

From: [colin graham](#)
To: [Public Input](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: Zoning amendment-bylaw 2024-46
Date: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 10:24:47 AM

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please do not make the proposed change to allow the new Hyatt hotel to reduce the number of off-street parking places currently required.

1. PARKING NEEDS.

The construction of the Hyatt hotel has eliminated a large parking lot. That lot was often full during conventions at the Best Western hotel next door to the new hotel. Where will the Best Western overflows now go? Where will the Hyatt's *additional* overflows go?

That now eliminated parking lot was the only place for off-street parking for coaches and vehicles pulling trailers (often US military personnel travelling between Alaska and the lower 48). All those vehicles will now park on on the street.

Our neighbourhood needs *more* off-street parking not less.

2. TIMING

This rezoning request should have been made before construction began or after several years of the new Hyatt's operation, when data on its use of off street parking and cumulative neighbourhood impact has been collected. I find this timing distasteful.

Please tell the proponent to come back in 5 years -- or not at all.

Please do not make this zoning change.

Thank you.

Coin Graham, [REDACTED], Whitehorse.



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [Jim Smith](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Fw: Hyatt Rezoning
Date: Friday, October 25, 2024 7:22:07 PM

Dear New City Council,

I've been informed by your planning staff that I need to resubmit my input for the Hyatt Rezoning. My input is below.

All said, I still feel the same as I did when this was first discussed. Essentially this is a half million dollar developer cash grab // grant to a private company.

Thanks for considering my input,

Jim

Sent from my mobile

From: Jim Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 25, 2024 11:04:39 a.m.
To: Cameron, Kirk [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Hyatt Rezoning

Hi Councillor,

Thanks for the reply,

The issue i have is Council is relying soely off of the representations of a developer in a 5 minute Council delegation. The delegation has not hired an independent parking expert to conduct a study to prove the point that they may have an over supply of parking. They have also not provided financial statements showing that they are in dire financial hardship with the current costs of the project.

Also all developers have and are experiencing financial hardships during periods of high interest rates. What makes this developer any different than other developers to receive such a big grant? Should the developer have not done a financial forecast at the early planning stages to manage financial risk at the onset of the project including the scenario of high interest rates impacting their cash flows and project costs? What do their current financial statements say about their financial situation with and without this grant?

I do agree that there may be some validity to the different parking use of this hotel vs their neighbour. But I am still hesitant for taxpayers to potentially forgo half a million dollars that could be used to improve the City.

If a private entity were to benefit from a half million dollar tax grant, I feel that the burden of proof is on them.

Anyways, Ive said my piece and trust that Council will make the best decision for the community and take all points into consideration regardless of the outcome.

Jim

Sent from my mobile

From: Cameron, Kirk [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2024 8:26:15 a.m.
To: Jim Smith [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Hyatt Rezoning

Thanks for your input Jim.

I was one Councillor really pushing on this one. I tend to look at practical consequences/outcomes. In this case, what I see is a good tax-generator for our City that will see almost no impact on parking. The kind of people paying the big bucks for rooms at this Hyatt are flying in. Unlike the Goldrush and Yukon Inn for instance that are very much connected to the vehicular traffic, the Hyatt will not be one of these. Therefore, there is some reason for saying, give them this financial break en route to a viable revenue-generating establishment of value to the long term fisc of the City.

I'll stop here and very much look forward to your counter arguments! I want to weigh all of this before I vote on this matter. You make very good points.

Many thanks for providing your input! kirk

From: Jim Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2024 8:46 AM
To: Public Input
Subject: Hyatt Rezoning

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my opposition with the consideration of the Hyatt zoning amendment regarding parking that you seem to be inclined to support or even move forward with. I feel that this is a **developer cash grab** regardless of what the developer says. It is masked behind pleas that the City zoning requirements are too onerous and if approved would basically be a half million-dollar City grant to a single private hotel. My comments as follows:

- Why is the developer asking for this now while the building is under construction? Should this not have been dealt with before the building proceeded to construction? If they proceeded to construction, it appears that they were ready to accept the

conditions of their original permit application including cash-in-lieu for permanent parking loss.

