

From: [Gerry Steers](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2024-49 to rezone 401 Casca Boulevard and 4.61 ha of vacant Commissioner's land
Date: Saturday, November 16, 2024 3:46:45 PM

The City is again trying to remove healthy Green space to convert to more housing development. I do not live in Whistlebend, but I do have an interest in the McIntyre Creek park area, and the ability of wildlife to move through to the river. Every time the City takes any part of this land away, it further endangers both wildlife, and the neighbourhoods that are developed around what was their area to avoid people.

There is already too much traffic on roads not designed for the Whistlebend development to have occurred, and if you are taking the opinions of the citizens that pay your salaries into account, DO NOT CHANGE THIS AREA to future development. I understand the rezoning for the smaller area required for utilities use, but not for development of any other kind.

My vote is NO, and as much as I do not belong to any support group for the WhistleBend folks, I am sure they don't want this either.

People move to Yukon for our lifestyle, so it baffles me why the City keeps trying to destroy what Yukon is most known for. A 10 meter buffer is not a satisfactory amount. Just don't do it!

Gerry Steers
Porter Creek resident

From: [Alex Campbell](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Concerns re: Rezoning of greenbelt on Casca Boulevard
Date: Monday, November 18, 2024 10:16:31 AM

Good morning,

I'd like to submit my concerns with the proposed rezoning of the greenbelt space next to Casca Boulevard.

I have reviewed the associated map and documentation with the rezoning. I am aware through my own recreational activities that there's a trailhead ('Downward Dog') in the proposed area that was created recently (within the last 2 years) by the City of Whitehorse. I worry that this trailhead will be removed, or compromised, as a result of 'development' that could result from this rezoning. I don't believe my concerns are without merit, particularly given that the already limited trail network immediately surrounding Whistle Bend has been reduced and/or restricted at the sake of development. Given that Whistle Bend has limited space due to being framed in by the Yukon River, Porter Creek, and the Mountain View Golf Course, I am concerned that trails and meaningful greenspace have become an afterthought and eventually there will be no alternatives, despite the subdivision's population continuing to increase at a rapid rate.

I have previously shared my concerns in writing with city trail planning staff in addition to the mayor and council about the city's approach to trail planning with Whistle Bend. Their responses were certainly discouraging, as it was communicated that residential development would continue to be prioritized, no additional trails or connections to nearby trail networks are planned, and only that trail planning could be revisited at a future unknown date.

My hope in sharing these concerns is that no further trails or trail access points are compromised or removed entirely as a result of this rezoning.

Thank you,
Alex Campbell
[REDACTED]
Whitehorse, YT

From: [Thomas](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Northeast Casca Boulevard Zoning Amendment
Date: Wednesday, November 20, 2024 8:59:21 PM

I am concerned about the north casca boulevard rezoning and losing access to Downward Dog trail.

The report calls the mountain bike network "informal".

The Downward Dog trail is identified in the [citys own trail map](#). The map identifies "non-City of Whitehorse trails" and Downward Dog is not identified as that. It's identified in the map as a city trail. Why then is it considered informal?

This reads as dismissive of an established and formal mountain bike trail that is [well used](#) and one of the few that whistle bend residents have access to in their own neighbourhood. I use this trail regularly on foot and bicycle.

Was Contagious Mountain Biking Club given notice of this amendment?

The amendment should ensure that access to the trail remains. There is plenty of room along the north edge of this area to include a buffer that would allow for trail access to remain.

From: [Matthew Wilson](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Amendment 2024-49
Date: Monday, November 25, 2024 11:56:30 PM

Good Evening,

I'm writing in response to the proposed changes to the greenbelt/ walking path area to 'future planning'.

This change only serves the property owner it surrounds and the city. Making it into future planning only enforces the idea that this land is due to be developed. I cannot understand why, the City of Whitehorse is obsessed with destroying every tree in Whistle Bend. Rather than leaving some green areas and secluded paths. Which makes me wonder why the city has not changed its slogan from the 'wilderness city' to something else. Changing this area does not serve the people of Whistle Bend. Many people use this path on a daily basis with their pets and families. It's one of the few paths that are away from roads and littering. Where people can safely enjoy the outdoors.

