

Official Community Plan Review 2009 - Complete Chart of Community Café Input - Phase 2

Facilitator	Table 1 (Wed) Mike E	Table 2 (Wed) Kinden	Table 3 (Wed) Ben	Table 4 (Thurs) Mike E.	Table 5 (Thurs) Ben	Table 6 (Thurs) Kinden	Table 7 (Thurs) Mark	Table 8 (Thurs) Adam	Table 9 (Sat) Mike E.	Table 10 (Sat) Mark/Ben	Table 11 (Sat) Kinden
I Downtown Height											
a Should taller buildings be allowed?	Some select locations along escarpment. Safety issues important.	Height increases could be allowed for some areas.	Overall majority was in support of taller buildings. A few not in support. One person called for a shadow analysis. Grid of storey designation.	Allow 20m if built to green standard. Nearer cliffs in select locations	Support for higher housing. Select locations where impacts to existing residents will be minimal. Ensure taller buildings are mixed use.	Support for removal of storey restriction. Some support for taller buildings.	Remove storey designation. All select locations along escarpment higher.	Taller buildings should be allowed when demand warrants it.	Mixed response. Most said taller is OK, although one said no height change from current.	In select locations. Minimize shadow impacts by having building interspersed. Also remove storey designation.	Height increases could be allowed for some areas. The future vision of each area needs to be determined prior to a discussion of height. Should be a stepped approach moving out from the escarpment.
b If taller, how tall?	Keep 4 storeys/20 metres overall, with a few exceptions.	Keep 4 storeys/20 metres overall, with a few exceptions.	Exceed 20 m along escarpment but gradually step down towards river.	Up to 20m with green buildings required	n/a	No consensus on how tall.	Along escarpment to be 20m, then 15.5m and then 10-12m at the river	n/a	n/a	n/a	Restrict to 20m and remove reference to storeys. Some taller buildings may be permitted.
c If taller, which areas?	Rogers/5th lot is OK for up to 25 metres. Has to be high quality mixed social/market housing. Increase to 3 storeys/12 metres between 8th/cliffs. Whistle Bend would be fine for some 8-10 storey development to north side of town square.	Increase height limits near the escarpment, in Old Town, and west of 4th.	Along escarpment.	Nearer cliffs in select locations - Rogers/5th lot, Steele St lot, 7th ave near Garden - could consider up to 25m	Northern end of town by Canadian Tire (shadow impacts will be lessened).	Support for taller along escarpment.	Higher along the clay cliffs	n/a	Near cliffs - then 'spread' away from there. Look at setbacks for upper storeys as requirement to keep lower profile.	Along escarpment and along the northern end of City. Keep Main Street; southern end of City and Riverfront lower.	Increase near escarpment and near north town. Some discussion on increasing height in Old Town (some consensus).

	Table 1 (Wed)	Table 2 (Wed)	Table 3 (Wed)	Table 4 (Thurs)	Table 5 (Thurs)	Table 6 (Thurs)	Table 7 (Thurs)	Table 8 (Thurs)	Table 9 (Sat)	Table 10 (Sat)	Table 11 (Sat)
2 Park Reserve Designated areas											
a Which areas are worthy?	No decision	Protected areas should be provided to service residential areas. They should be interconnected through fingers. Creeks, lakes, wetlands should be given priority. Should represent land that is not suitable for development. Some protection should be provided in the McLean Lake area where scientifically appropriate.	Mt. McIntyre Ski Trails/Stinky Lake/McIntyre Creek; Paddy's Pond; McLean Lake; behind Spruce Hill subdivision	Mc Creek - follow FMC proposal.	Ice Lake/Paddy's Pond; McIntyre Creek area proposal; beyond Long Lake where F.N. parcels are located; McLean Lake	More investigation of environmentally sensitive areas is required. These areas should be subsequently protected. Protect riparian areas. Determine areas of importance to public. Protect flat green areas near development (no consensus). Protect ski trails and McIntyre Creek area where it makes sense. Protect Versluce Meadows and riverfront areas in Riverdale. Protect "infill" areas in Riverdale (no consensus).	McIntyre Creek watershed, Chadburn Lake area, Wolf Creek, Marwell Wetlands, Crestview Ponds, Mclean Lake Wetlands	McIntyre Creek area, Grey Mountain Bike Park, McLean Lake. Revisit size and scope of Chadburn Lake Park Reserve (no consensus).	n/a	McIntyre Creek area and Ski Trails; Paddy's Pond and Ice Lake. Keep Chadburn Lake Park Reserve	Areas that hold environmental significance should be preserved. Recreation areas should be protected, especially near residential development. Ski trails and McIntyre Creek should be protected (no consensus on size of park). Protection of Paddys Pond, rock gardens (significant recreation areas). Protect Versluce Meadows and Hidden Lake.