- Did the developer ever commission an parking study to support and substantiate its request?
- Why would the City forfeit the possibility for half a million dollars of cash-in-lieu for parking that is "lost in perpetuity" as one of the managers said.
 - The half a million dollars could be used for other parking related improvements across the Downtown core.
 - The City manager indicated our reserves are already reaching their lows. We can't afford pseudo grants to the private sector and place the burden of private development on general taxpayers while we have other infrastructure priorities to deal with and fund including downtown parking improvements.
 - If the City forfeits its right to charge cash in lieu for permanent parking loss, **the burden of dealing with a development-induced parking loss will be shouldered by general taxpayers and not by development. Development should pay for the impacts associated development, full stop.**

I am writing this recognizing that the City is reviewing its Zoning Bylaw and I support these endeavours to review parking generally. Many cities in North America have revised minimum parking requirements but my understanding is that these have been relaxed primarily for residential uses and not necessarily for other uses. This is not a residential use.

This is a business and the business should have understood the financial implications of proceeding with this development prior to engaging with the development, not mid-way through.

I do want to acknowledge that i am supportive of all measures to mitigate the need for parking and remove parking demand generally by supporting reduced min parking requirements (where applicable near fast and frequent transit) and active transportation and transit. I just think this question is not about active transportation and transit vs car use. This really is a question about absolving a developer of its financial obligation to provide cash to the City for varying from the bylaw and how the City will fund improvements that are triggered by development.

Jim

This message and any attachments are for the use of the intended recipient only and contain information that is privileged and confidential. Should you receive this message in error, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately. Thank you.

From: [O'Farrell, Jeff](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning Application for Hyatt Place property - City of Whitehorse
Date: Wednesday, October 30, 2024 2:01:37 PM

From: Tim [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2024 8:18 AM
To: Mayor&Council <Mayor&Council@whitehorse.ca>
Subject: Rezoning Application for Hyatt Place property - City of Whitehorse

From: Tim [REDACTED]
Sent: October 26, 2024 9:20 PM
To: Downtown Residents Association [REDACTED]
Cc: Kirk Cameron [REDACTED]
Subject: Rezoning Application for Hyatt Place property - City of Whitehorse

Hi Nathan

Once again we are spending valuable time on things we thought were long ago settled. It seems like the traditional sequence of: finalize a development idea, acquire a suitable piece of property, consult with the building authority about zoning compliance or necessary amendments that have to be obtained, obtain the amendment, do detailed site and architectural design, apply for a building permit and incorporating any necessary changes, tender, award, build, commission and occupy - has taken a side track on the Hyatt project. I make this judgement from what I hear and read, so my comments may be unwarranted in today's context.

I was on the phone with a planner colleague and mentioned the Notice of Zoning amendment hearings we saw reported on CBC Yukon. The opinion given was that issuing a Development Permit or Building Permit which includes non-compliant elements goes against all established processes and in fact may be contrary to, in this case, the City's own policies or even the Yukon *Municipal Act*. I can understand and accept a minor post-commencement change unanticipated, but where minor doesn't include relief from off-street parking requirements for a new 115 guest room full-service convention hotel. Its sort of like ATCO EY applying for and obtaining a permit to construct an Electrical Reactor Site (all over town, mini-substations) and then changing the first word of the development to Nuclear! I exaggerate but you'll get the point.

Before Cornerstone was built, Jan and I appeared at City Council to express concerns about the only seven off-street parking spaces provided and that the newly-opened 7th Avenue road surface was too narrow to have any on-street parking. The planner replied that "... these residents don't own or drive cars ...". I asked what about the building's staff for operations, programs and the deli and they said that seven was still plenty. I assume the market price top floor condos each came with a designated space but I don't know how those have been accommodated if they do have designated spaces. Again, changes could have since been made to accommodate more vehicles on site.

I concede there has been no change in our neighbourhood parking density since Cornerstone

opened. How can you get more than the 100% on-street capacity that existed before construction started? I started taking photos from our 6th Avenue and Main Street corner 3rd floor deck - E and W along Main Street and N and S along 6th Avenue - probably 200 over a year and a half and they show full on-street subscription 99% of the time between 0800 and 1700 hrs weekdays. Very affordable parking is available in the Whitehorse United Church-gifted City Parking Lot adjacent to the church lot, yet it sits 5% occupied on a good day. And some even park against the WUC fence on the lot's east side in the cold months and plug into the outlets on the church side designated for the Minister, church staff and persons there on church or rental customers' business! A few routine plug-pulling walkarounds put an end to that until the next winter.

We have noticed two new trends in the past few winters. Firstly, some Downtown workers drive into the Sarah Steele Building parking lot, park, plug in and walk away for the day to work somewhere nearby. No vehicle has ever been towed that we have noticed. And secondly, some not-so-brazen parkers find an on-street parking space early and walk to work, and on the colder days use their vehicle's remote start functions from their office desks to keep the engine and battery warm and to return to a comfy front seat at -40°. I admit I use my FordPass app and iPhone to start our parked Escape when we are away when the weather is really cold and I don't want the risk of someone stealing my block heater cord, use expensive electricity or have to ask son Mark or daughter Jane to start it regularly.

