is quite unique with many factors influencing the rate of development. As with Metro Vancouver, housing demand is not always driven by resident housing needs but can be significantly impacted by foreign buyers for investment purposes, or second home owners wanting property for recreation purposes. Squamish is also a bedroom community for people who work in Greater Vancouver, with significantly greater purchasing power than those working and living in town. The end result the population may not meet the threshold but the housing needs could be critical for more supply under your current policies.</p>
Bethel Land	<p>It would our preference that the Growth Management policies not be formalized until the housing needs study is completed, whereby there will be tangible statistics related to the type, location and amounts of housing needed to fulfill the resident needs. As both Whistler and Vancouver knows, housing supply is not necessary meeting resident housing needs, particularly from an affordability and type perspective.</p> <p>Growth Management Boundary</p> <p>As questioned at the Q&A session, there is concern that the GMB does not respond to stated intent of the policy but rather has simply followed private property ownership boundaries. In particular, the staff report indicates that the "plan maintains a strong growth management focus, directing growth to serviced infill locations prior to expanding into peripheral areas. The intention of this policy is to support efficient land use, cost effective development servicing and natural areas protection". The report that provides a default position, for the lands outside the GMB, which will be for resource uses, significant employers, industrial uses, protected areas, airport and recreation. The concern with following private property ownership lines (both those within and those outside the UGB), is that it is a lottery for those large land owners that are within the UGB, while those that fall outside must have uncertainty whether they will ever get to develop in the next 5, 10 or 25 years.</p>

Bethel Land	<p>At the meeting, an example of a small (could be considered infill) property is next to Quest University and north of Ring Creek. A portion of the property will remain as a quarry but the upper reaches are immediately adjacent to the developing Quest University node. A preapplication for this property was before staff in October 2015, where it was noted that an OCP amendment would be needed and that the development would be put on hold until the 22,500 population was reached. The goal posts have now moved to a population of 34,000 even though the site is immediately adjacent to a future node, and other than ownership is no different than the surrounding properties.</p> <p>A similar, yet not as evident situation exists for Crumpit Phase 3, where a pre-application with staff earlier in 2017, indicated that a portion of the property now within the UGB would be considered without a Sub Area Plan if increased density was considered on the property currently with RS1 zoning. Now these lands are on hold until a population of 34,000 is reached, and therefore staff has not recognized these discussions.</p> <p>Extraordinary Benefits to amend GMB / Community Amenity Contributions – It is understood that the extraordinary benefits are above and beyond the CAC’s as well as OCP and other development requirements. Although it is recognized that all such EB’s cannot be known at this time, it may be good to specifically identify any that the District may see worthy at this time. Further some sites maybe better than others to fulfill such benefits (location specific). Important to have some level of certainty for applicant before they invest too much into an idea that the District will not support – do not want it to get political.</p> <p>Environmental Protection - Certainty of important corridors that can be protected through development (note Resource industries do not necessarily protect these environmental values) is a good idea, as noted at the meeting.</p> <p>Finally, was the community provided a deadline for comments?</p> <p>Thanks for giving us the opportunity to respond, I only wish I would have known they should have been completed a few weeks ago to be part of the Council report.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
Chris Hill	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Our students are in need of a new school location so we can continue to expand our grades, ensuring growth and extending opportunities to our community children in Waldorf education.</p>

Stephanie Boha	<p>With a growing population I believe it is in the best interest not only of the people living here, but also to the district for continuing to attract more people to allow partial development of the Cheema lands so we can benefit from Bob Cheema's generous offers. The new Waldorf school depends on this being allowed, and providing your population with various schooling options such as Waldorf is something that a lot of people living here want and appreciate. Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2 Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. To support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits.</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p>
Mina Kavia	
Tara Pinsonnault	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Meghan McCrone	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Maninder	House too expensive now here we need to make price lower for families. What is council doing to help hard working families? All i see is policies that do not help growth and opportunities.
Jack	World class hiking and bike trails bring so much into our community so like why not keep them open and make them permanent.

Gabriel	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2. Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Leah bliss	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>I think the lands will inevitably be used. To get the trails for the community and land for a school seems to be a big plus to the community. Ideally if you can act now to secure this and manage to stipulate in a community building plan how you would like to see the rest of the lands divided and developed this would be fantastic. It seems that area could handle more population density and eventually have more stores and services around the university area for people to use within walking distance. If you pave the mamquam it seems the area could handle a little more traffic volume. It seems to be in better position to handle the extra volume than downtown or valleycliffe with only one entrance.</p> <p>I believe a beautiful waldorf school is a draw to the community for certain people. I'd love to see a bigger waldorf school On a better piece of land so that the school can grow and develop and add even more to our community than it already does at present.</p>
Aman Brar	<p>No vancouver housing crisis we need more land supply in addition to density. Land supply needs to be increased, people want privacy and not be placed on small piece of land with 100 other people.</p>
Mohinder Chadha	<p>I support more housing so my children can stay in our community. Please remove the population cap!</p>
Will Meadows	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2. Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Ashley	<p>As a young person, my childhood is based on Tourism in Squamish. The bike trails are a key and integral part of it. I don't know what the biking community would do without access to particular trails. It would be detrimental. Let's secure these trails by removing the population thresholds and ride on!</p>
Nancy Normandin	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to: Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Shannon McCarthy	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to: Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Candice hatina	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to: Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Bonnie Dyck	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Christopher Gordon	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Guy Gerath	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2. Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available</p> <p>Thank you, Guy Gerath</p>

starr mclachlan	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Kyla Paine	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Emily Perdue	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available</p>
Jeff Van Mulligen	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available. I also appreciate that they will maintain access to the recreational lands for mountain biking and hiking</p>

Jennifer Kelly	Please help us to build a school at Garibaldi!!!
Jennifer Kelly	
stefanie jane ineso	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Candy Tang	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Wayne Henriques	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Melanie Cochrane	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Sibylle Wuethrich	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Sibylle Wuethrich</p>
Myles	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p>
Mel Horner	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Nina Fields	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Jonathan Ok	<p>I think more homes and schools are good, please change growth management policy to allow this by getting rid of this arbitrary population cap of 22500 and get council to consider not adopt 9.2h policies.</p>
Jessica Stachoski	<p>Squamish waldorf school is busting at the seams. A new location and school is in dire need. The highlands would be the perfect place as it is not out of town but still close to nature</p>
Jessica Stachoski	
Stephanie Clark	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