The city and territory has been doing a good job of destroying excess trees and land scape. Rather than leaving some areas to be actual green belts. Whistle Bend is no longer the same but has focused on excessive destruction and construction. Rather than taking its time do things properly. And truly consider the consequences of their actions.

I ask council, just leave well enough alone for once.

Thank you,

Matthew Wilson

Neil McGrath Public Comment Re: Proposed Bylaw 2024-49 Zoning Amendment Northeast Casca Boulevard

Please accept this submission as a comment relating to the proposed rezoning contemplated for Northeast Casca Boulevard. This comment relates to the component of rezoning the Public Greenbelt surrounding the Heiland Property to Future Planning only, as I do not have any concerns with the rezoning of the pumphouse to Public Utility.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments in this regard. As a Whistle Bend resident, I have several concerns, which I have laid out below:

It seems counterintuitive to go through the cost and administrative burden of rezoning this to Future Planning, to retroactively plan for an area that the majority of Whistle Bend residents are likely to want as Greenspace anyways. It seems almost disingenuous to change an area from Greenspace to Future Planning under the guise that it could result in any number of new future uses.

It makes the most sense to keep this area as Greenbelt to create continuity between the already sparse patches of habitat we have in Whistle Bend as well as access to the limited, and continually degraded trails that are currently in place. We used to see moose, coyotes, and other mammals come through the pond over to the patch behind the school, then hook up to this area of larger greenspace using the strip on the opposite side of Eldorado.

The City itself built the Downward Dog trail which is now heavily used, so it is obvious the planning folks aren't communicating with the trails and recreation folks, which is concerning, as this is not simply an "informal mountain bike trail network" as it is characterized within the Admin Report, as we watched when the City utilized an excavator and other heavy equipment to construct and had designated signage posted to encourage use.

It seems like this is being done as some kind of workaround to skirt the rules contained with the Master Plan Policy. So, if the City wants to start planning some type of different use in areas zoned Greenbelt in other neighbourhoods, it's ok for them to just use the guise of rezoning to Future Planning so that they can waive the requirement for a Master Plan?

It seems as though there may have been a reason that this area remained as Greenbelt from the 2009 Whistle Bend plan through to the 2018 one - because the use of the area has evolved as such that it should remain Greenbelt for recreational use. If there are some kinds of future plans to change the use on Lot 1139, that should be made explicit within the rationale behind this rezoning, or else the residents of Whistle Bend are left puzzled as to the reason behind it, which is not a good look from a governance standpoint on a new City Council.

As noted in the Administrative Report to support this application, the site is currently zoned Greenbelt, typically applying to public lands left in a natural state and primarily intended for buffers, walkways, trails, and passive recreation - which is the exact use of this area by local residents. What would be the purpose of changing this to something intangible and non-specific? Inclusion of additional Greenspace may be considered in future planning? Why not just leave it as such then? What would be the administrative cost and use of scarce City resources to go through this rezoning process, a new planning process, to then just wind up rezoning back to Greenspace in the first place? It appears odd to rezone from something that is specific to something that is vague and ambiguous.

November 28, 2024

In closing, there are already so few tiny strips of land zoned as Greenspace in Whistle Bend around the cliffs and to the west between Porter Creek, let's not eliminate more of the little green space we do have.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for the consideration.

Neil McGrath
Whistle Bend Resident



Mayor and Council
City of Whitehorse

December 08, 2024

Bylaw 2024-49

This bylaw raises a number of questions for me.

The Drawing

There is no drawing number, but it is dated 10/8/2024. The red lines seem to indicate the rezone area, but what do the blue lines indicate?

Zoning

PU public utilities is indicated for the pumphouse at the northwest corner of the area. Is the drainage swale also a public utility? Will the storm drainage exit the whole parcel to the North toward the drainage swale/kettle?

Does FP Future Planning mean you don't know what the zoning will be; or you don't know what to do with this area? Why keep us in suspense? The existing private parcel in the middle probably has a septic system. What are the implications of land development over previously occupied land with a sewage disposal system? The reason I ask, is this is what is happening in the newer phases of Whistle Bend; with land development over top of old sewage lagoons. In my previous letter on the subject, I asked the City/Developer to remove the impervious lagoon liner. I never heard back. Why?