I am copying our Mayor-elect Kirk Cameron on this as I believe in transparency in commenting. I have known Kirk for a long time and worked with him on a project about 20 years ago. He understands administration, governance and the legislative process. He and his new Council have their work cut out for them on many difficult fronts, and this type of problem is just one of them.

And Thank You and your DRA colleagues for working so hard on behalf of we Downtown residents. Jan and I certainly appreciate it.

Best regards,

Tim Koepke

[REDACTED]

Whitehorse, YT

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Harold Roche](#)
To: [Public Input](#); [Mayor&Council](#)
Subject: Hyatt Hotel / Gold Rush Inn parking reequest
Date: Saturday, November 2, 2024 8:04:11 PM

As one of the owners of the Pine Medical Building (5110 5th Ave), I am very concerned to read of the request to have an exemption given to NVD for the parking requirements for the Gold Rush Inn and the soon to be completed Hyatt Hotel. First of all, I am amazed that this is even being discussed at this late date. Should the parking requirements for these properties not have been sorted out between the City of Whitehorse and the developer long before a building permit was even issued, let alone at this advanced stage of the construction?

It looks to me like NVD proceeded with this project knowing full well it wasn't going to meet the requirements and would apply as late as possible for an exemption or an amendment to the bylaw requirements. Worse case scenario, possibly having to pay a fine. If this is the case, I consider this highly unethical on NVD's part. Also, for the City of Whitehorse to allow either scenario to happen, is a failure on the City's part to enforce its own bylaws. To be satisfied with simply collecting a fine is also ethically questionable.

NVD needs to play by the rules and be totally transparent. They haven't secured the required off site parking they promised and need to be held accountable. Existing businesses like ours, shouldn't have to pay the price and suffer the consequences created by NVD's desire to follow their own rules and not the Bylaws mandated by the City. As we all know, Bylaws are not worth the paper they're written on UNLESS they're enforced.

As a medical facility, we have clients, many of which have physical limitations and need to be able to park nearby. Having to walk several blocks is just not an option. I hope you recognize this problem and hold NVD to their promises by enforcing the rules.

Regards,

Harold Roche



From: [Legislative Services](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: FW: off-street parking space
Date: Monday, November 4, 2024 12:05:20 PM

From: hana fischer [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 2, 2024 9:45 AM
To: Legislative Services <legsvcs@whitehorse.ca>
Subject: Fwd: off-street parking space

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: hana fischer [REDACTED]
Date: Sat, Nov 2, 2024 at 9:43 AM
Subject: off-street parking space
To: <publicinput@whitehorse.com>

Hi, is your letter a joke ?

You decided to build a monster hotel, which does not belong and fit here knowing that you could not go underground. The buried toxic material, high water level did not let you, but you could create new parking inside the building. You are talking about off street parking now at 505, 507, 509. 511. May I ask how many cars can you accommodate there for two existing big hotels ? Also Main street does not have capacity for the future heavy traffic.

Those rich guys who signed for this enormous project should pay from their own pockets to reduce the hotel size and be punished. They are ignorants without deep knowledge. On top of it the preparation started during the vegetation season, how respectful.

I live across from the future hotel and have lost my view. Construction lights are disturbing all of us and we have complained to Ketzka already. When the hotel will function God help us, but that is not your concern right ?

The owner of the Hyatt, Northern vision, should compensate us, including those lovely small businesses across. They complained to city hall but unfortunately they did not have a chance to stop or change the project, none of us. That is what city hall does, protects the rich.

Sincerely Hana Fischer

From: [Vickie Roche](#)
To: [Public Input](#); [Mayor&Council](#)
Subject: Hyatt Proposed parking bylaw - Zoning amendment bylaw 2024-46
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 11:19:54 PM

I am one of the owners of the Pine Medical building across the street from the Hyatt Hotel.

City of Whitehorse bylaws require that the Hyatt Hotel provide 72 parking spaces on their property. From what I can determine, it appears that neither NVD nor the Hyatt own land for *any* parking. It appears the 43 parking spaces they claim to have is on leased land, and can be sold or developed. If this is true, the Hyatt is short all 72 parking spaces.

The owners of the Hyatt Hotel are asking the City of Whitehorse to reduce the number of required parking spaces (to provide their staff and hotel/restaurant guests), relying instead on public parking. Once the Hyatt is operational, it will mean even fewer parking spots for all the patients who go to their doctor, nurse or physiotherapist at the Pine Medical Clinic, and to the other health care professionals in the building.

