

Provisions on scale, height and setbacks will never fully address the concern that the character of a neighbourhood will be compromised.

The Bartam trailer court is a brilliant example of this. A disappointing appeals process ended in a no win situation for everyone involved. The development could have still gone ahead, to the dissatisfaction of those who appealed it, with fewer units than the developer had wished to build, at a lower density than the city had hoped.

Were people upset because the shoddy plywood fence sitting there now is an Old Town landmark? Because residences would be shaded? No, they thought the building was ugly. It didn't fit with the vibe of the neighbourhood. A few aesthetic provisions in our bylaws might have allowed residents to appeal the building in a meaningful way but there were none, this bylaw offers that.

There is something special, and worth cherishing about Old Town. Do you know why Old Town has so much character? What makes it so unique? It's the fact that you can leave your office at 5pm and walk to Weaver's to grab a new toque before your 6pm reservation at Bullock's. You can end the night with a pint at the Woodyard and safely stumble to your home on McDonald Drive.

How can the people in Old Town live, work and access amenities without hopping into a car? Because much of Old Town has *always* been zoned for mixed use. That's what makes it special.

I live in a Central Residential Zone. I love being able to walk to the grocery store and bike down the street for breakfast. That's why I moved here. That's why people pay premiums to own a residential building downtown.

Mixed use zoning is a positive thing.

The other reason people talk about the character of their neighbourhood is because they don't want change, period.

But things have to change. If when I'm 50 things haven't changed, well, I might be dead. Or struggling in some post collapse world where zoning and public hearings are a faint and distant memory. It sounds like a laugh to equate the passing of a zoning bylaw to the environmental and economic collapse of society, but it's resistance to change that's the real killer. It isn't just a nail in the coffin, it's death by a thousand papercuts.

The open houses I have attended have largely been dominated by a generation or two older than my own. Not to say that we should cast

aside the voice of experience, but I do think it's important that people my age are given a chance to be heard.

We're very busy, statistically overworked and underpaid (even in this town). We don't have time to comment on this issue. Barely any of us believe we are going to retire, either because we can't afford to or don't think we'll live to see it, or a combination of the two. It is hard for us to put energy into combatting the values that put us in this position. We simply don't have the capacity to hold our own against retired boomers. I've attended nearly every open house on this issue and hid behind my screen. This is an emotional conversation for everyone, but ultimately we will be the ones most impacted for the longest amount of time by the content of this bylaw.

As a person under 30, I support this bylaw. I want to grow old in a city I can easily get around in, and if we don't encourage a more walkable community and incentivise public transportation now, that won't happen. My generation is keen on multifamily dwellings, we don't like cars and we hate ornamental lawns. Our neighbourhoods will look very different from the ones the generations before us built.

I am more than just an eco anxious young person, I'm a whole person with multiple priorities and strong values. There are many reasons for me to be supportive of these proposed amendments.

As a builder, I support this bylaw. I am incredibly passionate about building better homes. "Missing middle" housing happens to be the most efficient to build and maintain. I could give an entire dissertation on the social, economic, environmental and health benefits of medium density housing but I've only got 10 minutes. To sum it up: One sixplex is faster and easier to build than 6 detached homes, units are more energy and thermally efficient, air quality is easier to control, there is a larger footprint for greenspace, shared living better promotes community and combats loneliness, and units are more affordable.

As an environmentally conscious person, I support this bylaw. We can't afford to house people in detached single homes. We can't continue driving personal vehicles. People are concerned about out of control street parking because they can't imagine that anyone could live in this society without a vehicle. Unfortunately they are right. If we continue to build infrastructure to support personal vehicles, and design our communities around them, people will continue to need them. That is exactly why our bylaws need to give us the freedom to reconfigure the urban landscape.

As a foster parent, I support this bylaw. I want my community to be walkable both so I know my kid is closeby, and because more foot

traffic means safer streets. I was born and raised here. Beyond sports there aren't many options for young people. When I was in highschool they were only just building the greenspace next to city hall, otherwise we would spend hours stressing out the staff at Javaroma until we eventually worked there ourselves. Mixed use means more places where youth can go without depending on a ride. It means healthier teens with more independence.