3 Urban Residential development											
a How much needed?	Keep existing greenbelt areas intact - no further urban res areas needed for 25 years. Beyond 25 years move airport.	More is definatley needed.	Consensus that Whistle Bend will accommodate majority of population increase in the near future. Look at densification of existing neighbourhoods.	Need to plan new area across River. No to Porter Creek D.	Overall support for compact development within urban core. Need to know what First Nations plan to do as parcels may absorb residential demand.	More is needed.	No new areas but those listed. Focus on building up and infill	More is needed.	n/a	5000 units approximately.	More is needed.

	Table 1 (Wed)	Table 2 (Wed)	Table 3 (Wed)	Table 4 (Thurs)	Table 5 (Thurs)	Table 6 (Thurs)	Table 7 (Thurs)	Table 8 (Thurs)	Table 9 (Sat)	Table 10 (Sat)	Table 11 (Sat)
b Where?	Big Box area should be re-zoned to allow mixed-use res-com devel. New big box in CS area should share parking lots. Existing urban residential areas main focus for new development - accommodate significant population increases in all existing neighbourhoods. More development in Old Town - relax regulations somehow. Allow Garden Suites the same as living suites.	Densify in existing areas prior to opening greenfield developments. Use suites, detached suites, duplexes and multifamily to densify. Possibly in the Long Lake area, Porter Creek D.	Beyond Copper Ridge; Long Lake	Logn Lake area - span from KDFN selection adjacent to Croucher Creek to same setback from River as Whistle Bend has. Encompass whole area in here that is not environmentally sensitive. More density in existing urban areas. Ensure that new development have Whistle Bend-style green fingers. Expand mixed-use areas Downtown.	Focus on increasing density in existing areas. New areas identified: Long Lake.	Support for some development in PCD and selective infill on Pine Street. Subdivide and densify existing areas.	Marwell area, Tank Farm, Hamilton Blvd Extension, next to McRay More infill and allow suites and carriage house, garden suites, Mixed residential downtown and Marwell, Ball diamonds in Takhini	Selective infill in Riverdale. Redevelopment of Grey Mountain School site. Focus on higher density in existing neighbourhoods. One said (Ted Staffen) look at development by Grey Mountain (no consensus).	Have a mix of residential options. Look at areas around Yukon College. Limited amount in Porter Creek D would be OK - i.e. flat areas adjacent to road. Need wide variety of housing options for all income levels. Could have carefully implemented increased housing in existing areas (but make sure existing services e.g. mail etc can handle it)	Long Lake area, Beyond Copper Ridge. Also focus on increasing density in existing areas.	Infill small greenfield areas, underutilized lots, and densify existing neighbourhoods prior to larger scale development. New areas for development (consensus) include Long Lake Road (mix of urban and modified CR), Beyond Copper Ridge, Mclean Lake area (urban res and modified CR), Fish Lake road (match KDFN). Other areas could include (no concensus) west of Kopper King (access to ski trails) and flat areas on Grey Mountian Road. Residential areas should be planned to
c Mapping approach – Urban Residential or “Future”?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No new areas but those listed. Focus on building up and infill	n/a	Look at generic residential designation for certain areas - could be either country or urban, depending on suitable of land, servicing, etc.	n/a	n/a
4 Country Residential development											
a More neighbourhoods or not?	No more.	Yes, but only after building up of existing through multiple family and subdivision.	Overall no support for new neighbourhoods but look at infill and subdivision possibilities of existing neighbourhoods. Also expand existing neighbourhoods.	No more.	Overall majority opposed to new country residential.	No more country res.	No more! It is not sustainable	No more country residential development. Have variable lot sizes within country residential neighbourhoods.	Look at modified country-res in Lobird area as option.	n/a	Focus on areas within the serviced areas of Whitehorse.