There is another Medical Clinic (Whitehorse Medical) and the Medicine Chest Pharmacy behind the Hyatt whose patients may also have physical limitations and need to park nearby.

Can you imagine asking a heart patient, a sick person or a handicapped person to walk several blocks to their doctor's appointment? It's hard enough now for them to find a parking spot. Oh, crazy me, I keep forgetting they will all be riding bicycles!

I also feel empathy for the surrounding businesses and all the residents near the Hyatt. There will certainly be a loss of business for Aroma Borealis and the 506 restaurant (located immediately across the street).

Therefore:

1. I don't think the zoning amendment (Bylaw 2024-46) should be approved to allow the Hyatt to rely simply on existing parking on the street,

especially considering medical and health care patients need parking close by.

2. If the Hyatt is allowed to pay cash to the City of Whitehorse for their outstanding parking spaces instead of providing their own parking, it does not solve the existing parking problem downtown. Therefore, the Hyatt **must** provide their own on-site parking, and not have the option of paying cash.
3. If the City receives cash-in-lieu from the Hyatt, the monies collected should only be used to provide additional parking spaces downtown. Council should not be able to reallocate monies in the Parking Development Reserve Fund to general revenues or to finance other non-parking related expenditures.

Vickie Roche



From: [Pine Medical](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: re. zoning amendment (Bylaw 2024-46)
Date: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 10:10:50 PM

Dear officer,

I don't think the zoning amendment (Bylaw 2024-46) should be approved to allow the Hyatt to rely simply on existing parking on the street, especially considering medical and health care patients need parking close by.

If the Hyatt is allowed to pay cash for their parking spaces instead of providing their own parking, it does not solve our problem. Therefore, I think the Hyatt should be required to provide their own on-site parking.

Regards,

--

Pine Medical Centre

From: [daishu zuo](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: parking spaces
Date: Saturday, November 9, 2024 6:27:41 PM

Greetings,

I believe that the developer of the Hyatt Hotel must have known the following start of construction;

- the proposed size of the intended hotel
- number of rooms
- existing city of Whitehorse bylaws
- required number of parking spaces to accommodate guests and staff

I therefore do not think the city bylaw should be changed. A proposal to build the hotel would most certainly involve a site survey and an accurate assessment of the parking requirements. The Hyatt could secure parking space elsewhere. The shortfall in parking spaces for the Hyatt may be due to possibly poor planning by the developer not accurately evaluating the space available to build the hotel and the required number of parking spaces the accommodate guests and staff on the lot they have. Changing the city bylaw to accommodate the Hyatt punishes local businesses making it more difficult for their patients/customers to secure parking spaces in areas previously available.

Daishu Zuo, Reg. Ac.
Traditional Chinese Therapy



From: [Terry Markley](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Hyatt Hotel parking
Date: Sunday, November 10, 2024 11:03:15 PM

I feel strongly that the city should not sell public parking spaces to the new Hyatt Hotel on Main. Parking is already an increasing problem downtown. A new large hotel should provide its own private parking spaces. The hotel corporation is saving money and increasing their profits by not creating the needed parking spaces. By selling public spaces instead of Hyatt adding additional spaces the city is a partner with Hyatt in creating a parking crisis on Main. Why was providing sufficient parking spaces not a mandatory part of Hyatt's plan for city permits?

Whitehorse resident

Terry Markley

From: [Sportees Activewear](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Zoning Amendment - Hyatt Parking for Nov 12 Public Hearing.
Date: Monday, November 11, 2024 10:44:05 AM
Attachments: [To City of Whitehorse.docx](#)

Hello.

Please find attached letter for the Nov 12th Public Hearing re: Hyatt application to amend parking.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrea Rodger and Alan Thomson

Andrea Rodger
Sportees Activewear
www.sportees.com



find us on Facebook - Search Sportees Activewear.
#sporteesyukon

andrearodger.usana.com

Jats Backyard Landscaping
www.jatslandscaping.com

To City of Whitehorse

Re: Zoning Amendment – Bylaw 2024-46 File No: Z-06-2024

Re: Application to amend zoning at Hyatt Place/ Gold Rush Inn parking to reduce the number of off-street parking spaces.

We are the owners of 6098 6th Avenue.

We currently have 4 busy businesses that run out of this building – Sportees Activewear, Jats Backyard Landscaping, Streamline Architects, and Lynx Pediatrics Clinic.