As a homeowner, I support this bylaw. I want diversity in my community. I am excited at the potential of a fourplex down the street, new faces who want to participate in and grow the neighbourhood that I love. I want to support the small businesses that pop up around the corner. This is what makes living in community so exciting, the bustle and the collaboration. The visiting and the sharing. New people and new ideas. I don't want to live somewhere where I have no opportunity to meet my neighbour because we shop at different grocery stores on opposite ends of town.

As an advocate for food security in the north, I support this bylaw. Supply chains are failing around the world. Climate is changing. We need to promote agriculture now so we're ready to dive in when it's necessary. Without easy access to land we will never be able to address food security in the north. We need greenhouses and unconventional land use, and we need bylaws to support that. Opening the doors to different approaches and ideas is the best step we can take.

As the founder of a non-profit, I support this bylaw. My friends and I built a million dollar non profit because there was not enough flexibility or accessibility in this town to support a modest wood shop at the outset. There is little incentive for property owners to address vacant buildings or lots, and 40% of the downtown is a parking lot because the city said it has to be. These were our requirements: at least 2000sqft, accessible by public transit, barrier free entry, under 10k a month. I didn't think it was a lot to ask. We had to gut and renovate a bar to build our shop.

As a person with complex mental health needs, I support this bylaw. Because I live so close to downtown, every support I need is within walking distance of my home. Anyone living with ongoing mental or physical health needs should have the choice and the right to ready access to the support they need. Regardless of their socioeconomic status.

I support this bylaw, for many reasons. I was part of the focus groups that informed this document. As a young person, homeowner, advocate, builder, foster parent, and finally as a resident of this city, I feel heard.

I've spent a great deal of time mulling over the new bylaw, and by no means am I an expert in its contents, but I learned a great deal from the open houses and various fact sheets supplied over the last few months. And from today's hearing. I was excited to see the changes proposed and inspired by the opportunities they provide. I'm grateful for the work that the City and their Planning Department have done to bring us such a comprehensive document. The work you are doing is notable and truly professional. I hope the community of Yellowknife can reflect on the fact that each member of your team was hired for their skills and knowledge, and that it is your job to present the most optimal and progressive solution moving forward.

Thank you for all of your work in drafting this new bylaw, and thank you for the opportunity to speak in favor of it.

Cat McGurk

Good morning. My name is Tom Hall and I am appearing on behalf of a number of concerned residents in the proposed RC-1 zone, representing over 30 residences, primarily from 50A Avenue. Our concern with the current draft of the by-law is several of the Permitted Uses in the proposed RC-1 zoning.

A municipal by-law of this scope, complexity and importance requires a tremendous amount of work and meaningful consultation in order to have a good product. Unfortunately, despite repeated requests by our neighbourhood committee going back almost a year, we were not given the opportunity to meet with the planning team in order to discuss the project and express the concerns of our residents. We believe that would have allowed our committee to provide valuable input much earlier in the process. Additionally, the limited consultation on this by-law took place in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic with all of its resulting restrictions and demands on people's time, meaning many people have simply been unable to participate. Despite our committee and countless other citizens requesting that the consultation period be extended so that more meaningful consultation could occur, this hasn't happened.

Having said that, we were pleased that after the initial round of consultations (such as they were), the Planning Team amended the bylaw in response to the clear opposition to the proposed Residential Central zoning. The creation of the RC-1 zoning and the removal of the most egregious of the Uses was certainly a step in the right direction. However, at the Governance and Priorities Committee meeting on October 25, the Mayor and several councillors essentially re-started the consultation process by introducing last minute amendments that put several of the offending Uses back into the bylaw under the guise of "We want to hear from more people". This effectively renders the consultation to that point meaningless and sends the unfortunate message to citizens that their input to that point wasn't important. There are clearly some councillors and City officials who have their own dreams and visions of what a by-law like this should look like. However, elected officials are there to listen to the people that elected them to be their representatives, not to indulge their own dreams.

The proposed Permitted Uses of Commercial Retail Sales and Services, Convenience Store, Food and Beverage Service and Urban Agriculture, Commercial that were put back into the RC-1 zoning are all wholly incompatible with a residential neighbourhood and should not be included. Having had the benefit of reading a number of the letters sent to the City in that regard, as well as letters to the editor, and in the interest of time, we will not re-state the many obvious reasons why these commercial uses are all incompatible with a residential neighbourhood, such as extended hours of operation, noise, increased traffic, etc.