<p>Lauren Baldwin</p>	<p>Dear Mayor and Council, Thank you Mayor and Council for allowing us to review the newest draft version of the OCP. As I shared at earlier stages of this process, I am concerned that the OCP does not adequately allow for our community to maintain a diversity in education options. By limiting land development there is no allowance for independent schools - which are vital to supporting a diverse population - to grow. This makes it difficult for any independent school, but even more so for a Waldorf school where accessibility, regardless of income, is a major pillar (http://www.squamishwaldorf.com/index.php/tuition-assistance/). Additionally, I believe that the focus on play, nature and movement in Waldorf schools best serves the whole child and exceeds what is routinely available in the public system. The different focus allows for far greater social and physical development in the early years and builds the foundation for a love for learning that lasts a lifetime. It is my understanding the Bob Chema has confirmed in writing on multiple occasions, his commitment to provide portions of DL 509&510 to: 1. Provide property for a new and larger Squamish Waldorf School location and 2. Donate the high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. These initiative support multiple goals of the OCP and part of what makes Squamish such a great place to live. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization I am in support of revising section 9.2.f of the OCP toe remove the population cap and proceed with the development of a portion of these lands so that the community can capture these huge benefits while they are still available. Thank you for your listening to your constituents. Kind Regards, Lauren Baldwin Parent and former faculty member, Squamish Waldorf School</p>
<p>Andrew Kuepfer</p>	<p>I believe the OCP is a great vision for Squamish moving forward and honestly I dont have allot of constructive criticism because it is very much in alignment with my community goals also. One problem that I am very aware of is the need for a new Waldorf School location as the current facility is 'fatigued' to say the very least. The Waldorf school is great benefit to the community and has very specific criteria for what kind of space works for the school and unfortunately requires access to green space. The school has looked at the available brownfield developments and they unfortunately do not fit the need. Due to this I firmly believe that concessions should be made for a greenfield project that supports this not for profit education system as it is of significant benefit to the district population and I also think the existing land in Valleycliffe could be better served as a multi-family housing unit or similar To get more greenspace might require allowing more concessions to population cap as, in general, the school will never be able to obtain a large enough piece of land to use. Andrew</p>

James Martin	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2. Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives are a crucial in attractive new and diverse population to Squamish and support multiple goals of the OCP as well as provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits and secure their future while the opportunity is still available.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
karin burns	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Sincerely, karin burns</p>
Tracey Greenberg	<p>We are thinking of returning to Squamish to live in the near future. We would love for our daughter to once again go to the Squamish Waldorf School. The old school was great because of the pedagogy and dedicated faculty.</p> <p>The one disadvantage the school had, though, was the facility had been outgrown and lacked things like a gymnasium and large school yard in which children could run and do sports. A new school would be a dream for us and might encourage us to make our move back sooner than later.</p> <p>The Waldorf pedagogy is holistic in nature and allows for children to grow and learn from the inside out—a great opportunity for this community and the world at large.</p>

Emiliano Velasco	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location.</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Joan Bennett	<p>I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to include portions of the District Lots 509 & 510 that are offered by Mr. Cheema . It would be wonderful to secure the hiking, biking trails for current and future generations as well as provide space for a new Squamish Waldorf School.</p>
Patrick	<p>I want my family to flourish after I am gone, provide more affordable housing and social housing. Let's not drive away young people who are the future of our community.</p>
Andrew	<p>These population caps on Future Residential Homes are ridiculous. We have a preventable solution to housing crisis but instead we are making it harder for investors to come into the community with very little explanation as to why this decision is in place.</p>
Susan	<p>My children deserve excellent education. We need another K-12 school and we are currently being offered land to allow for a new Waldorf school. WHY would council deny such a offer? It boggles my mind. Seriously, why is this council so anti-development?</p>
Julia	<p>I am so privileged to have grown up in such a beautiful city with an environmental ecosystem that is unbeatable. However, with the threat of environmental degradation due to climate change, I now live in a potential flood zone so I highly encourage the council to ensure that all citizens have access to escape routes.</p>
Charley	<p>We need houses, let people make them. I would suggest including future residential land within the growth management boundary.</p>
Luciana Azevedo	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Scott Cozens	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Sara Forest	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
SARA FOREST	
Kristi Robinso	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>I am 1000% in support of the Squamish Waldorf School being built in my neighbourhood. Let's remove the barriers to make this happen.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Kristi Robinson</p>

Adam Greenberg	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Benoit Forest	<p>I am very excited to know that Bob Cheema has agreed to provide portions of his lots (509 & 510) to the Squamish Waldorf School in order for them to build a much needed, larger school location. This education community is committed to creating a nurturing environment that is synergistic with nature. Having access to this land would allow for vital access to natural spaces for the children to learn how to appreciate their connection with the environment. This, along with donating the rest of the land for mountain biking trails, would provide great boons for the Squamish community and must be considered for the future benefit of students and nature lovers alike.</p> <p>I support the movement to remove the population cap so that development can begin while we still have access to this opportunity.</p>
Ken Hull	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Rhea Schutt	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

Rhea Schutt	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Vanessa	
NaTai Perdue	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>We have three children in the Waldorf school and feel it is a perfect fit for us. We know that as Squamish grows more and more people will be compelled to enter this type of education. It would be an incredible shame if this opportunity to expand our intake potential wasn't fulfilled.</p> <p>NaTai Perdue</p>
Michelle Williams	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>

<p>Visnja Pavicic-Kaltenbrunner</p>	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
<p>Alfredo Lopez Bago</p>	<p>Please respond by Tuesday, January 16!</p> <p>Your urgent support is needed to help us secure a future location in Garibaldi Highlands for SWS. The District is consulting the public on Official Community Plan (OCP), and the current draft presents barriers to development on the Cheema lands, where we hope to build a new school. It is critical that we provide comments by Tuesday. Community feedback will make a difference and they are open to make changes if there is strong community support.</p> <p>You can make comments through this link: https://squamish.ca/yourgovernment/projects-and-initiatives/ocp/ocp-comments/</p> <p>Below is a suggested comment. For ease, you can cut and paste this write up, or write you own, then send an email to myself or Christine Martin, so we can track our support.</p> <p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
<p>Jasmine Rai</p>	<p>When there is a policy that undermines the overall benefit for the community then why should it remain in place. Increasing said negative policy is only furthering this notion. I would suggest the council members reconsider and to not let political agendas get in the way of benefiting the community. Future Residential Development is what the community needs and wants.</p>
<p>Manjot Thandi</p>	<p>Remove the population cap as job security and housing affordability go hand in hand with increasing residential developments.</p>
<p>Kristan Chung</p>	<p>It would be a great idea for council to remove the population cap and allow development as it will allow us to continue to use the bike trails and secure permanent access.</p>
<p>Eliza Wong</p>	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>I would like you to know that currently there is no land available to purchase in Squamish, even if there are lots available they end up going to bidding wars which is leading to land prices to skyrocket. There is a easy solution to this, we need more land supply and this can be accomplished by removing the population cap on future residential land.</p>

Kristen Andreasen	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Sophia Paczek	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Edward Hughes	<p>Cheaper homes “no reason to complain about changing policy if it benefits the community at large. Get rid of the population caps and put 9.2h in a seperate section, it should not be a caveat to extra ordinary community benefits.</p>
Begona Cid	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2. Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Randy	<p>We need more commercial space. My husband would like to expand his business and hire locally, however there is no office space available or the rents just too high!</p> <p>The population is growing in Squamish which is great for small businesses, the more people here equals more customers. This is why i support the removal of the populations caps on future residential lands and word changes for 9.2fii from adopting policies to council consider items in 9.2h.</p> <p>Also, i would like council to zone more land for commercial.</p>
Mathew	<p>My name is Mathew . I am general Manger for a business in Squamish. I think Squamish needs more supply of houses , apartments single family development I am against city to put population caps on build able properties . Rather putting caps city should allow more housing to build so there is lot of supply against demand . I strongly recommend city to not cap individual properties .</p>
Astrid Lackner	<p>I teach at the Squamish Waldorf school and I'm hoping the Cheema lands will be open for development soon. I see more and more families with young children move to Squamish and our school needs a bigger building to accommodate this growth.</p> <p>Thank you Astrid</p>
Peter	<p>Whistler for the slopes and Squamish for the trails. Summer 2018 keep the bike trails open or you will lose my vote. Simple as that. Remove the cap.</p>
Oliver	<p>Remove population caps. Allow development. We need the free market to determine the growth and development in our city. If people do not want to live here, then development will stop but if people do want to live here we need to be able to meet the demand to keep prices in check. Just my two cents.</p>
Gabriel Alden Hull	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location. -Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Sincerely, Gabriel Alden Hull</p>
fritz bindseil	<p>I strongly support the idea of Squamish Waldorf School building a school on the Cheema lands. It will be a wonderful location .</p>