We are watching buildings being built all around our property, including the Hyatt and the new Ryder Apartments. (and 2 other rumoured condos in the works within our sights, sandwiching the Hyatt)

The parking pressure has been increasing with each development.

The parking on 6th Ave is not metered so we watch many people park and then head over to jobs on Main Street, workers from the construction on the Hyatt and now the new Ryder Apartments and beyond. There is rarely an empty space during the day or early evening all the way down the street from the parking lot behind the Bling Condo (currently being used by a tour company from the Gold Rush Inn) to way past the City Graveyard.

There is insufficient parking on all the side streets as well, including parking for the Sarah Steele Building, Pine Medical Building, Cadence Cycle, The Legion – there are rarely any parking spots in front of these buildings.

We have also heard that the old Toyota building is becoming a daycare which will add more workers and traffic.

As a suggestion - The City owned parking lots need to be turned into multi-level parking garages, as per other cities to accommodate this increased development. (behind CIBC, & end of Main St for starters)

We are opposed to the change in the bylaw.

We would insist that the Hyatt/ Gold Rush provide the necessary amount of parking, which I am sure was included in the original building plans.

As how could it be approved without?

The Hyatt is advertising 115 rooms, with 5 hospitality spaces, and 24-hour food services.

Where are all of the staff from the Gold Rush and the Hyatt going to park? Where are the guests parking? and locals coming by for dinner? Special events?

It will set a precedent for the future development in the area – new Ryder Apartments, 2 new condos and whatever will be next and the future parking issue will be horrendous.

There has to be some standards, and we must keep to those.

Andrea Rodger and Alan Thomson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Pine Medical](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Fwd: re. zoning amendment (Bylaw 2024-46)
Date: Monday, November 11, 2024 11:32:42 AM

Dear office,

Further to the previous email, I would like to list all staff from the clinic who express the opinion that this bylaw 2024-46 should not be approved.

Pine Medical Centre

Xiu-Mei Zhang MD
Yong Xiao MD
Pauline Planas, clinic staff
Marjorie Gelito, clinic staff
Carla Wang, clinic manager

Women's Midlife Health Clinic

Michelle McCulloch NP
Shawn O'donovan-shipmen NP
Megan Paul NP
Josee Deslandes RT
Carol Yamada RPh

Regards,

Carla Wang

----- Original Message -----

From: "Pine Medical" [REDACTED]
Date: Nov 6, 2024 8:46:19 PM
Subject: re. zoning amendment (Bylaw 2024-46)
To: publicinput@whitehorse.ca

Dear officer,

I don't think the zoning amendment (Bylaw 2024-46) should be approved to allow the Hyatt to rely simply on existing parking on the street, especially considering medical and health care patients need parking close by.

If the Hyatt is allowed to pay cash for their parking spaces instead of providing their own parking, it does not solve our problem. Therefore, I think the Hyatt

should be required to provide their own on-site parking.

Regards,

--

Pine Medical Centre

--

Carla Wang [REDACTED]
Clinic Manager, Pine Medical Centre

From: [r annett](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: re hyatt place hotel, zooming amendment
Date: Monday, November 11, 2024 8:19:08 PM

FAO the City Council.

Having read the the document associated with the rezoning request, there can be no advantage to the proposal. it would be throwing away 450,000\$.

The money is one thing, but once that hotel is operational the parking in that area will be hell. This takes into consideration the new apartment being built at the rear, the tiny carpark that used to be the toyota lot and the fact there is a church on the corner and 5 other apartment blocks near by and one more hotel nearer 4th ave.

This hotel should not have been permitted in the first place of if could not accommodate the required parking slots. The original development permit should have been thrown out. It makes a mockery of the system.

Regards
Richard Annett



From: [Rob Ziegler](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: File No.: Z-06-2024: Zoning Amendment - Bylaw 2024-46
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 9:07:16 AM

Good morning,

I'm writing in response to Bylaw 2024-46, a bylaw to amend the zoning at 505, 507, 509, and 511 Main Street to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces for the new Hyatt Place Hotel.

I'm a condo owner in the area and I oppose the requested zoning amendment for the following reasons:

- Reducing the required parking for this location, which is already lower for downtown locations than it is elsewhere in the city, will only benefit the developer/owner by relieving it of its obligations under the bylaw according to how the property was zoned when their development permit was issued.
- The hotel will inevitably increase traffic in the area and, due to the nature of the traffic it will compete with both nearby residents and businesses for the available parking. Allowing a (further) reduced parking requirement will only serve to deprive either the area of needed parking spaces or the City of payment-in-lieu funds it may need to address the available parking in some other way if the developer is unable to provide those spaces.
- If this is something that was necessary for the hotel to be viable, it should have been applied for prior to construction to beginning. That the application was only submitted well after the development permit was issued suggests this is merely a cost saving measure.
- The City's own Administrative Report recommends that Council direct that this bylaw amendment not be brought forward for consideration.