	Table 1 (Wed)	Table 2 (Wed)	Table 3 (Wed)	Table 4 (Thurs)	Table 5 (Thurs)	Table 6 (Thurs)	Table 7 (Thurs)	Table 8 (Thurs)	Table 9 (Sat)	Table 10 (Sat)	Table 11 (Sat)
b If more, where?	Allow up to 3 units on RCI-size lots. Allow RCI subdivision to 0.5ha. New roadways should be built to narrower standard.	Long Lake, McLean Lake, Grey Mountain.	n/a	No Country Res on Grey Mtn Road.	A few areas mentioned though: Long Lake; McLean Lake, South Access Road.	n/a	n/a	n/a	Grey Mtn Road idea - bench. Not totally supported by table. Would be hidden from view, could provide relatively affordable option - think of as "cabins".	Grey Mountain Road with the condition that trails are maintained.	n/a
c Multiple family allowed?	n/a	New country res should be modified country res with smaller lots and denser housing forms.	n/a	Allow but with restrictions to control that it's not too much.	Support. Allowing garden suites also good idea.	Densify existing country residential areas.	Yes, Multi family (like grooberville) of triplexes and quads as well as subdividing lots within	n/a	n/a	Overall support for increased density but with restrictions. Have a cap on number of buildings allowed or square footage. Garden suites is a good idea.	n/a
5 Industrial Development											
a Whitehorse Copper area for Major Industrial?	n/a	Tailings area should be used for major industrial.	Yes	Yes.	Currently not feasible with tailings and mine shafts.	Use tailings area for major industrial.	n/a	n/a	Remediate tailings area. In general more ind is this area is OK.	Yes	n/a
b McLean Lake area?	n/a	Use up existing quarries prior to opening new ones. Ensure proper studies have been completed. Proper setbacks need to be established Ok for quarries.	Yes/No. One said area should be protected.	n/a	No	Some industrial in McLean Lake area where it makes sense. Use up existing quarries then explore future land uses.	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes	Use existing quarries and convert to industrial where appropriate.
c Stevens area?	n/a	Future residential after quarries are exhausted.	Yes	n/a	Yes	Use as industrial after quarry materials removed.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
d Other? If so, where?	n/a	n/a	Utah area; behind McRae	Landfill. Make sure not visible from the Highway - i.e. need at minimum a significant green barrier.	Utah Siding. Also expand existing nodes (i.e. McRae)	Area near Crestview. Further industrial service development in the Ear Lake area.	More in McRae area and a big area at the intersection of the Alaska Highway and North Klondike Highway	Long Lake area only if a second bridge is constructed.	Expand McRae. Industrial in 'muffin' area north of Crestview on Highway. More industrial in Kulan/Taylor areas - allow further intense use of lots.	Utah area; South Access area	Whitehorse tailings area, existing quarries, Ear Lake area, behind McRae, and south access could all be used for industrial/industrial service. Additional utilization of existing areas should also occur.

