



OCP Review 2009
May 12 Open House Comment Form – Summary of Comments Returned

Organized by Topic

Topic 1 – Downtown Height

Summary

No Increase – 3 responses

Increase near escarpment – 4 responses

Overall increase – 2 responses

Other – 3 responses

Not sure the results reflect what actual comments were in regards to building height (NO INCREASE)
Downtown height – good comments. I would think that existing residents in proposed area should be consulted.
I would strongly discourage increasing height restrictions/building masses in the downtown core. The usual impact of such development would likely erode the heritage value of the downtown, interrupt viewlines across the downtown core (especially to/from Grey Mountain or the clay cliffs) and change the character of the area. Is there a reason height restrictions & building masses can't be flexible in urban residential areas, especially in areas where vehicle traffic can't be more effectively accommodated or controlled?
Topic 1: high areas throughout to promote high density and promote 'wilderness city' instead of urban sprawl
Topic 1 – Doesn't make sense to build too close to the escarpment due to safety concerns – retain the metre requirement & remove the storey requirement
I am totally against increasing the building height limit, especially in the old town zone. I am appalled, given the existing low density, residential & heritage character of old town, that groups would be recommending that tall buildings be allowed near the escarpment zone in old town where I live. Living near the clay cliffs means that we lose natural light and sunlight for part of the day. Allowing tall buildings would only exacerbate this problem. A tall 2 storey house was built right next to our house (2 stories plus basement level) which now blocks much of our evening sun from about 6 months of the year. This had really lowered our quality of life. I am very concerned about any further encroachment on our quality of life and enjoyment of property. There are many under-developed parts of the downtown including empty lots & buildings of less than 4 stories, why not fill those in first rather than disrupting the peaceful neighbourhood of old town.

Topic 1 – taller buildings only near escarpment, and then only if they do not cast shadows on others Height should decrease from the escarpment to the river – same number of stories as the avenues.
#1 – Downtown area looks good for planning as has been drawn
I like only a height increase in the escarpment area
Escarpment no problem with heights – no shadows no impact
Increase height near the clay cliffs, tier it down towards river

Topic 2 – Park Reserve Designated Areas

Summary

Protect McIntyre Creek – 5 responses

Protect McLean Lake – 4 responses

Protect Mary Lake/Wolf Creek – 2 responses

Protect Long Lake/Croucher Creek – 2 responses

Other areas – 5 responses

They don't seem to represent what was being said by citizens. There was strong support for protection of McIntyre Creek at the meetings, but it doesn't come across that way by your interpretations. Whistle Bend got a free ride with little opposition as the sacrificial lamb to save McIntyre Creek
In general I support the results. In particular I support the Park Reserve designations which further discussions to boundaries and support the
I would strongly support the zoning of Long Lake as Park Reserve.
Topic 2: promote more density in order to have more park reserve
#2 Map – reflects a much better distribution of recreation area. Each area should be equipped with a stewardship society who is willing to keep the area clean & with good habitat Could preserve a buffer around Long Lake, Chadburn lake, etc. For recreation – back far enough for good riparian area
#2. Mary Lake needs riparian area protection. This is a staging & nesting area for migratory birds. All lakes & streams & rivers need a riparian area protected of about 100 meters Croucher Creek is salmon bearing stream and needs a min of 100 meters from high water protected
Topic 2 – SAVE the Mt Mac Ski trail area Save McIntyre Cr
Park reserve designation for Mt Mac Ski trails is supported 12 times – 4 specifically and 8 times within the friends of McIntyre Creek proposal – This should be the end result for this area. Only 1 comment supports expansion of Raven's Ridge Residential development on the ski trails. 12 to 1 residential should NOT be considered for the Mt Mac Ski Trail area currently used by over 1000 members
Park reserve designated areas. Good ideas, does that mean that the greenbelt area will be compromised because of parks? I would like to see the stretch of greenbelt between Valleyview and Mt Mac along Hamilton be included in the Mt Mac Park