Based on this I strongly urge City Council to reject the application to rezone the site of the Hyatt Place Hotel.

Sincerely,
Rob Ziegler

From: [Zandria Ash](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Proposed zoning amendment for Hyatt
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 8:09:42 AM
Attachments: [hyatt zoning.pdf](#)

Hello. Please consider my submission against the amendment to rezoning the 500 block of mainstreet for NVD.
Please see attachment.

Thank you,

Zandria Ash-Lawrence RMT

Zoning Amendment submission for 505, 507, 509, and 511 Main Street, Hyatt Hotel.

These are some points I would like the Mayor and Council to consider. I hope everyone involved in the decision thinks deeply about what will be best for Whitehorses' future and votes against this amendment.

It is not just my voice I am sharing, but those of the dozens of people I have spoken with and my roughly 500 clients.

1. Ever since construction has started at the 500 block of Main Street, parking has been a big issue. Clients can not find spots to park or have to park blocks away, taking a long time to find a place to park. This affects my business.
2. Everyone who frequents businesses in the area or works in the area has been looking forward to the end of construction to have easily available parking again. It has been very frustrating and disappointing finding out that NVD will be using at least 29 on street parking spots. They will likely need much more than that for all of their staff and guests. Have they considered where the tourism business is going to park their buses now? I do think that they really need to supply more off street parking.
3. Whitehorse NEEDS a downtown multi-level parkade. There is not enough parking. Ask anyone who works downtown will tell you how hard it is to find parking. I have heard the stories many times about having to run out and plug meters and about all of the parking tickets it gets them. The argument that people should use active transport or the bus is short-sighted, wishful thinking, and not likely to be doable even 50 years from now. Whitehorse is growing so there will ALWAYS be MORE single use vehicles than there is now. People constantly come in from communities or are just passing through. Many people who work downtown live too far away to bike or bus. Many who live closer to downtown do not have the physical capabilities to use active transport. The bus system is a HUGE disappointment to anyone wanting to be at work by 8:30 in less than an hour. (We need buses on the half hour!!) WHITEHORSE NEEDS TO BUILD A MULTILEVEL PARKADE. It would be full with just the people who work downtown, and perhaps be helpful for those living downtown as well. This might be an excellent next project for NVD.

4. The City of Whitehorse is shortsighted and lacking good judgment if they do not hold firm on the idea of the Parking Development Reserve Fund, holding companies/corporations accountable for the parking needed for their projects. Not doing so is not fair to anyone. Not the people who live and work around these new high density buildings, not the people who live in or work in them, and not their clientele. Our city can have over \$500k put into the Parking Development Fund. Why? Why would you choose to only accept \$90k!?!?! What a disservice to our city and its residents. NVD is responsible for a lot of high density building downtown, which is great, but if they are not held accountable for parking, the city and citizens will be on the hook for it, suffering, while their big business benefits. This is not acceptable to me or the dozens of people I have consulted about this. A Multi-Level Parkade is a must in the coming years. We need to start saving and planning for it.
5. Reading the 2019 Downtown Parking Management Plan, I see that the data was collected in 2018!!!! Do you know how much on street parking has increased since then? How much has our population grown in the last 6 years? 10k? 15k? More? It is significant. This plan is dated. The parking in the area concerned may have been low then, but is much higher now. There wasn't even a building in use on either side of Main street at the end of that block.
6. The city has a new pilot project set to remove snow from parking spaces on Main Street and 4th and 2nd avenues at night 1-2x per week. If the Hyatt cannot supply its own off street parking this will not be possible for this area,
7. The excuse that this block of mainstream is only 200m from a bus stop may help a few fly in visitors, though I doubt many staying at such an upscale hotel will be using the city bus to get there. As far as for people going to businesses this is no good. Many of my clients do not have the capability to walk the 5 blocks from city hall. Our bus system just isn't efficient enough nor useful enough for most people.
8. The 300 block of Hawkins Street had the very same zoning change for the building 305 Hawkins where Kind cafe is. The Amendment was allowed and now it is almost impossible to find parking there. The businesses in Hawkins house were GREATLY negatively affected. Just like in this case it is affecting patients seeking health care. The amendment never should have been allowed as everyone who goes to the area now suffers for it.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please do not approve this amendment.