Anthony Adamson	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to providing portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location - Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Tu Hon Chung	<p>i support new development as it will allow a new Waldorf school to be built on future residential land. Council should remove the cap.</p>
Ann	<p>We need more affordable housing for all and council should allow development on future residential lands in order to build more housing. The 22,500 cap should be removed.</p>
Kashmir	<p>Do not let bureaucratic red tape stop us from alleviating future housing crises. Remove all caps and have council consider items in section 9.2h rather having to adopt policies.</p>
Colin Spark	<p>Reviewing the OCP for the first time - (sorry I've been busy) I focused on a couple of key areas I'm sure there's lots of good stuff in there and I hope to comment more should time permit. That said I'm very disappointed to see that there's no objective to improve pedestrian access to the Tantalus Range or to do something to reduce the impact of highway 99 on connectivity across the valley.</p> <p>At the end of the huge numbers of visitors driving past Squamish to access bigger mountains every day that could be accessed with a foot bridge across the river. We have a Chamonix quality resource on the west of the river in the Tantalus range yet it is to all intents and purposes inaccessible. Enabling pedestrian access across the river would be a huge draw for the outdoor / mountaineering / hiking community. Just look at the numbers of users of the Chief / gondola trails.</p> <p>Regarding the impacts of highway 99 - I don't see any attempt to address the impact this has on preventing cross valley movements of pedestrians or wildlife or traffic. Personally I'd like to see it lowered or some non-signalized intersections - i.e. flyovers / cut and cover sections to reduce its impact on the community.</p> <p>Another issue that should be tackled is the insistence on Squamish's industrial development. Please, let's be honest here, there's a huge port in Vancouver however there are very few accessible places in the world with the natural beauty of Squamish. Society is increasingly valuing these places with good reason and they should be valued for their natural assets. The recent development of Site B is astounding, apparent blatant disregard for a unique estuarine environment aside from the visual impacts should be tackled head on. Again, there really are a limited number of these environments. The Chief & the Estuary should be cherished & not degraded further. Let's face it (again) the saw mills and lumber yards / log sorts really are not their for the scenery, it's a crime to waste such areas for such industrial development over development, (or not) for those that actually value such a rare combination of geographic features.</p> <p>While I'm on the subject, another thing I don't see is any concern over highway noise - what on earth are we doing having a major highway with no noise related speed limits going through a provincial park where you can't escape the vehicle noise in comparison to Lions Bay where we have 60k limits, noise walls not to mention elevated intersections...</p> <p>Come on DoS we need to see what amazing potential this place has and work what the future occupants and visitors will value. It's time to move on from the logging town mentality... Look to Chamonix as a model perhaps.</p>
Terence Chung	<p>development on future residential land is good for our local economy. it's good for the community. why is council trying to increase the cap further? the two population caps should be removed and council should consider items in 9.2h</p>

Joshua Horoshok	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Sally McLellan	<p>Future residential neighborhoods will provide more affordable housing options, i see this as a good thing, not bad. Why does council not agree? Please remove the population cap and keep the current residential neighborhood designation.</p>
Danielle Robson	
Corey McLachlan	<p>The Squamish Waldorf School, has outgrown its current school and location, to accommodate its growth, a new school is required. The School has engaged with Bob Cheema who has generously agreed to assist the school by providing a portion of his land for a new school. I also understand that Mr Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>Mr Cheema's support for the Squamish Waldorf School and the donation of portions of his land for trial use support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a significant community benefit. This provides a unique opportunity to secure land for the benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can benefit.</p>
Susan Butler	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan Butler</p>

Cornelis J Uys	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Scott Todd	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Peter Belostotsky	<p>Dear Squamish OCP Stakeholders,</p> <p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <p>Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location</p> <p>Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community.</p> <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers.</p> <p>Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p> <p>Sincerely, Peter Belostotsky</p>

Gina Hopper	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2. Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Christine Martin	<p>On behalf of the Squamish Waldorf School, I understand that Bob Cheema has confirmed multiple times in writing, his commitment to provide portions of District Lots 509 & 510 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide property for a new and enlarged Squamish Waldorf School location 2. Donate the unique slabs and high value mountain bike trails section of these lands to the community. <p>These two initiatives support multiple goals of the OCP and provide a massive community benefit that must not be overlooked. This is an opportunity to secure tremendous benefits for current and future generations of students, parents, hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers and nature lovers. Based on these commitments from Mr. Cheema and his organization, I strongly support the revision of section 9.2.f of the OCP to remove the population cap and proceed with development of a portion of the land so the community can capture these two huge benefits while they are still available.</p>
Richard	<p>As a millennial, I am concerned with affordable housing. So i don't get why the Council would prevent residential development. Its a bit counter-intuitive if you ask me. Remove the population caps.</p>
katie ryland	<p>i support cheap housing, we need more cottage housing. If there will be cottage housing on future residential lands then i will support removing the population cap on future residential lands.</p>
Paul Whittenburg	<p>why hasn't the access route been created in the jay crescent area? I thought the developer had a deal with the city that it would be built? I support removal the population caps on future residential lands to build an access route down to the highway.</p>
Pamela Davidson	<p>Uncertainty of jobs and affordable housing has put myself and my friends in support of future residential development through decreasing or removing the population cap.</p>
Bill Paton	<p>re: 18.6 i: Evaluate proposals for a pedestrian crossing to the west side of the Squamish River.</p> <p>I am strongly in favour of this proposal. For a relatively small cost, it would effectively double the trail network in Squamish, which would increase the interest in tourists as well as residents.</p> <p>I further suggest the opportunity for a Canadian army engineering unit and other volunteers could contribute to the building of this bridge, as was done in Castlegar.</p>