We would also note that the section of the Community Plan dealing with the Residential Central area makes no recommendation for extensive commercial development. As far as commercial agriculture, it should be painfully obvious to anyone why the keeping and processing of livestock such as pigs and the processing of fish in any residential zone is

totally inappropriate. Again, we would note that the Community Plan reference to urban agriculture means “activities that do not conflict with residential uses such as raised garden beds, small chicken coops and domestic beehives.” It never included livestock such as goats and pigs.

Other proposed uses such as Commercial Recreation, Religious & Education Institutions, Medical and Health Services, Planned Development, Urban Agriculture, Community, and Community Resource Centres could possibly be included in Discretionary Uses as these should be individually evaluated for their compatibility with the neighbourhood.

Our residents are not against housing densification. We agree with some of the dwelling types that are proposed for the RC-1 zone in the current bylaw such as duplexes, triplexes and secondary residences, which are the same as those proposed for other residential areas, notably R1 and R2. These are residences, which are appropriate in a uniquely residential setting. Commercial uses are not. We would note, however, that the inclusion of dwellings such as Townhouses and Multi-unit dwellings in Permitted Uses is a dramatic change for all residential zones in the new by-law.

There are some starry-eyed ideas that our City should look like cities in Europe or Southern Canada, or even New Zealand. Cities such as Hamilton, Ontario have been cited as examples to follow. However, let’s compare apples to apples, not apples to elephants. Hamilton is a city of over half a million people. Yellowknife is not even a city by comparable population standards. Unlike those large southern cities, the existing downtown core is within walking distance from almost anywhere in Yellowknife. The City’s Community Plan recognizes that fact, and describes the RC area as a “geographically convenient place to live”. The City’s planning consultant stated that when Niven Lake was developed, no convenience stores or other commercial properties were included because it was felt that it was within walking distance of the downtown and its amenities, including convenience stores. Given that most, if not all of the residential neighbourhoods in the proposed RC-1 zone are closer to downtown than Niven Lake, the same logic should apply.

So why is the City proposing to simply expand the downtown core by commercializing existing residential neighbourhoods near the downtown? It is certainly not because of growth. I like to be an optimist, but you also have to be a realist. One only has to look at the various economic reports and forecasts for the NWT. The Conference Board of Canada forecasts that with the exception of the non-commercial sector, every sector of the economy in the NWT will see declines in employment over at least the next 10 years and even uses the word “grim” to describe the forecast for certain sectors. They also state that population growth will be “dismal” beyond 2022 and turn negative after 2027.

Even if growth was a possibility, there are plenty of empty and underdeveloped lots in the downtown. One of council’s stated goals is the revitalization of the downtown. This has not materialized to any meaningful degree, so now the approach appears to be to abandon the downtown and simply expand the potential commercial sphere beyond the

downtown. Why not take steps to improve the downtown such as tax or other incentives to locate and build, and taxation of vacant properties on a “best use” basis to encourage owners to either develop or sell those properties rather than leave them vacant? The City puts caveats on residential properties that require owners to build within two years of purchasing the lot. Why not similar incentives to force commercial owners to build?

If the by-law proceeds as Council appears to want, it means that those developers that have no desire to build in the downtown can simply move outside the downtown core and infect the existing residential neighbourhoods with commercial developments that are wholly incompatible with those neighbourhoods, ultimately driving out the residents and simply expanding the downtown with all its associated problems. That misses the mark for both downtown revitalization and housing.

Almost all of the 90+ public comments tabled for the Governance and Priorities Committee meeting in October were opposed to various elements of the zoning bylaw and a large number of those were specifically opposed to the original RC zoning. However, we keep hearing self-serving statements from some City officials about the “significant support” for the by-law.

We also hear about “all the businesses that support the RC zoning and are just waiting for it to happen”. These unsupported statements are simply being thrown out to support an entrenched position. We saw nothing in the public comments about businesses being supportive of the RC zoning. Of course, developers are going to support an unfettered ability to build whatever they want, wherever they want.

The City is also abdicating its responsibility to oversee development by attempting to put so many “Permitted Uses” in the RC-1 zoning area. This would effectively mean that a developer could build anything within those permitted uses without any additional approvals, without Council approval, and free from appeals. It certainly makes the job of the developer, Council and the City planners that much easier if everything is simply permitted, but that’s not how you ensure appropriate development occurs. It has been suggested that the regulations associated with the zoning bylaw will ensure that development is controlled, but those regulations typically only deal with the nuances of development such as setbacks, landscaping, parking, signage, etc. If someone is permitted to build an all-night exotic dance club in the middle of a residential neighbourhood, we highly doubt that the regulations governing what sort of siding the building is clad in are going to go very far to allay the neighbour’s concerns.