-Zandria Ash-Lawrence RMT

From: [Diane Brent](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Zoning Amendment – Wyatt Place Hotel (Bylaw 2024-46) – DB Submission
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 9:47:55 AM

Zoning Amendment – Wyatt Place Hotel (Bylaw 2024-46) – DB Submission

Submitted: November 11, 2024

The facts pertinent to this amendment request, based on the information available to me, are as follows:

- While the Administrative Report is titled “Zoning Amendment – Wyatt Place Hotel”, it also covers requirements for the Best Western hotel, also owned by the applicant of the Zoning amendment (Northern Vision Development Limited Partnership or NVD).
- The terms and conditions for the Hyatt Place Hotel (still under construction) are set out in its Development Permit (issued in July 2023), which includes off-street parking requirements for both hotels – 47 parking spaces for the Hyatt and 25 for the Best Western.
- NVD bought the Best Western (formerly the Gold Rush Inn) in 2006, and therefore owned it for the past 18 years.
- The Best Western has used the two empty lots now occupied by the Hyatt for its (customer) parking for several years, until the start of construction of the new hotel.
- As a replacement for the lost parking, the Best Western has been using the parking lot from the old Toyota dealer property, on Main & 6th.
- The applicant is seeking to reduce by half its off-street parking requirements, with the aim to reduce the cash-in-lieu payment requirements, which would result in a \$448,944 cost reduction from the \$542,474 cash-in lieu payment, as per the current Zoning Bylaw and under the Fees and Charges Bylaw. This amounts to an 83% reduction in payment to the City of Whitehorse.
- The CC Zone already provides lower requirements than other zones – i.e. one parking space per 150 m² instead of for 100 m² (in other zones), as mentioned in the Administrative Report.

Given the facts above, here is my position on the amendment:

The Zoning Bylaw and its related bylaws and rules (Fees and Charges Bylaw, Development Permit, etc.) should be followed according to the legal application of the bylaws to these four subject lots. There should be no special treatment or exceptions made for this proponent and hotel development (or any other proponent or other commercial development). The parking density requirement of one parking space per 150 m² for that CC zone should remain intact. There is no justification for lowering legal parking requirements in this particular case.

Respectfully,

Diane Brent
Downtown resident

From: [Bev Gray](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Submission to public hearing, zoning amendment Bylaw 2024-46 from Aroma Borealis
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 9:51:46 AM
Attachments: [City of Whitehorse - Parking.doc](#)
[Untitled attachment.00008.htm](#)

City of Whitehorse

Proposal: Parking bylaw amendment, requested by the Hyatt Hotel, 511 Main Street

Response: Aroma Borealis Herb Shop, Beverley Gray, 504B Main Street

In accordance with the bylaws of the City of Whitehorse, the Hyatt Hotel is required to provide a total of 72 parking spaces. However, the developer is only offering 43 parking spaces, resulting in a shortfall of 29 spaces. The Hyatt is therefore requesting that the City of Whitehorse reduce the required number of parking spaces for its staff and visitors, suggesting reliance on public parking instead.

This situation reflects inadequate planning on the part of the developers, and I am surprised that the City of Whitehorse approved the project without ensuring that all requirements were met.

Should the zoning amendment not be approved, the developer will need to secure additional parking in a nearby location or opt to pay cash-in-lieu for the outstanding spaces, as stipulated in Section 7.3.7 c) of the Zoning Bylaw. I oppose the Hyatt's proposal to pay cash for the 29 missing parking spaces rather than providing their own on-site parking. Allowing this would negatively affect our local customers' ability to park and access our businesses. I firmly believe the Hyatt should be obligated to supply its own parking facilities.

If zoning amendment Bylaw 2024-46 is approved, permitting the Hyatt to rely on existing parking along Main Street, it will continue to adversely impact our customers, staff, and neighbors, as has been the case over the past year during construction, when parking has been consistently occupied by tradespeople, contractors, and subcontractors. This has left our local customers with limited parking options to access our business. After 26 years in this location, we have felt the repercussions of this situation, significantly affecting our team and sales.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Beverley Gray

From: [James Concepcion](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Rezone for the Hyatt Hotel parking requirement
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 10:04:16 AM

Hi. This is James Concepcion and I am a resident of 602 Main Street and also the owner of Antoinette's and the property at 4121 4th Avenue.

I object to this parking amendment rezone. Right now, we already experience a parking shortage at our building that sometimes makes me park 2 blocks away from my apartment.