<p>Topic 2 – “Park Reserve” should be weighted as to ecological value. Not all these listed areas are reflected by size equivalent to their ecological value. For instance, Verslucce meadows and Stinky Pond and Paddy’s Pond are largely man-altered environments (some bulldozed during WWII) of far less ecological integrity and ecologically much less significant than McLean Lake, upper McLean lake and downstream wetlands. Crestview has wetlands and hiking/ski trails west of the neighbourhood that should be park reserve.</p> <p>Extend Crestview wetlands south; Verslucce meadows and stinky lake are ecologically altered; McLean Lake is ecologically intact – should be enlarged to include drainage basin, not just the creek. Should include sleeping giant. (Map included)</p>
<p>McIntyre Creek area should be made into a park.</p>
<p>McLean Lake park reserve area should include addition of upper McLean Lake area and all of Sleeping Giant Hill</p>
<p>Wildlife & recreation corridor should connect McIntyre Creek area & McLean Lake park reserve area</p>
<p>Extend the Park Reserve area for Wolf Creek to the south to encompass Mary Lake. Mary Lake was identified as an environmental protection area in the 2002 plan. It is an important water body for water fowl (red necked grebes) and fur bearers, moose, caribou</p>
<p>Park reserves should be adopted. The more green space the better – especially consider adoption of park areas for preservation of natural/sensitive ecosystems – not to allow more accessibility to Whitehorse residents</p>
<p>I think that McLean Lake, upper McLean lake and sleeping Giant should all be in the same park with trails! And I love to go canoeing in the lake</p>

Topic 3 – Urban Residential Development

Summary

Against Porter Creek D – 3 responses
 Protect Watersheds – 2 responses
 Densify Existing Areas – 5 responses
 Other – 5 responses

<p>Don’t like the idea of densifying area or creating more housing around college between Takhini + PC</p>
<p>I would suggest a viewshed analysis to identify opportunities & constraints to new development (such as along Grey Mountain Road & adjacent to Long Lake).</p>
<p>Community Cafe results highlight progressive zoning of new residential areas across the City limits</p>
<p>Topic 3: have a plan i.e. Population vs time vs where development happens. Allow higher density in old town for sure. Take most cost effective approach</p>
<p>Topic 3 – agree that new areas need to be well planned for Densify current areas like beyond Copper Ridge</p>
<p>Build the wilderness city with dense residential with close proximity to trails greenbelts & open space so we can play close to home</p>
<p>Topic 3 – No urban residential near ecologically sensitive areas such as Raven’s Ridge or McLean Lake Go Slow – Let’s increase number of households on country residential and build on Whistle Bend site before destroying natural areas which we should preserve for recreation and sustainable, ecological lifestyle.</p>
<p>No to land development between Mountain View Drive and Alaska Hwy.</p>

Explore urban densification (e.g. Condo development) in urban residential development areas
#3 – No building (residential) between Porter Creek & Takhini – PCD – Develop to help promote and manage use of McIntyre Creek.
McLean Lake should be residential or reclaimed gravel pits.
Multiple zoning options for the same lot (realizing that this would be sparingly applied) It would speed development up by eliminating a) uncertainty about opening up the OCP b) financing c) wasted time
1) close off 5 th , 7 th & 8 th avenues. Sell land of 40' x 100' lots created with first option @ market rates to adjacent landowners. The cross streets serve no purpose. <u>Benefits</u> fewer streets to clean, more land to develop, less need for ridiculous overbuilt developments