Given the surplus of available properties in the downtown, the lack of forecasted growth for the foreseeable future, the clear lack of demand for commercial properties, the need for housing and the clear opposition to the destruction of many of the well-established, family-friendly, community-oriented, residential neighbourhoods in the RC-1 zone, it makes no sense for the City to sacrifice those neighbourhoods for an unproven southern idea.

Yellowknife is not Hamilton or Calgary, or a city in Denmark or New Zealand. Anyone who has lived here for any length of time (I was born and raised here) knows that Yellowknife is a unique City with unique neighbourhoods and a unique history of development. The approach here appears to be that we can take a southern model and simply overlay it on the City and everything will be wonderful. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The residential neighbourhoods in the proposed RC-1 zone are populated by people that want to take advantage of their unique locations in order to walk to work and to the downtown, have their children walk to school from kindergarten to Grade 12 (all very environmentally conscious I would note), and yet have what has been referred to as the "gold standard" of a single detached home. That allows them to have a yard for their children to play in, perhaps a garden, and somewhere to park their vehicle so that when they want to take advantage of Yellowknife's natural beauty, they can load up their canoe, kayaks or camping gear and drive to one of our local recreational areas.

In addition, they want to know their neighbours, participate in block parties and gatherings, build a strong sense of community and when something unreasonable threatens their chosen lifestyle, band together to oppose it. Those are the reasons why our residents choose to live on 50A Avenue. The bylaw as proposed suggests that a big box retail store or a nightclub, or an all night convenience store would greatly enhance the character of such a neighbourhood. The residents of 50A Avenue and other neighbourhoods in the RC-1 zone, and anyone else who has an appreciation for quality of life, disagrees. The City needs to listen to those residents.

Thank you.

Madam Mayor, Councilors and Administration, thank you for the opportunity to speak today on this most important issue for us all. I want to start by saying how grateful I am that we live in a community where residents can voice concerns over important municipal decisions that can affect their quality of life.

I truly respect the work that Administration has undertaken on this issue and I would like to acknowledge the hard work and effort by the Planning & Development department. Even though we do not agree on everything related to a vision for development in Yellowknife, that does not mean I can't acknowledge the work, energy and time invested in bringing this By-law proposal to the stage where it is today.

I also want to acknowledge all of the work, time, energy and dedication of neighbors on 50A Avenue who participated on a committee formed to help residents on our street express their concerns and raise their questions on the future of development in this part of the downtown.

I choose to live on the outskirts of the downtown and I have done so for the past 26 years - from 55th Street to Albatross Court, to a 44th Street condo for a short period of time and finally 50A Avenue where I chose to downsize and retire. My family and I walk to work, walked to school, walk to city facilities and truly enjoy the proximity of living close to downtown. We also enjoyed coming back home to a neighborhood.

I understand the importance of adhering to the Community Plan (and the Zoning By-law) as a blueprint to ensure controlled development within the community. While I can accept that premise, I would like to see reasonable parameters established within the Zoning By-law to effectively manage development in residential areas adjacent to the downtown.

I think more people living in our area, in any area, can be a positive development. I think I can say that many, if not all, of my neighbors understand that densification can be a positive development for sustaining a vibrant atmosphere. To illustrate this, let me remind everyone that 50A Avenue borders on a major apartment complex and a hotel behind one entire length of our street, a four-plex and 10 floor residential building at the entry to one end of 50A Avenue, and we have B&Bs and Airbnb's, as well as renters, individuals renting rooms and social housing on our street. I think all of these examples illustrate the diversity of our neighborhood. An increase in duplexes, triplexes and secondary suites are more than welcome in our neighborhood

I think residents of 50A Avenue have already demonstrated that they are not opposed to specific commercial development. Day cares, group homes, residential care for seniors, commercial recreation, and religious and education institutions, under discretionary use, could be maintained in the RC-1 Zone.

I should also point to the positive impacts that densification will have in helping Yellowknife reduce its levels of greenhouse gas emissions, and state that this makes it easy to support having more people living in our neighborhood. The lack of affordable housing, the need for densification, and the effects of climate change are only some of the challenges faced by this community, like all others across the country.