Chris Small	<p>I would like to comment on potential pedestrian access to Tantulus park on the west side of the Squamish River. I believe the District should NOT be build a bridge to the west side of the Squamish for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Currently the west side of the river is a vital refuge area and migration corridor for area wildlife. Previous valley wide development in other places (ie. Canmore.) has resulted in increased human wildlife conflict much to the detriment of the wildlife. We should learn from these previous mistakes.</p> <p>2) Is not Squamish's motto "Hardwired for Adventure"? How is the spirit of adventure enhanced and promoted by easy access? There should be some places where adventure and effort has a reward of solitude.</p> <p>I agree with the Mayor on this issue.</p> <p>Sincerely Chris Small Former President Squamish Access Society</p>
Ingrid Gutzmann	<p>The OCP should definitely include wording to open the opportunity for better access to backcountry users (summer and/or winter). It is understood that thorough research on the environmental impact could preclude access, but inclusion in the OCP should encourage the legitimate appraisal of a solution.</p>
zsana tulcsik	<p>Hi. I was trying to find information in the plan about the development proposal in the Cheekeye Fan area. I don't see the proposed development area, what is in the proposal, and how the District plans to mitigate the traffic issues it will cause on Government Road.</p>
Steven	<p>As a recent graduate of Quest University, i decided not move back to vancouver. Mainly due to the fact that i fell in love with the beauty and nature of this city and because vancouver is just to unaffordable for me. I am not the graduate student that has decided to live and stay in squamish, there are many others, we have all decided to stay here because it is much more affordable than vancouver and burnaby. my fear is that when vancouverites decide to move out here a housing crisis will ensue. The city needs to be more proactive and have the servicing infrastructure in place to mitigate any influx in the population. I want to have a family here and stay in the community. Thus, i feel that decreasing the population threshold cap or even removing it all together for future residential lands will be only providing long term benefits and stability to the community.</p> <p>It is basic econ that i learned in my first year class, if the demand is too high for housing it will cause prices to shift upwards. to compensate for this one must increase the supply to offeset the demand. In the case for our city, we need more housing units and a variety of them.</p>
Candice	<p>My family and I support making changes to allow for a new school to be developed in the highlands. My child would like to attend waldorf school next year. Squamish needs more schools with better and diverse education. Please make the following changes to future residential land by removing the 22,500 population cap and also by having council consider items in 9.2h as precursors to development.</p> <p>thank you</p>
Penny Johnson	<p>I would like to own a house with a front and back yard. I do not want to pay high strata fee for condos and townhouses, which is pushed in the ocp on to squamaish residents.</p> <p>I rather see development happen on future residential lands. In order for this to happen, council must remove the population caps and also consider items in 9.2h. I am not sure why there are so many restrictions for development occur on these lands but it is frankly quite obvious. I would also encourage council to put 9.2f point 2 in a separate section and not have it tied to section 9.2f.</p>
Sarah Miller	<p>I would like to request that council and staff change the section regarding future residential land.</p> <p>Council should allow for development by removing the population cap of 22.5k and 34k, and also not set the requirement for council to adopt the 7 items in 9.2h but rather have council consider those items.</p> <p>it would be better for our community if there is more development as it will bring in more tax revenue for our city and also it will help increase the tax base.</p>

Anastasia Nikola	<p>Dear Honorable Mayor and Councillors</p> <p>Firstly, i want council to make the following changes to the ocp reharding development of future residential land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. remove the 22,500 population cap and if possible even the 34,000 cap 2.allow for portions to be developed instead of just a small portion 3.council should consider items in 9.2h rather than adopt 9.2h polices <p>i am writing to you today to express my concerns about the direction that our city is heading. We are starting to become a bedroom community for the rich, where according to census data a 53% pf squamish residents commute out of town for work.</p> <p>My husband works in the trades, he is lucky to have work here in squamish due to the recent construction boom. However, there is a lot of people that there are not enough local jobs and that is true! it because of the policies that this council is trying to adopt. you are forcing people to go work out of town rather than incentivizing them to start business here locally. There are many opportunities to start a business in construction and my hope is my husband can start his own plumbing company one day. However, i dont see this happening anytime soon if the market is controlled by the key players. it doesnt allow others to risks and start a new business. I strongly think that if council were to change the wording for development around future residential land, it will allow small businesses to grow and flourish.</p> <p>thank you for reading</p>
Isaac Jacobson	<p>The OCP talks about smart growth, which is a great idea. However, the ocp fell short on this proposal. How is it smart growth to focus on infill when there is no land to develop in our city? this basically means we are going to have land speculators coming into our city and buy up land rezoning for higher density and then flipping it. While causing housing prices and land values to skyrocket.</p> <p>No one in the community wants this to happen, we want prices to remain affordable. One way to do this is too allow development of future residential lands. We need to have more new supply of land to offset the buying demand. one way to do this is to remove both population caps of 22,500 and 34,000, allow for the land to be developed and to get council to consider items in 9.2h instead of adopting them. I think it would be better if 9.2f ii was not tied to the extraordinary benifit, instead it should be in its own section and tied to 9.2f to prevent an application to be submitted into council.</p>
Craig Moore	<p>I want to express my opposition to the wording for limited development of future residential land.</p> <p>I frankly do not understand why council would want to have 2 population caps on these lands. Doug Race recently voted in favour of giving tax breaks to the oceanfront development and said that council should not be moving goal posts as that would send the wrong message to developer community. Now I would like to ask council why it moving the population cap up even further? does council not understand that the city is going through an affordability crisis? We need to see more development and area where there is no flood hazard or debris zone. Council should remove the 22,500 population cap or even both caps (34,000) and allow for full development of future residential lands. Also, council should consider items in 9.2h instead of having to adopt the 9.2h policies to allow for a development application to be submitted for review.</p>
Aran	<p>To the Mayor, Councillor and Staff,</p> <p>I would like to bring section 9.6c to your attention. I would like to request changes to the wording of this section. As it is currently read, the section will not allow extension of water and sanitary to lands above 200m. I believe that this wording is too restrictive. I would like to recommend the following wording:</p> <p>"Should there be any developable lands above 200m elevation, provisions to the development design must be made to accommodate developments above the 200m elevation limit in terms of water and sewer servicing and delivery to the satisfaction of the engineering department.â€</p> <p>By having this wording we still identify the 200m elevation threshold but state that through engineering we develop a way to service development above the threshold.</p>

Fiona Adams	<p>i bought a house in squamish 2 years ago due to the affordable prices. Even though in the last two years the price of my house has increased, i fear that my children will be unable to afford a place to live in squamish. I bought a home in squamish not an investment property. And it boggles my mind why this council is trying pursue and implement policies that will cause house prices to accelerate upward by restricting land supply. We need more development and it needs to be affordable for all income levels.</p> <p>one way to do this would be to allow development of future residential lands by removing the 22,500 population cap and by making council consider items in 9.2h rather than having these policies adopted.</p> <p>it is my wish that council listen to this advice and try to help make squamish an affordable place to live.</p>
zsana tulcsik	<p>Hi. I was looking at Schedule F-2 and noticed that the proposed bike lane is only propose to extend to before the end of Government Rd, where it meets Squamish Valley Road. I believe one of the most dangerous roads for bikes is on Squamish Valley Road from the junction of Government Road to Hwy 99. People speed excessively in this area and it is very dangerous for bikes. I (as well as some of my work colleagues) ride our bikes to work to Alice Lake every day and it is one of the worst parts of my day. I've been run off the road twice by trucks that cut back in too early. I also see many road bikers use this section of road. Please consider extending the bike lane plan to that small section of road. Thank you.</p>
Garret Moore	<p>As a long time mountain biker, i am pleased to see that the OCP has created a connected trail network throughout the city. This will be great for the city as less people will drive around. Also, schedule G is very well thought out. We need to protect the core trails from development. if there is any development that threatens current trail networks i would like to see better trails created to compensate for that loss of trails.</p> <p>Also, i believe that council has not clearly thought out the limited development section. it does not make sense to have two populations caps. I have never understood the reasoning behind the 22,500 population cap. I would like to see both population caps removed from future residential lands and i would like to see council adopting 9.2h policies changed to consider policies.</p>
Graham Davis	<p>I think the OCP is well written and that council and staff have done a great job in presenting good environment protections and also encompass the core values of the community. There is one thing that I struggle to comprehend is why there is two population caps? we should not be allowing any development on future residential lands until 34,000 cap is reached. please remove the 22,500 cap and keep just one cap.</p>
Sam	<p>Dear Council and Mayor,</p> <p>My child currently attends Waldorf School and she enjoys going to this schools. Many parents and myself want to this school grow. Currently, the school needs more space for the students currently attending. There is an opportunity for a new school to be built, I would like to strongly encourage council to reconsider its wording for section 9.2f in the OCP. It would be highly applauded by many parents if you remove the 22,500 population cap and also allow council to consider items in section 9.2h instead of having to adopt all the policies in 9.2h.</p> <p>thanks</p>
Kuldeep Thandi	<p>Remove the population threshold of 22,500 on future residential development.</p>
Bal Singh	<p>The 22,500 cap must be removed so there can be better and more safe housing. I want safety for my kids.</p>
Lovedeep Kaur	<p>NO 22,500 population on future residential developments. We need to have more single family homes in the market.</p>
Kamal	<p>Please reconsider the wording of the OCP and remove the 22,500 cap and get rid of the small wording. Also, council should really not have to adopt the policies instead they should just consider the items in 9.2h</p>
Paven Thind	<p>I understand the reasoning why the Squamish Nation would like to focus on our expansion of Downtown. But, I would like to live in an area where I can have a backyard for my kids to play on, I do not want to be limited to only having the choice of living in a condo or by the flood plains. Therefore, I would like for council to take into consideration to remove the 22,500 population cap and allow for these future residential lands to be developed.</p>