Topic 4 – Country Residential Development

Summary

Support Country Res Development – 4 responses

Against Country Res Development – 7 responses

Grey Mountain Road – 2 responses

In general I support the results. In particular I support the Park Reserve designations which further discussions to boundaries and support the No More Country Residential Development as indicated at the displays Also support the Stevens Area for gravel/industrial development
Topic 4: Support high density – less urban sprawl
Topic 4 – Hold off on country residential. That Whse Copper was a fiasco. There are lots that need holding tanks for water & sewage because it is bedrock or swamp
Topic 4 – Do not increase country residential neighbourhoods yet. Increase allowable density on present country residential Decrease maximum square footage while increasing allowable number of households from one to two per country residential lot First Nations may develop country residential inside the city as well
Stevens could be country residential
Lots on Gray Mt Rd for green homes. Improve the road only do not put in street lights etc. Divide the land into 1 acre lots with all lots facing south/south-west
Any expansion of country residential is quite incompatible with issues of energy, “large footprints” and services (efficiency) We need greatly enhanced public transportation and spatial planning for it.
Support Grey Mtn Road development
Balance of urban sprawl to limit large country residential within city limits
No More Country Residential Development as indicated at the displays

Topic 5 – Industrial Development

Summary

Stevens Area – 5 responses

No Industrial at McLean Lake – 3 responses

Clean Up Ear Lake – 2 responses

In general I support the results. In particular I support the Park Reserve designations which further discussions to boundaries and support the No More Country Residential Development as indicated at the displays Also support the Stevens Area for gravel/industrial development
Topic 5: Agreed – keep industrial as close to each other, densify
Topic 5 – It totally makes sense to build industrial in areas like the Whse Copper mine site. They want flat cleared space Not at Utah site too close to [woc] and upstream of water source
Industrial Dev: MacLean Lake as an Industrial development No! How ironic for those of us who have been here more that 25 years to see Ear lake as an Industrial area and in the state it is right now. Is that the fate of McLean Lake in 25 years from now?
Topic 5 – McLean Lake area should not be zoned industrial. It should be reclaimed and rehabilitated as part of an ecological reserve in the heart of the city Stevens's area is rich and abundant source of gravel to easily meet all the city's needs. Air currents flow north & do not impact on residents The difference between light/service industrial and Heavy industrial should be clearly differentiated. Former toxic sites should be made use of for industrial purposes. (e.g. Utah siding, Whitehorse Copper) Do Not allow asphalt plants or concrete batch plants or any other toxic industrial plants at McLean Lake due to prevailing winds & highest density population No Heavy Industrial land uses at McLean Lake or ear Lake or South Axis. Remove Skookum Asphalt from present location – Move to Stevens
NO new quarries or industrial development in McLean Lake area. Only use existing disturbed areas & then convert to low impact service or residential areas. Industrial uses are not compatible with future park reserve & residential uses in the McLean Lake area.
Support industrial use 1 st
Also support the Stevens Area for gravel/industrial development
Ear lake was supposed to be cleared of quarrying approx 4 years ago after a 9 year extension – How come they are still there?

Topic 6 – Highway Development

#6 – No highway through McIntyre Creek!! No no no!
Topic 6 – Utah siding should be developed for trucking McRae could be expanded; seems underutilized.
Highway development, if necessary and narrow the width or road, would decrease noise pollution, invasive species (this is all being done in other Canadian & American jurisdictions)

Topic 7 – Agriculture

Summary

Yes to Chickens – 5 responses

#7 – yes if it is leased area for fields of hay etc. Then in future when needed the city can develop residential lots. City should keep title to all large areas until needed. Plan the lots they will [leave] & have them surveyed ready for sale. Smaller scale agriculture can be done on country residential – i.e. Chickens/turkeys/1 or 2 horses, etc or large greenhouses
Topic 7 – promote community gardens Yes to urban chickens
Chickens, gardens, more bike paths all great ideas
Topic 7 – Yes to chickens, limit of 3; No to roosters No agriculture is city – need land for urban uses
#7 Yes to Chickens – major support for urban agriculture in general
Leave community gardens