We also experience a parking shortage by the Cathedral between 4th and 5th Avenues for our customers at Antoinette's. NVD is a big corporation with lots of properties in the city. They should have constructed a parking facility like most other developers in the city for their customers and staff.

So I vehemently object to this parking requirement rezone.

James Concepcion

From: [Wil Brown](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Proposed Zoning Amendment for the Hyatt Place Hotel
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 10:53:59 AM


To whom it may concern:

We, the residents of 602 Main Street, agree to the administrative recommendation that this proposed zoning amendment NOT be brought forward for consideration under the bylaw process.

We opposed this amendment because it will negatively impact the parking spaces of the residents in the area when the hotel inevitably operates and generates visitors.

Thank you,

Michael B. Brown and Wilma Brown



Whitehorse, YT

From: [Sandra Dahl](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: written submission re: zoning amendment-bylaw 2024-45
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:05:39 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

As a long time resident of Whitehorse, I was dismayed on learning that the structure being built at the corner of Main Street and Sixth Avenue was to be yet another hotel, rather than the desperately needed parking garage. I recently learned of the zoning amendment application by the hotel to reduce the parking requirement to what appears to be half of the normal allotment.

As a resident who frequents several businesses located in the block across the street, parking when needing/wanting to visit a medical practitioner or business has been severely negatively impacted by the ongoing construction. Due to the removal of the parking spaces immediately in front of the construction site, as well as the vehicles of the construction workers themselves, the ability to park anywhere nearby has been difficult. Using the one hour parking spaces in adjacent blocks results in parking fines when attending an appointment lasting one hour or more. Parking in nearby, non metered areas continues to be impossible as those spots have already been claimed by the employees of many of the downtown businesses as they are able to park there for lengthy periods without attracting parking fines.

As someone with reduced mobility, the contention that using public transit to access establishments in the area is both ludicrous and insulting. A transit system that runs on an hourly basis is barely functional in good weather, when coupled with -30 degree weather, is becomes tantamount to frostbite at best, loss of limb or death at worst. As there are no nearby places to wait out a possible close to hour period both before and after a visit, these are likely scenarios if forced to utilize public transit. Unfortunately, using what appears to be the sole handicap bus is not a viable solution as it is already overwhelmed with the residents already utilizing the service.

Contrary to the zoning amendment submission I've read, I firmly believe the distance between the area being considered to the closest bus stop in front of the RCMP detachment is significantly greater than 100 meters, while the distance to the bus stops on Second Avenue (in front of City Hall or in front of the Visitor Information Centre) is greater than 500 meters. Speaking again as a person with reduced mobility, using public transit is not the one solution fits all being touted by the party seeking the zoning amendment.

The zoning amendment also seems to purport that, even with reducing the number of parking spaces provided, the vehicles of their guests would not affect the availability of those spaces for the general public during business hours. I beg to differ. Unless the hotels will be requesting their guests leave by 8 a.m and not begin the check in process until after 5 p m., they will be utilizing the already limited parking available.

I have been told that, in the hierarchy of needs considered by the municipal government, those of the general population come last. Should this zoning amendment be approved, effectively eliminating half of the available parking in that block, while prioritizing the needs of a single business, this will be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

Sincerely,
Sandra Dahl
[REDACTED]
Whitehorse, Yukon
[REDACTED]

From: [Yukon Posture](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Cc: [Fleming, Chelsea](#)
Subject: ZONING AMENDMENT - BYLAW 2024-46
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:21:50 AM

Dear City of Whitehorse decision-makers.

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed allocation of parking spaces to the new hotel on Main Street and its surrounding areas. As a health practitioner with over ten years of experience in our community, I have witnessed firsthand the challenges our patients face in accessing medical facilities, particularly those with mobility issues.

Currently, parking is already at a premium, and I have experienced increasing difficulties in securing a spot for both myself and my patients, many of whom have severe health conditions that hinder their mobility. The hotel's construction has exacerbated this issue, as construction workers have occupied numerous spaces, further limiting access.

The proposal to allow the hotel to take additional parking spaces would significantly impact local businesses and healthcare providers. Patients must have convenient access to medical services, especially for those who require assistance, such as individuals with paralysis. Reducing available parking would not only hinder access to health services but could also deter potential customers from visiting nearby businesses.

I urge the chamber to reconsider the decision to allocate these parking spaces to the hotel. Preserving access to parking is vital for maintaining the health and well-being of our community and supporting local businesses.

Thank you for considering my perspective on this critical issue. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

Vasco Sequeira. RMT.