Sim Singh	We need more development in higher and safer parts of town. Change wording in section 9.2.h to portions and NOT small portions. Remove 22,500 cap. Allow for housing
Nishu Kaur	Don't agree section 9.2h Change small portion to portions. allow for safe houses from flood areas. thank you
Dalvir	I think like to see a change in words section 9.2.h. Says small portion but I believe that must change to portions. Please listen mayor.
Dalvir	I think like to see a change in words section 9.2.h. Says small portion but I believe that must change to portions. Please listen mayor.
Kamalpreet Kaur	Council is not heading in the right direction. I am not sure what public polls they are reading but housing is one of the biggest issues in town. I don't see much in the OCP that helps relieve housing prices for people earning an average wage. The only way to bring down prices is too open up more land and too allow for more competition in the marketplace. One way would be to open future residential lands for development. We MUST remove the 22,500 threshold and consider the six policies in section 9.2.h rather that taking the tedious task of going through and adopting every single policy before allowing any limited development.
Gurjit	Why is council about to pass the golf course for development too polygon which has land zoned as green space but not let land that zoned for residential not be developed? There should be equal playing field for all developers in the city. So far it is clear that the community plan does not create a fair and equal market for this reason I support removing the 22,500 population cap on future residential land.
Harry Grewal	Dear Mayor, I would like to point out a disagreement that I have with the current wording of the community plan. I would ask that you remove the 22,500 cap from future residential land and make council consider items in 9.2.h. instead of adopting the items. Thanks!
Ravinder Singh	I am glad that the city is working to revitalize the area. However, parking is a major issue that i do not see being addressed in the OCP. Our city has been growing at an exponential rate the last few years and I really do think that the city needs to address the parking in this area. They should set aside land for parking garages. Also, don't get me wrong, i think the growth in our city population is great because it is bringing in more revenue for all the stores in the city. We need more growth in our city, it has to be smart growth. This is why i support changing the language in section 9.2. I would ask kindly to council to eliminate the 22,500 population cap and change adopted policies to consider items on 9.2h and also to remove the word small.
Gurleen	I work at hotel in Whistler for many year but i live here squamish. my husband wants to buy land to build new house but land too much money. Please remove the 22500 population cap and council please consider items not adopt them in section 9.2.h.
Jaswant Brar	i want to say that council is going in the wrong direction. i sent my comments before in the summer and no has listened. i will say it again, remove the 22,500 population threshold cap and allow development of future residential lands.
Simrath Lali	i live in the highlands and i strongly believe e we need another access road down to the highway. there is only one way to get down and there is a lot of traffic that goes by my house everyday and people drive really fast. The city needs to put speed bumps on the road. The only solution that i can see and that my neighbours agree with as well is that we need to build a new road though the cheema lands, this is why council needs to remove the 22,500 population cap so that it can be built for the benefit of the community.
harman	My comments to the city is that to please eliminate the 22,500 population cap, and get rid of the word "small portions and council should also not adopt policies but instead council should consider items in 9.2h
Dave Sidhu	Last year I applied for building permit but there was so much red tape from city and because I was not a experienced developer I was not handle all this extra requirement from the city planning department and forced to sell my land. Why does city have so much red tape to make everyone life hard? I read this ocp 9.2 section and you guys put two population cap on cheema lands why? What are you guys doing in council? How this make any sense? You should have only one cap even better if you have no caps. This is what public wants to see not what you have wrote now. Example of even more red tape is the adopted policies wording, I know for fact this will take council forever to adopt and is another delay tactic to stop development, so please stop doing this to our city. I want council and mayor to consider items in 9.2h not have to adopt them

Jasbir	<p>I work as a manager at local retail store for the last 5 years. My income has been pretty much the same but the cost of living in Squamish continues to rise. My dream of buying a home for my family is within the grasp of my hands but prices continue to rise year after year. With the new mortgage rules coming into effect it will become even harder for average income earners to be able to qualify for larger mortgages. For this reason, we need prices in the city to come down to make it affordable. One way to do this is to increase the supply through density and to open up rural land for development such as future residential land. Council should consider doing this asap and this will be possible if council makes the following changes to section 9.2f.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) remove the 22,500 population threshold 2) council consider items in 9.2h instead of adopting the items in 9.2f 3) remove small and just have portions <p>thank you for your time for reading this.</p>
Jeevan Gerwal	<p>Please Mayor and Council make these changes to ocp, it will be good for our city. You must remove the 22,500 cap and mayor must consider items instead of having to adopt items in 9.2h</p>
Harp Sandhu	<p>squamish has been my home for the last 10 years and i have seen a lot of changes to our city and neighbouring city up north in whistler from driving my taxi on daily basis. My property taxes have been going up and i see no end in sight as our city continues to become unaffordable. I currently live in a townhouse but one day i would like to purchase a larger home. However, i dont see that becoming a reality when there is no land to purchase. We need more land to open up for the public to purchase. Everyone in the city is aware of the situation with the cheema lands, i would like to encourage council to make the following changes to the OCP, which are to remove the 22, 500 population cap and get council to consider the six policy items instead of having to adopt the six policies.</p> <p>sincerely, Harp</p>
Harpreet Gill	<p>Please make the following changes to the OCP. REMOVE the 22,500 cap for future residential lands. Make council consider items in 9.2H instead of adopting the items and allow for developing portions of land instead of small portions</p>
Gurpreet Gill	<p>I would like to see more development in out town. We need to start developing future neighborhood lands. I would encourage council to reconsider the wording in the ocp by changing council adopts items to council considers items in 9.2h</p>
Frank	<p>the downtown plan is very comprehensive and really well thought out. We really do need more density of condos and apartments in the downtown core. There is however, one thing that i dont understand is why there are no plans for new drive through restaurants? we really do need more drive through fast food restaurants in our city. We are growing at very fast and sometimes have a drive through without have to wait a very long time at McDonalds would be great.</p> <p>Speaking of growing at fast past our community desperately needs to address the housing crisis that we have. I spent 3 weeks looking for a place to rent and it was nearly impossible to find a place but luckily i was able to find a basement suite to rent.</p> <p>I do believe that one of the reasons for why we have low rental vacancy rate is due to the rental supply which is very scarce. I dont see any plans for increasing rental supply in the ocp. However, i think one way to do this is to have rental purpose built housing on future residential land. There is a lot of land available and i think the city should put it to good use.</p> <p>as it currently stands from what i've been told there are two population caps on future residential lands; I would recommend to council to only have one cap by removing the 22,500 cap. in addition, i would also recommend that council remove red tape by allowing council to consider the six policy precursor items instead of having council to adopt those 6 policies before a development application can be submitted.</p>