	Table 1 (Wed)	Table 2 (Wed)	Table 3 (Wed)	Table 4 (Thurs)	Table 5 (Thurs)	Table 6 (Thurs)	Table 7 (Thurs)	Table 8 (Thurs)	Table 9 (Sat)	Table 10 (Sat)	Table 11 (Sat)
6 Highway Development											
a New nodes or expansion of existing nodes?	If new box stores on Highway than should not be in the central area between 2 Mile / South Access. Move YG Highway maintenance to top of south access.	Use nodes for highway development. Look for undeveloped nodes.	Expand existing nodes. Minimize visual impacts by expanding behind them.	n/a	n/a	Use a nodal approach to highway development.	expansion of existing nodes	Ensure architectural controls on Highway development.	n/a	Expand existing nodes; Utah area	Use nodal approach with access frontage roads along Highway. New nodes where appropriate, densification of existing.
b What uses should be allowed?	Don't allow Highway to take away uses from Downtown. If Box	Any uses should be permitted if strong regulations are established for aesthetics. Support for more service commercial.	Accommodate what's at Marwell now. Transportation uses, electrical companies.	Big box retail in Marwell area.	n/a	Service industrial uses are acceptable, some commercial but nothing that competes with downtown.	More uses to keep trucks on the highway	Business parks	Conflicting responses on Big box - some say it's OK on Highway, some say no. Conserve land Downtown for better uses though. High landscaping for big box on Highway.	Minimize visual impacts by having tourist commercial uses along Highway with other commercial uses behind.	Restrict larger scale commercial development to downtown. Highway commercial should serve local residents (Centennial).
7 Agriculture											
a Allow minor agricultural activities within urban residential neighbourhoods?	Yes, allow chickens.	Support if linked to lot size. Issues such as noise, health, nuisance, and waste disposal must be dealt with. Limited number of animals supported.	Majority in support of community gardens. Most in support of backyard chickens but there is concern with noise, smell, etc.	Do a study on chickens to determine if it's a good idea or not. Bees too. More community gardens / greenhouses, e.g. Valleyview area.	Yes. Chickens good but no roosters. Community gardens should be largescale so they can contribute lots of food.	Communtiy gardens, urban gardening and local resources (berries) are supported. Concensus that permitting backyard chickens needs further study to mitigate any possible impacts. "Livestock" should be restricted to less dense areas.	Chicken but not roosters. Make a policy that encourages it but and community gardens but use a test area first.	No consensus on backyard agriculture. Support for community gardens.	Issues - roosters, smell, cleanliness, coops. Strategic locations for community gardens make sense - e.g. escarpment zone. Get agriculture going in the area on the River.	Overall support for idea. Greenhouses a better idea than community gardens due to cold climate. Need to examine impacts of backyard chickens.	Allow agriculture that has no impact on neighbouring properties. There was general support for urban agriculture. Also promoted rooftop gardens and larger scale community gardens.
b New areas in the City for agriculture?	Add fruit trees when landscaping on public land. Allow more shared gardens in escarpment zone.	n/a	n/a	Encourage more outside city limits - work with YG.	Good idea. But areas should be leased not owned.	n/a	Start out small or base it off of lot size. Larger lots have more room for setbacks	Yes	Encourage fruit-bearing landscaping.	No. Soil and climate not conducive for large scale agricultural areas.	No industrial scale agriculture.

	Table 1 (Wed)	Table 2 (Wed)	Table 3 (Wed)	Table 4 (Thurs)	Table 5 (Thurs)	Table 6 (Thurs)	Table 7 (Thurs)	Table 8 (Thurs)	Table 9 (Sat)	Table 10 (Sat)	Table 11 (Sat)
8 Outdoor Recreation areas											
a Should residential development be allowed in these areas?	n/a	Retain recreational use as the primary land use. Majority of land must be dedicated to recreation. Density and design needs to be controlled for residential uses. Need to have a greater public consultation process.	Majority opposed to idea.	As long as existing/planned recreation areas are not taken away, then it is fine. E.g. Meadow Lakes back 9 - not OK - but using portion of Mtnview GC area that is not 18 holes is OK.	Only in certain areas. Allowed in Mt. Sima and golf courses but not Mt. McIntyre.	This needs to be considered on a case by case basis. The recreation component needs to be the primary use. Needs to be conditions regarding green building standards for efficiency. Needs a stronger public process. On site sewage treatment plants required.	es, High density condos, seasonal or time shares. Golf courses as well as Mt Sima	Most people opposed to residential development in outdoor recreation areas.	Residential is fine - it can make these operations viable. They need to be self-sufficient. One vote 'against'. Don't lose recreational opportunities.	Low scale residential is a good idea for Mt. Sima. Low scale residential development that reflects surrounding environment.	Retain recreational use as the primary land use. Majority of land must be dedicated to recreation. Density and design needs to be controlled for residential uses. Need to have a greater public consultation process. It should enhance the business community and neighbourhood.
