



---

## Notice of Public Hearing Bylaw 2026-14

---

**From** Andrew Craigen [REDACTED]  
**Date** Wed 2026-04-22 3:31 PM  
**To** publicinput@whitehorse.ca <publicinput@whitehorse.ca>

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of Council,

Re: Zoning Amendment Z 03 2026 – Whistle Bend

I am writing in opposition to the proposed rezoning of the parcel currently designated PR (Parks and Recreation) adjacent to [REDACTED] in Whistle Bend.

I recently acquired [REDACTED] through the City's land lottery process. Having drawn second, I had the benefit of selecting from all available lots. My selection was deliberate and based on the existing zoning framework—specifically, the designation of the adjacent parcel as PR land. That designation was a material factor in my decision, as it reasonably indicated long term use as open space, with associated benefits including access, light, and neighbourhood character.

The proposed rezoning to RCM2 fundamentally alters those underlying assumptions.

This raises a broader concern beyond my individual lot: the integrity and reliability of the City's land disposition process. Purchasers in a lottery system are expected to rely on the zoning and planning context presented at the time of purchase. A post hoc change of this nature undermines that reliance and introduces uncertainty into future land releases.

From a planning perspective, I understand and support the City's objective of increasing housing supply. However, there appear to be existing areas within Whistle Bend already zoned for higher density (including RCM2) that can achieve this objective without retroactively impacting purchasers who relied on the established plan.

In my respectful submission, this amendment:

- creates a disproportionate impact on directly adjacent property owners,
- undermines confidence in the City's planning and land allocation processes, and
- is not necessary to meet density objectives given existing zoned capacity.

Had this potential change been disclosed at the time of the lottery, I would have selected a different lot.

I ask that Council give significant weight to the reliance interests of recent purchasers and decline the proposed amendment in its current form.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andrew Craigen