<p>Julia</p>	<p>To Mayor and Councillors, 2 of my children attend Waldorf school, their school is currently at capacity. I chose to send my kids to Waldorf as I believe in their school curriculum and many other parents do as well. I want my children to continue attending Waldorf school until grade 12. Our school has the opportunity to expand and develop a new school on DL509 and DL 510 lands. I emailed a letter to the Mayor and Council earlier this year and I would like to know why my voice and many other parents' voices were not heard? Council is making it even harder for these lands to be considered for development by putting two!! population caps on these lands and other future residential neighbourhoods. Council should reconsider its wording for the limited development section by making the following three changes. 1. Council should consider items in section 9.2.h. instead of Council adopting the 6 policies 2. Council should remove the 22,500 cap 3. Council should allow portions of future residential neighbourhood lands to be developed. I hope my voice will be heard this time. Thank you for your time</p>
<p>Arthur</p>	<p>Dear Mayor, Council and staff I have been living in our beautiful city for 2.5 years and I have seen the prices of homes continuously increase. Affordability is becoming a great concern for many of us, I have had friends that have cashed out and moved to smaller towns such as Pemberton and even further north, where the cost of living is much cheaper. Everyone in town knows about the situation with the Cheema lands. I would like to urge you to please reconsider and allow development to occur on this land. We need to focus on more rental supply and market rate rentals. In addition to this, we also need to focus on creating more units of affordable housing. As we increase the supply of housing this should help put a relief on rental prices and housing prices. I would like to formally request Council and staff to please make the following changes to section 9.2f, which are to remove the 22,500 population cap and only have one cap of 34,000 for future residential neighbourhoods. Allow for portions of future residential land to be developed instead of small portions and also Council should consider the precursor items in section 9.2h and not have to adopt the 9.2h precursor policies. Also, I would strongly recommend having the future residential properties within the growth management boundary. Our city needs more housing and I believe allowing limited development of future residential neighbourhoods will be beneficial to our community. Thank you</p>

Carrie	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>Recently, there was an editorial article published in the Squamish Chief where the editors stated that squamish housing prices have reached the \$1,000,000 mark. This is unbelievable that houses in squamish have reached this milestone benchmark. Our city now has similar prices to other suburbs in metro Vancouver but the only problem is our population is much smaller. what will happen to prices as our population continues to grow?</p> <p>I am surprised that council is unwilling to allow development of DL 509/510 as we need more supply of land for development . i've read the growth management section and i quite frankly do not understand why there are two caps on future residential lands!?! i would like to make the following requests to council...</p> <p>a)remove the 22,500 cap but if possible also remove the 34,000 cap on future residential neighbourhoods. b)allow council to consider precursor items in section 9.2h instead of having to adopt the items in 9.2h section. c)allow for development of portions of future residential land rather than small portions.</p> <p>if these changes are made by council then i believe we can help our community solve the affordability issues that we are currently facing.</p> <p>sincerely, Carrie</p>
Dwayne Kress	<p>Dear Council and Staff, please make the following minor tweaks to Section 9.2.f.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove "small portion" change it to "portions" 2. Remove the 22,500 population threshold cap 3. Remove "adopted policies in section 9.2.h." change it to "consider items in section 9.2.h." <p>It's time to put this land and the adjacent lands into the development process to ensure connectivity between the Highlands-Estates-Brackendale and Downtown.</p>
Dave	<p>I have been living in brackendale for 3 years and I have constantly heard about the risk of flooding in this area. as global warming continues and sea levels rise, how will this OCP help current homeowners in our area? I see that the city has approved a lot of development in brackendale but has the planning department considered future flooding and how the homeowners will be affected?</p> <p>Council should be prioritizing development on land that is not in flood plains. this bring me to my other point. The land use designation of Future residential neighbourhood. These lands are outside of the flood plain so why is council to trying to prevent development of these lands? is the safety and security of squamish citizens not the priority of this council? or would council rather spend millions and millions of taxpayer money to help evacuate flood victims?</p> <p>we need development in places outside of flood plains and this is why I would like to request council to remove the 22,500 cap from the limited development section. also, the section says to allow for small portion of land to be developed but the word "small is very ambiguous and should be eliminated and be reads as "portions.</p> <p>also, I would like to request council to get rid of unnecessary red tape which is the wording of "adopted policies and change it to council "consider precursor items</p> <p>I would like council to please read my comments and think very carefully about what the future of community should be, because as of right now this ocp clearly has missed the mark.</p>

James Knight	<p>I would like to express my concerns over the growth management piece of the OCP. Council has missed the mark and has to realize that we need more land for development and investment. DL 509/510 should be allowed to be developed. i would like council to make the following changes to section 9.2f</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)remove the &quot;small portions and change it to &quot;portions 2)remove the 22,500 and 34,000 cap and, 3) council should consider precursor items and not adop t the precursor policies. This point makes literally no sense as it will take council many years to adopt the policies which makes the 22,500 a moot point. <p>i am asking council to make these changes and i hope my voice will be heard.</p>
garry	<p>i would like to say that this ocp does not reflect what the community wants. There is no land available for anyone to buy and prices continue to go up because of bidding wars.</p> <p>as such, i want council to remove the 22,500 cap from all future residential land and allow for limited development of all these lands. also, council should remove the wording &quot;small portions and change it to &quot;portions and remove the wording council adopts policies to council consider precursor items from section 9.2f</p>
Mitt	<p>I have read the ocp thoroughly and i was at the recreation centre during the public open house. I wrote my comments regarding growth management boundary but i feel like council and staff have missed the mark. I am confused as to why there is two population caps on future residential neighbourhoods and not just one, which is 34,000. why is there still a 22,500 population cap on the properties?</p> <p>i am a member of SORCA and everyone that i ride with have read the articles in the squamishchief regarding the cheema lands. So far this ocp seems like it is doing everything possible to prevent development of their land. We want to be able to access this land for many years to come and i am just confused why council is not working with the cheemas but instead raising the cap even higher?</p> <p>i would like to request council to remove the 22,500 cap and the 34,000 cap for the cheema lands. these caps make no sense and seem very unfair.</p> <p>thank you for your time, Mitt</p>
James	<p>Hello,</p> <p>i have been living for 5 years in this city and it is becoming increasing unaffordable to live here with increasing property values and property taxes. What will this OCP do to help make the city affordable for the average person to live here?</p> <p>I dont understand why the OCP focus on increasing density through rezoning land for more density rather than opening up more supply of land for development.</p> <p>I would like to ask council to allow future residential land to be inside the growth management boundary and remove both population caps.</p>
Ben Kineshanko	<p>The District should continue to develop brownfield land and should not allow any further greenfield development until full build-out of existing, in stream developments and all low impact greenfield and brownfield developments are complete. This said, I am in full support of Garibaldi At Squamish. It would be amazing to have a ski hill in town and would be even better to have a gondola to get there instead of roads. wink wink.</p> <p>I fully support the creation of work / live and more commercial and industrial space in the community and height and view obstructions restrictions on downtown streets and am glad Council is working in this direction.</p>