Perimeter Trail

Will the perimeter trail be relocated or incorporated?

Vehicular Access

On Casca there is only one opposing intersection opposite these parcels; at Iskoot. If the whole area is zoned RCM / RCT, the amount of traffic off and on Casca would be significant. Can you limit the density to a reasonable amount of traffic for one 4 leg intersection? Left hand turns will be the limiting factor. It appears that there is not enough room for another intersection, yet the entire parcel is so big it may need more than one. Previously, one traffic report mentioned an initial concept for the Casca Eldorado intersection which could have involved another roundabout. Presumably there was a concern about

traffic volumes there. That was changed to a 4 leg intersection that we have now at Eldorado. Are you contemplating a road connection to the bulb at NE corner of Eldorado? If so, I am not keen to add that traffic to my street. Don't do it.

Planning

I am concerned that this method of planning will look deceptive to residents. I doubt there is a desire to deceive. But you know the potential implications of such a zoning bylaw better than the resident. Yet your one page drawing delivered to nearby residents makes no reference to any potential implications. This is why I don't like the FP zone. It could mean anything; or it could mean nothing, if there is an economic downturn. The City has created a big question mark, loaded with anxiety for some residents.

It appears to me that this bylaw is proposed too early; because it lacks the information that people need. If you don't have that information, then why stir up anxiety? If you do have general information that could help understand the potential implications, I suggest you provide it.

I would be pleased to discuss this further if necessary. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Regards
Brian laird



C.. Whistle Bend Association

From: [Jason Tillman](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Rezoning Casca submission.
Date: Monday, December 9, 2024 4:03:44 AM

In relation to this evening's public hearing about the potential rezoning of the green space to future planning, I'd like to provide my input.

My written submission is that I hope you reconsider this proposal and leave the green space as it is. I currently live on Iskoot, and when my partner and I bought this property, there was great consideration that this area of Whistlebend was mostly developed. We put a lot of thought on where we bought our home as we didn't want to live near an area of constant construction and development. We wanted to live in Whistlebend but thought we chose a place that we would escape the development. We knew that the area across the street was green space and we would at least have peace and quiet in a neighborhood that was constantly expanding.

Unfortunately, this past summer we, as many people did, lost our view of the mountains for the construction of the climbing/gymnastics gym. I never thought that this would have been a location selection for such a build but so be it. I know there was a lot of complaints about why they chose this location. It was certainly a frustration as my front view is now of a large white wall. At least the back had trees and peace. So, when I heard that more trees were being destined to be removed it was frustrating. I understood there may be a time the owners of the large lot on Casca may sell and be developed, but at least there was a substantial green space between to block the noise, buildings, and construction if that day came. When I saw this proposal I was instantly discouraged that now we were losing more of the feel of living in a "wilderness city".

I understand the needs for housing but there is still so much being developed in the newer phases and I don't see why this area needs to be clear cut right now. This is one of the only wooded path systems in Whistlebend and me and my kids walk it daily. We bought there because of those trails and the feel of the forest right across the street. We feel we've already lost some property value and quality of life due to the gym being built where it was, and we greatly hope you will leave these trees intact.

I feel that the redress will be that there will be a buffer of greenspace between the road and development, but we've all seen what happened with the spaces that were supposed to be left behind Whistlebend Place and on Tarahne Way. This doesn't appear to have ever been addressed.

I've spoken with multiple people who are frustrated but feel it doesn't matter; the city is going to do what they wish without the residents' wishes in consideration. I really hope that this didn't happen, and others are coming forward.

I plead that you reverse your considerations of rezoning. I really did not think I would have to worry about this and I was safe from development when we bought our home and I'm terrified of the quality of life we will lose and the drop in property value we will see if this happens. I would be there in person tonight however we are visiting family abroad for the next few weeks. I appreciate the consideration and I hope you decide to leave these trees alone, among the few left within the sub-division of Whistlebend.

Jason Tillman
Concerned citizen of Whistlebend

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Lindsay Knezevich](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Zoning Amendment Bylaw 2024-49
Date: Monday, December 9, 2024 11:15:35 AM

Hello,

Please find the below written submission in regards to Zoning Amendment Bylaw 2024-49 for the Northeast Casca Boulevard Amendments in Whistle Bend.

