

Mike Martin <email redacted>

**Reply all**

Mon 12/7/2020, 10:08 AM

**Public Input**

Enterprise Vault

Hello.

I am an employee of the city of Whitehorse and I am still uncertain whether I am allowed to comment on this amendment or not. If I am not allowed to comment then please stop reading after this paragraph and disregard what is in the next paragraphs.

The first thought that came to my mind when I was invited to express my opinions on this amendment was "This is totally insulting". I have been to three of these amendments now and there has always been an overwhelming majority against the severity of the changes yet the changes always go through. This new amendment has already been accepted and the fact that you are putting us through this procedure.... as I said is a total insult. You are just going through the motions. The last amendment next door to this proposal already had one building built prior to the amendment being accepted. Contractors don't do this unless they already know.

There was a time when I thought I might be able to make a difference in that we could influence the mayor and council to a reasonable number of units such as four. I have realized now that no matter what I say or do, it will not make a difference. This deal is already done. So then I started thinking that you ( being people or the system and procedures) should be ashamed of yourselves for giving the few residence that live around here and moved here because of the way it was, hope. You give us hope that we could make a difference to ask for a reasonable outcome. There is no hope and you should be ashamed of yourselves for pretending we have some.

I suspect you will not receive as many comments as you have for other amendments in the neighbourhood. Please don't take it as a sign that we accept the amendment proposal but it is rather a response to knowing the deal is already accepted and we have no say. We know we are just wasting our time by writing comments. We are learning.

Holding true to my word with the last amendment, I have been looking hard for property outside of city limits. I don't like living here anymore. Whitehorse is losing the last of its' charm that I loved when I moved here 32 years ago. It was not an idle comment, it is just that it is very difficult to find a suitable property outside of city limits for a reasonable price. But we are still looking at least once a day.

You win.

Sincerely,

Mike Martin.

Cam Kos <email redacted>

**Reply all**

Mon 1/11, 3:28 PM

**Public Input;  
Mayor&Council**

Enterprise Vault

Summary:

- Many new Whistebend lots coming available in the coming year
- Previous public input on compatible densification/infill was already provided by residents in 2011/12 supporting compatible construction not out of place and non-consistent zoning.
- Existing RS zoning bylaws allow MANY options including subdividing and putting in 2 – 3 unit buildings on land, all without the need for rezoning, public hearings or council approvals, all which would be aesthetically compatible and similar height with other area properties
- All previous buildings in the area were able to be built within RS heights and even a brand new 3-plex development on Elm Street directly behind 1306 Centennial is able to go up on a lot under half the size of lots 1306 and 1308 all within RS zoning rules.
- DevConcerns-it appears previous RS/RM rules were not followed by last RM development at 1306
  - Garage built in front of existing RS home in RS contravention before RM rezoning approval - according to outbuildings not allowed in front of principal residence.
  - Fences and trees removed from 1306 within 3 metre buffer appear still not restored
  - Serious light and shadowing issues with adjoining RS properties
  - Elm street RS homes recreational spaces facing metal walls, dumpsters, and bright lights now and would be expanded with another development
- New Centennial Light pollution with many high up bright LED building and parking lot lights at 1306 and even spilling onto Elm Street at night, would be compounded with another tall building approved
- Allowing 3 metres above the RS limits is adding on top 10 feet which is almost the height of some homes in the area making this 3-4 times taller than the area buildings
- Units at 1306 are still just ramping up so full impact of parking and congestion hasn't been realized as the owner permits only one stall per unit

- plus max one guest parking (even 3 the bedroom) and no rec vehicles, boats, etc permitted on the building's lot per renters lease agreements.
- Zoning changes are damaging residents' views of the city as a caring and supportive entity of homeowners who invest life savings and/or commit to 25 year or more mortgages to buy in a location they find visually or aesthetically pleasing that should have an established stability and character.
- Allowing random spot zoning doesn't support healthy previously well planned neighborhoods

Detailed Comments:

Multiple Zoning changes are eroding the area's community fabric as some local residents are beginning to question who cares about the neighborhood as it feels that the city doesn't.