John French	<p>The latest OCP update has me once again feeling compelled to speak up about the near future of DL 510/511. This latest draft indicates these large parcels well out of the flood plain will be designated Limited Use.</p> <p>It is time to allow development to begin on the portions of this land adjacent to Perth Drive, Pia Road and the rest of the northern border of the Garibaldi Highlands neighbourhood. With Crumpit Woods, Ravenswood, University Estates and Legacy Ridge all well on their way to being developed this is the time to allow the owners of DL 510/511 to get into the game.</p> <p>Squamish is a very attractive place to live and there is no doubt in my mind that the former Nexen site, the former Interfor lands and other in-fill areas will be successfully developed in the near future.</p> <p>I also believe the land owner was unfairly denied development approval when the builders of Quest University chose Squamish.</p> <p>Some see the development of DL 510/511 as sprawl and I get that. By using smart growth strategies and negotiating development conditions the DOS can ensure natural values are maintained while infrastructure expansion costs are kept as low as possible.</p> <p>With residential property values in Squamish surpassing values in Metro Vancouver communities like Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows and Port Coquitlam one way to address the housing affordability issue here is to promote competition amongst housing developers. Holding back development from the Top of Perth parallel to Pia down to Condor Road and Bluebird Place simply ensures Squamish's astounding property values are going to continue to increase while making home ownership an unachievable dream for individuals and families earning a modest annual income.</p>
John Franko	<p>Dear Council and Staff, please make the following minor tweaks to Section 9.2.f.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove "small portion" change it to "portions" 2. Remove the 22,500 population threshold cap 3. Remove "adopted policies in section 9.2.h." change it to "consider items in section 9.2.h." <p>Based on the prices in Squamish, I believe having more opportunity to purchase properties will ease the burden affordability.</p> <p>Regards, John</p>

<p>Christine Endicott</p>	<p>Hello, Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Our feedback is in regards to Active Transportation, pages 105-106. We are very concerned about cars parking on sidewalks and ask that you please address this issue for community safety. One car is always parked on the sidewalk on Summits View Drive at the corner of Village Green Way. Another is regularly parked on the sidewalk on Nature's Gate near Summits View. Throughout the neighbourhood, people are often parked on sidewalks or have their vehicles partly in their driveway and partly blocking the sidewalk. This is a safety issue as it means all pedestrians, including the elderly, children and those with strollers or in wheelchairs, are forced out onto the road. This neighbourhood is becoming much busier as the newest townhouses are opening up and so violators should be ticketed or towed. The sidewalks are not owned by the home nearby but rather by the entire community and should be free and clear for pedestrians for their safety. Can you kindly deal with this issue by ticketing/towing over several weeks, to deal with this once and for all, and also copy this to council as they are seeking input into their OCP and this relates directly to their chapter regarding Active Transportation. If the sidewalks are not clear and safe, how can we walk safely? Keeping sidewalks clear is not a huge expense; it simply needs to be made a priority if council truly believes in promoting active, pollution-free transportation such as walking and cycling. Also, sidewalks will need to be cleared of snow when the snow comes if you do believe in Active Transportation and keeping walkers safe. Last year, we could not walk safely as the sidewalks on the busy stretch of Cleveland near the Nesters Mall was not kept clear of snow, and neither was the stretch of sidewalk between the Highway 99 corner at Cleveland and the Adventure Centre, running beside the busy highway. The snow was left there for many weeks, dangerously forcing pedestrians, including those with strollers or wheelchairs, onto the highway or busy road. One more issue: Since Parkhouse opened, Bailey St. has become a giant parking lot with cars and big trucks jutting out right onto the road, partially blocking it. This is a traffic hazard for cyclists and drivers as well as walkers. Why are vehicles allowed to park in a way that they are partly on the road? Finally, we feel the roundabouts are generally unsafe for pedestrians as drivers fly through them and do not pay attention to pedestrians. Please ensure crosswalks are painted wherever there are roundabouts to keep walkers safe. Thanks very much for your attention to these issues. If you can address only one issue right away, the issue of people parking on sidewalks is the most pressing, in our view. We realize not all streets have sidewalks, but where you have had developers provide them through your good planning process, please let walkers use them and stay safe by ensuring no one is permitted to block them. Even on Halloween night, people parked on the sidewalks and forced children onto the road. This happens every day, year round, in this neighbourhood and the problem is getting worse, not better.</p> <p>Thank you again.</p>
<p>Stacey Spiers</p>	<p>We live on 1026 Finch Drive. Our main concern with the new OCP plan is the densification of the surrounding areas to our place. We have a very high water table already, with small creeks running on each side of our property and it seems to be rising each time a new development has been put in. We had to spend close to \$10,000 last year to put concrete and subpumps into our basement in order to stop the water from seeping into our basement. We are still on a Well and the over run of the well water is continuous during the wet season now, where as before it would only come on during HEAVY rain. Our front yard has pools of water in it. If there is more housing allowed and no proper drainage, we will be flooding on our first floor which is ground height. I wonder when the last time a Proper Water engineering study of this area was done? Running the water off into the creek that runs along Logger's lane doesn't help as when the tide is up, this backs up all the way to Finch Creek. The surrounding treed area where the paths are have all started to be water laden and unwalkable during the rainy season, since the new developments have been put in. Some other steps for Drainage need to be looked at before we allow mass densification in the Downtown area and surrounding areas, each existing person with a lower property will be seeing the effects of higher water levels in their basements.</p>