9 Architectural design regulations											
a Should the OCP support having commercial design standards Downtown?	Yes	There should be some type of architectural controls downtown. They should focus more on building massing and incorporation of greenspace. No consensus on this issue.	Majority say yes but standards should be open and flexible.	Standards for heritage look on Main, 1st, and in core commercial area (Wood to Lambert, 1st to 6th	Good idea. But design guidelines should not be restrictive. Ensure guidelines promote creativity and innovative design. Build with options.	There was support for design guidelines to reduce the impact of taller buildings. Restrictions regarding larger setbacks, building massing, landscaping, courtyards and densities were discussed.	Yes. On main street and the 2 streets on either side for height and look.	Design standards should focus on sustainability especially energy efficiency. No support for architectural design standards across the City.	Use tax incentives to meet certain standards - i.e. carrot not stick.	Yes. It should be a requirement.	Support for design guidelines in the commercial core that relate to the human level of the building (storefronts). No consensus on yes or no.
b What should they include?	Heritage look on Main St and one block either side plus 1st Ave. Need parking solution in conjunction. Address function before form.	n/a	End design standards (i.e. what we want to see). Do not include standards on colours and materials.	Green standards as well as heritage look. Incl. landscaping - trees, etc.	Design guidelines should say what you can't do.	Discussion of requiring a certain percentage of natural materials on building facades. Use murals, local art and recreation spaces to beautify downtown.	No 'new' looking buildings and no steel and concrete buildings	n/a	Waterfront area - designs must ensure public security, i.e. no dead spaces.	Should design for crime prevention and green connections.	Support for regulations regarding building massing, public/greenspace, landscaping, setbacks. Guidelines should reflect the vision of the community and the area of the city.

	Table 1 (Wed)	Table 2 (Wed)	Table 3 (Wed)	Table 4 (Thurs)	Table 5 (Thurs)	Table 6 (Thurs)	Table 7 (Thurs)	Table 8 (Thurs)	Table 9 (Sat)	Table 10 (Sat)	Table 11 (Sat)
10 Referendum requirement											
a Should policy 6.4.4 be amended?	Most said keep as is, although one said to scrap it altogether.	Referendum is not needed if an integrated protected area plan is developed. Plan should be supported by a strong public consultation process. Comprehensive and long term protected areas plan needs to be implemented before referendum bylaw is amended.	Majority say leave it but one person wanted it amended. Some are open to the idea of alternatives. Look at ADS idea where locals vote.	n/a	No consensus but everyone agrees referendum is not practical. Middle ground necessary!	If a clear park plan is developed, where park reserve areas are well defined and very difficult to change, then the referendum is not needed. Need guaranteed protection of some greenspace.	Could not get anyone to give a consensus on this. Even though MikeG explained it really well at my table.	General consensus that referendum should be repealed. Overall it should be modified and that process should require extensive public consultation.	2 votes to ditch/amend, 3 votes to keep opportunities for citizen participation (e.g. plebiscite), 1 vote for keep as is with consultation requirements as well. Make sure, in general, that lots of information is available.	Open to idea of an amendment but the City should bring forward the change to the public for further consultation. Should be a single item consultation meeting. Issue needs more time and investigation.	Keep the referendum in place. Time the referendum with the election to give people a "cooling off period". Use a minimum size where the referendum bylaw kicks in.