Topic 8 – Outdoor Recreation Areas

Location of Trans Canada Trail should be on there & marked recreational
Topic 8 – Mt Sima started as a non-profit society. If ‘developer’ moves in, there should be more public discussion
Identify the trans Canada Trail within City – possibly include @ recreation trail/corridor.
The millennium trail needs sign with maps at key entry points like traffic circle. Also include distance so people know the time to do the loop. Tourists have no idea of what it is

Topic 9 – Architectural Design Guidelines

Topic 9: Any architectural standards need to support a plan, come up with plan 1 st . I don’t like the idea of standards as they are VERY hard to write well.
Topic 9 – Skagway, Whitehorse, & Dawson benefit from consistent style design, both benefit residents and visitors. Gold rush theme is best for downtown
#9 allow other materials like straw bale
Architectural – Maybe time to look at building codes to allow (besides straw bale) things like ramped earth, earth ship(tire house) and other more green alternatives

Topic 10 – Referendum

Summary

Support Referendum – 10 responses

Not sure the results reflect what actual comments were in regards to building height (NO INCREASE) and referendum (leave it as is)
Re: Referendum – I think if it took 2000 signatures to enact the referendum, it needs at least a matching # to remove it.
#10 – Please leave the referendum in place! We need to be aware of what is happening. Even Alberta has requirements to consult!
Topic 10 – any referendum requirement is a result of broken trust. Specifically, I think the requirement for a referendum should be put to a referendum
Topic 10 – Consult & keep as is
I guess I have a question as to why we are addressing the referendum question at this level when we have had more people who have agreed about the fact that this should be – in that I mean the referendum should stay
Topic 10 – Do not tamper with the referendum. Leave the referendum as is. At the same time, there needs to be a public process for developing protected areas policy, nomination and establishment of protected areas. It needs to be transparent and accountable. It needs to be based on Science (ecological inventory) and sound land use planning principles NOT existing political ideas of past or present politicians and citizens with business/financial interests
No to rescinding the referendum. If the citizens were listened to in the first place, there wouldn't have been a need for the petition in the first place.
Green space referendum should not be deleted unless the City can come up with an acceptable alternative, re: a firm green space plan and commitment that is proactive, long term & provides secure parks & protected areas that residents can rely on to provide long term park amenities
<u>Retain</u> OCP Policy 6.4.4
referendum (leave it as is)

Other Topics

Affordable Housing

We require a significantly increased stock of affordable rental accommodation – zoning should allow for this & encourage this
Affordable housing in old Canadian tire
allow garden suites
Bylaws regarding basement suite in Duplex areas or gramy houses for example – Allow it – look into changes in that area
Affordable – low cost housing. The city could look into a pilot project to demonstrate the sustainability of a green building for low cost housing – example downtown lots by the river

Density

Why is old town the only area of the city without a density? The density of 60 units/ha should never have been taken out
Increase density in old town as long as it conforms to zoning requirements of physical dimensions, setbacks, etc
densify and keep lot size reasonable when you do

Downtown

<p>Re. Downtown</p> <p>1) Traffic calming on 6th Ave, big problem somebody is going to be killed; a traffic light, pedestrian crossing or speed bumps should be installed @ 6th & Black</p> <p>A program should be initiated to consolidated alleys in old town to adjacent lots with garbage trucks going up streets. Alleys serve no purpose easements can be issued to Yukon Electric for their power lines. <u>Benefits</u> less need for maintenance of alleys by city, 'creates' usable land for development or general use by residents. All land owners of a block must agree to close off alley, a survey boundary is run up the middle of the alley and land consolidated with adjacent lots</p>
Build new municipal bldg, city hall, fire station & transit building downtown at old Canadian Tire Building. (plans included)

Other Comments

Would like to have one more meeting where changes happening in our neighbourhoods will be discussed
Whse should be developing groundwater wells uphill of Copper Ridge to service that part of the city up hill. Groundwater collection places will need protection. Groundwater wells up hill will save pumping uphill and provide second source should come up with one or other