Kelly Franz	<p>Good job.</p> <p>First Nations Lands should be incorporated into the plan, at the very least identified as federal Indian Reserves rather than "no information available on the map. Why can't we work with Squamish Nation and include or at least identify reserve lands in planning? For the sake of reconciliation having something acknowledging that it is reserve land would be nice.</p>
Kelly Franz	<p>Good job.</p> <p>a few greenways could be designated as wildlife corridors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One on hospital hill between HH and Plateau Cres could reflect current green spaces rather than showing residential development area (area covering about 6 lots north of lot 1880 (essentially connect little stawamus at McNaughton Park to Smoke Bluff Park). - another should be outlined through the future residential development uphill from crumpit woods to the east and west, connecting west all the way to the squamish River - there is almost connectivity already through this east west corridor, except right at Magee ave/Bowen Ave - maintaining as much of this corridor as possible would be good long-term. - other greenways east-west e.g. along the mamquam river would be good to establish before residential development prevents the opportunity to do so.
jim gracie	<p>(1) sked B - future residential area south and east of Quest university will put more vehicles on the already busy Mamquam road . A link to Centennial would be better. (2) sked D1 - show rial line as defacto dike (3) sked D2 - dike needed north end Wiawakim to rail line . (4) sked F1 - the major intersection to Valleycliffe will need better sight lines over the knoll on hwy99. Pedestrian bridge over blind channel should move to rail bridge so that sailing vessel masts are not impacted. (5) sked F2 - Skyline drive is too dangerous for a main bike lane . (6) sked F3 - connect Swan trail along west side Bailey street.. (7) sked G - Mashiter south , pipeline , tantalus to depot and railwoods are good links which should get higher priority. Pedestrian bridge over blind channel should move to rail bridge . Future critical needs to include regaining ownership of dike trails at Eagle run ,Town dike at Sixth ave and Judd beach .. (8) sked H - new Dentville park, show WMA , natural park along Mashiter creek should be continuous and name for park at east end Depot road should be Froslev.. (9) sked L - despite note Cheekye should be shown in red. (10) sked N - oceanfront parking spaces at community park are sparce and the possible parking structure will decrease size of the community park.. (11) sked O - waterfront pedestrian bridge over blind channel should move close to rail bridge. Need trail link southward to connect with highway overpass near casino. (12) sked P - pedestrian bridge over Mashiter south of University avenue bridge is redundant and priority should go to reconnecting Ring creek falls trail along the western and southern boundaries . Safety setback for the northward advance of gravel pit needs to be wide.</p>
Matt Gunn	Great work District of Squamish Team!!!!
Monica	i want to make a clear indication that i support removal of the population cap of 22,500 and to include future residential lands within the growth management boundary.
Navneet	Honestly, please don't drive me and my family out of Squamish because of housing affordability and over crowded calssrooms. My entire family supports removing the populations caps and building more schools with different education curriculum than public schools.
Hailey	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>I am in full support of removing caps on Future Residential Neighbourhoods for the following reasons. I have legitimate concerns regarding the standards of our classroom sizes for our kids. My partner and i put emphasis on high standards of education and as the population increases in squamish this has become a growing concern. We need larger schools and for this reason the cap on these lands should be removed.</p>
Wyatt Thompson	Squamish budding tourism industry can greatly benefit from permanent and established trail network. If these valuable trails such as jacks trail and roller coaster are not secured through agreements with developers then community will lose out. But at the same time, I realize that this is private land and our community is lucky to have access to the trails on this land for this reason the city should work together with the developer by removing both of the population caps.

Winston	I would like the city to ensure that the trails are protected and that trail connectivity is maintained. If this can be guaranteed i support the removal of the 22,500 population cap and also to change the wording of council adopting to council considering items in 9.2h.
Brad	We need to protect the bike trails! i will support anything that keeps the access open. Please remove all the population caps Thanks!
Gill	I support removing the two population caps on this land use designation. I also support changing the wording of council has adopted policies that address all items identified in 9.2h to council has considered items identified in section 9.2h as precursors to development in future residential neighborhoods. I support these policy changes as we do not need a vancouver housing crisis here, which everyone knows is starting to happen here.
Roland Davie	I want to make a statement regarding this land. I do not agree with what council has decided to do, there should be an equal field for all lands in our city. I would like to request council to remove ALL population caps from this property. Secondly, this property should be included within the growth management boundary, and finally my last request is that council should consider items in 9.2h rather than adopt items in 9.2h. The wording and direction of the ocp in regards to development is out of touch with the reality of what the community wants.
Jason Virk	Please remove the 22,500 population cap from all residential neighborhood lands.
Gale	I am an avid mountain biker and for many years my family has been using the trails on the cheema lands. We are grateful for them for allowing us and many other community members to use there land for so many years. I am strongly requesting the mayor and council to reconsider the land use designation that they have given this land. I have talked to many of my friends and we all agree that it makes NO sense whatsoever to have 2 population caps on this land. .Yyou guys have increased the cap from 22,000 to 35,000, why not just keep one cap? better yet, remove both caps and let the cheemas develop. We need more development in our city, we are currently facing an affordability crisis. it boggles my mind that this council is trying to prevent new development and many local jobs from being created. lastly, I would ask staff and council to make the following changes for all future residential neighbourhoood lands. firstly, remove the 22,500 cap, secondly remove small portions and change it to portions, thirdly remove adopted policies in section 9.2.h. and change it to "consider items in section 9.2.h. as of right now, like many others I know it seems like councils policies are contributing to the affordability crisis as there certain number of developers that are controlling the market prices. We need more new development by other developers to help lower prices and I hope council can understand basic economics of supply vs demand.
Justin Robertson	i don't understand why council is placing 2 population threshold caps on future residential lands. what is the reasoning for this? it would make sense just to have one cap of 34,000. I am not sure if council really understand that we are probably already at the 22,500 cap, there are many people that live in authorized and unauthorized rental suites. i have read the section regarding limited development and i do see that council doesn't want the future residential land owners to develop and good for them to prevent this. we shouldn't allow any new development in our city, it is becoming too unaffordable. but i just want to say that the two population caps just doesn't make any sense, it is very poor policy decision making. we should have one cap maybe even put it up to 50,000.
jasmine	i think the ocp does a good job of encompassing what our community stands for but i dont see how it well help people like me with average income to continue to live here. i work in the hospitality sector and it is getting increasing difficult to live in squamish. we need more rental supply as it is very hard to find a place to rent housing price continue to go up and i think what we need to do is increase supply of housing so that prices can come down. this brings me to my point that development of cheema lands should be allowed. council needs to revise the ocp to reflect this. council needs to remove the 22,500 cap and also change the wording in 9.2 f point 2 from adopted policies to consider items. this i believe is fair to all property owners, otherwise it seems like some owners are favoured and other are not. i hope council can find a solution to help solve the affordability crisis in our city

Robert Nelson	Squamish should maximize its density to create a viable downtown. Businesses downtown need to be supported to thrive. And sprawling creates more expensive infrastructure to support in other areas of Squamish. We need to spend less to get more. Creating high-density, mixed use downtown should be the focus. Then growth in other areas once that has been accomplished. People should be able to live, walk, shop, play downtown. We are moving in that direction, but not at 2.0 density? When most downtown locations are trying to achieve 10-12 fsr (far)? Squamish has many small lots downtown, it will be hard to complete larger projects soon. And then Squamish will continue to sprawl. Instead of focusing residential and commercial together to create a viable downtown with critical mass to support infrastructure and growth. Thanks for taking the time to read this!
Ben Kineshanko	Fully support this development. Great idea. DOS just needs to ensure adequate budget to maintain infrastructure
Sean McKay	I support greater density; however, one area of concern I have is view corridors being affected by building height. Mountain views contribute to draw and uniqueness of downtown and I hope maintaining the views is taken into consideration when designing new zoning bylaws. Thank you for the consideration.
Ben Kineshanko	Should hold off until existing brownfield land is built out and should not destroy existing trails.
Graham Rowbotham	Why has the greenway corridor along the Little Stawamus River been significantly reduced in the 2040 plan? Isn't this an ecologically sensitive habitat for salmon and other wildlife?
Larry Murray	This area is critical for further consideration. In fact it could; trump; (sorry) the planning on other areas. Here is why: Two schools; two active commercial malls; a hydro sub station; fast food restaurants; a spaghetti mess of little roads; hundreds of new condos coming on top of those already downtown - and it is the only in/out roadway to downtown and the official gateway....anda level railroad crossing right through the middle of the area!! A dangerous situation for emergency vehicles and high traffic volume now and more to come. How about a rail underpass (like the Chunnel between UK? France). The Federal Trade Corridor Fund can be tapped to make that happen.