There is no need for changing more area zoning. Recent local construction, infill, and subdivisions have all been able to work within the areas existing RS zoning rules while creating suitable and compatible densification and they have also been able to generate a profit. There are also hundreds of new lots coming online in Whistebend including multifamily ones, should any developer wish to develop a new multifamily building on a properly planned and correctly zoned multifamily lot.

Note that in the fall of 2020 the most recent request for rezoning densification in the Icoal area, on 14th Street, acknowledged the input from over 100 of the local area residents who commented on the 2011/12 infill meetings regarding density and zoning in the area, which while noted in the 14<sup>th</sup> Street application rejection did not seem to appear in the last Centennial rezoning request approval.

Another major concern is the previous (who will perhaps also be the new?) RM proponent and administration noted in that application, the high and large multifamily developments at the other end of Centennial. However, those comments have failed to note that the taller multifamily buildings at the other end do not impact an entire adjoining street or properties along the back behind them like Elm street. The other area has trees/water/public land behind, followed by the edge of the McDonald industrial area. That is totally different than the directly adjoining RS properties at the end of Centennial where the new rezoning request has been made and shares borders with RS zoned homes.

Present RS bylaws already permit a subdivision of the property. There is a perfectly good home on the property now and a demand for single family homes in Porter creek. If there is the owners desire to destroy that home, then putting up 2 new Tri-Plex units on a subdivided lot is possible and easy within existing rules and would actually be consistent with the area as new construction on Elm street is doing that and is within the bounds of present RS zoning. No rezoning, no public hearings, and no council decisions required and heights would be consistent.

The notes on the city website also point out that administration said in the 1306 development report it would not set a 'precedent' for others in the area. Therefore there should not be references to 1306 in this new 1308 rezoning request. Allowing these changes to continue is attributing to the destroying of the unique character and community significance of the area for existing homeowners.

The bright parking lot lights cause light pollution lighting up the Elm Street property behind and shining in their windows. In addition, standing on the deck of the Elm street property behind 1306, the residents now instead of seeing trees, a character consistent home development, or an appropriately sized fence, they look out at two dumpsters now in their backyard view.

Fencing between 1306 Centennial and 1304 Centennial was removed for construction and does not appear to have been replaced either. While I stand to be corrected, It certainly appears there is no 3 M vegetative buffer on all sides (per RM rules when adjoining RS zoning), as it appears all trees were removed in the 3 metres buffer area to the back fence and along the sides.

Also to note: Per previous 1306 Centennial approval - "Section 5.5 also requires a 3 m vegetative buffer between the RM and RS zones, which should reduce the potential for impacts to existing fencing."

Could the city make existing developments conform before adding the stress and angst of more public input sessions for additional rezoning?

Finally, comments about the 1306 development experience are appropriate to comment on here for this 1308 application as from the 1306 developers own website : Tenancy Agreement online:

"Each apartment is assigned **one spot with plug in**. No more than 2 vehicles per apartment to be in parking lot. **No recreational vehicles or boats are permitted to be parked in the parking area**. No vehicles longer than 20 ft permitted." (Noted in the website the 2 parking spots Max INCLUDES any guests)

This will create a street parking problem once renters get established with toys and multiple adults in units with vehicles. Anyone saying look it's fine now, using the 1306 development as an example, the season right after completion, wouldn't be thorough due diligence if comparing a proposed development with existing properties and long established tenancies and/or existing area owner use to a brand new rezoned property just built.

I have many before and after day and night photos and views to show already the impacts of just one oversized RM unit in the area but am unable to attach them all and the city's covid restrictions prevent myself and a number of neighbours from attending tonight to present in person or provide additional information or answer any questions regarding our presentations.

I realize the public hearing rules were amended to prevent people from entering but perhaps the city could also amend the rule of the hard and fast cut off on the night of the public input session to allow councillor questions back to presenters as it becomes a bit one sided with no chance of additional answers with the present format cutting off any additional input or information. It opens doors to misinterpretation or misinformation.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

Cam Kos