Thank you,

Lindsay

Zoning Amendment – Northeast Casca Boulevard Amendments

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am respectfully asking you to not proceed with the amendment. Not only that, I am asking you to just stop further development in Whistle Bend, at least for now. The Whistle Bend that was assessed under YESAA many years ago is not even recognizable anymore. The maps that were provided as part of that assessment barely reflect what has been realized.

The City's vision for Whistle Bend was a place where residents could work, live and play. And yet, it has taken 8 or 9 years for anything to be built in Whistle Bend besides housing. There is continued deferral of addressing traffic, appropriate access and active transportation routes into downtown. The City itself has not even initiated constructing the town square, which was meant to be a focal piece of this neighbourhood. What is that supposed to say to the people that live here? Especially those who have lived here for over 8 years?

Greenspace is precious. The Government of Yukon clear cut most of Whistle Bend and has limited trail systems to the outer edges of the neighbourhood. Then the Government, and ultimately the City, continue to support the continued loss of greenspace through additional phases of Whistle Bend and then the resulting infrastructure requirement to support the expansions through stormwater infrastructure and roadways. This amendment is now proposing to rezone a core connection area of greenspace between two of the only trail systems in Whistle Bend, which includes a trailhead and trail built by the City itself. The paved paths and trail system in this area probably have the highest use in Whistle Bend and contain the only paved path that isn't along a road or isn't a "green street".

Very little information has been provided for this amendment, simply a red box. All we, as residents can do, is assume you are proposing to clear all of this land, and take away part of what little recreational systems we have, with no commitments and no plans to address it. By taking away recreation, instead of investing in it, and creating integrated and accessible networks of trail systems, you are making Whistle Bend residents get in their cars and drive to other areas where these systems exist. Which, as mentioned earlier, seems to go against the very vision of this neighbourhood and what was proposed by the City itself.


I personally use this greenspace almost daily. I have seen the Government and Yukon and City of Whitehorse continue to clear greenspace in Whistle Bend, including along our limited trail systems, without any regard for recreation or aesthetics, sometimes without any authorizations or approvals to do so (i.e., new stormwater outfall for Phase 9a).

It's time for the City to be accountable for their vision of this neighbourhood and show that they are invested in that vision by moving forward with the construction of the town square, ensuring active transportation is built so that residents can actually feel safe leaving this neighbourhood in something other than a car, and invest in recreation in Whistle Bend.

Please just say no. Please just press pause and give us a break.

Respectively,

Lindsay Knezevich

Whistle Bend Resident, 

From: [Legislative Services](#)
To: [Public Input](#)
Subject: FW: Bylaw 24-49
Date: Monday, December 9, 2024 11:24:52 AM

From: Matthew Ainsley [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 11:23 AM
To: Legislative Services <legsvcs@whitehorse.ca>
Subject: Bylaw 24-49

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

This email is being drafted in response to the Bylaw 24-49 to amend Zoning Bylaw 2012-20.

Proposed change is to rezone PG -Greenbelt to PU -Public Utilities and FP - Future Planning.

Comments to be voiced at hearing:

Bylaw 2024-49 is another case where the cities poor planning, lacking foresight, and lacking respect for local residents unfortunately shows. It is a real shame.

Green space is an integral part of our community. It increases an individuals enjoyment in living in their neighbourhood, especially when people live in a suburb but still want to feel that connection to nature by being surrounded by old growth forest. In the spring, birds can be heard nearby from peoples homes.

The area in question had been marketed as such. People bought property based on their property having lesser development neighbouring it. These plots are deemed to be desirable and therefore increased their value and purchasing cost, also.

People purchase property with local green space being a large component of their decision. Changing a zone especially from green space to future development is a MASSIVE swing and shows a lacking foresight, poor planning ability, and lacking respect for the individual property owners nearby. It also erodes trust in cities future zoning of green space.

What is the point in zoning land as green space (which should be protected against all future developments) just to get flipped 180 in a couple of years. If this green space is

changed then let it be known that the city can and will try to zone other green zones to future planning. No green zone is safe if this is the policy that is now being adopted. This doesn't inspire a lot of trust.

I move against the notion to change this zoning.

Kind regards,

Matthew Ainsley