What we all want is some assurance that we will continue to have a reasonable residential experience not encumbered by the disruption of excessive traffic on a narrow street, pressures on parking that cannot be accommodated, and negative impacts on our quality of life caused by an incompatible mix of targeted commercial and residential uses in one area.

The City Website refers to Key Features of the Zoning By-Law;

“Downtown revitalization and increase densification” states that regulations direct where this is suitable and the character and feel of existing neighborhoods will be preserved through size and design regulations”.

Under the proposed downtown revitalization and increased densification zoning for RC-1, the character of our neighborhood would not be preserved. The recommended changes are more than densification and they are not suitable as presented.

Commercial Retail, Food and Beverage, Convenience Store and Urban Agriculture as presented could cause major changes to our environment and are far from being consistent with the stated goal of preserving the character and feel of existing neighborhoods.

I support Urban Agriculture if livestock is removed, with the exception of chickens and bees. I would take it a step further and have regulations for the number of chickens permitted in a certain area but that would be another discussion.

I do not support Food and Beverage and Convenience Stores as either Permitted or Discretionary Uses as I do not think these uses would be compatible with this neighborhood, especially considering that the sub-standard width of 50A Avenue would hinder traffic flow and parking. I would love to have a little coffee shop beside my home, or my own table d’hôte, but our street’s design is not conducive to these types of commercial activity. This is a good illustration of our concern about the ability to ensure reasonable commercial development in a residential area.

All I am looking for is to preserve a neighborhood life adjacent to the downtown, with densification and revitalization that respects the character of our neighborhood.

I understand that cities need to look to the future and be willing to adapt and ensure their growth. I could have talked about other pressing issues - downtown revitalization, the state of our economy in the NWT, what the future promises us, the population forecast, or the business forecast. The Economic Review 2021-2022 offers compelling information of the state of our economy.

https://www.fin.gov.nt.ca/sites/fin/files/resources/budget_2021-economic_review.pdf

But I wanted my presentation to focus on my neighborhood RC-1 Zone. Every neighborhood is unique and that’s something that we all appreciate. I understand that our neighborhood is going to change over the years, but please allow it to change while respecting its uniqueness. Allow growth that is suitable for the neighborhood.

Linda Bussey

Presentation to City Council – November 27, 2021 public meeting:

Presenter: Marie Adams – homeowner.

Good morning, City councillors and staff. I am not going to reiterate all of the points I brought up in my filed submission as you can all read that for yourselves. But I do have a few points related to my submission that I want to make in the short time I have here. I am speaking only for myself and my partner Bruce Davidson.

I have to say, that I was quite hesitant to speak at this hearing as many of us who simply want to foster more of a constructive dialogue with City council have been portrayed as being completely opposed to any constructive change that might be proposed. Many of us support reasonable changes (as noted in my written submission) but are looking for a fair process where residents are permitted to flag concerns which a developer can take into consideration. A process where communications are respectful and inclusive between the City, the Developer and Residents.

It is most troubling when City Council summarily dismisses what appeared to be reasonable amendments proposed and promoted publicly by its own city administration, in response to valid and serious concerns from Residents. To explain this further, city administrators recommended changes were communicated in writing, to residents like me, and which were also reported on by the local media. To overturn these proposed changes overnight after residents had been given to understand they would be seriously considered by Council, (at a forum where there was no opportunity for Residents to voice concerns), is definitely not conducive to promoting constructive dialogue and support for Council positions.

I am a passionate supporter of this City. As a homeowner and taxpayer, who has lived, worked and volunteered in this city for over 40 years, supporting the growth and development of this City, I like to feel that my views will be *at least considered* when changes occur in my neighbourhood.

If Council is truly talking about building the kind of neighbourhoods, we all want, I am personally challenged to understand how this proposed zoning by-law is going to assist in those aspirations. The sheer number of 'permitted' developments (versus 'discretionary' development) where residents are not permitted to have reasonable input into proposed developments is truly an example of exclusionary politics where residents are unable to fully participate or contribute to the economic and social well-being of their neighbourhoods. Ultimately that exclusion of views and concerns of residents does nothing to help in fostering a true 'sense of community' in this City. People will leave, and this will continue to be a city with a large transitory population.

I am personally saddened, that the simple wishes of homeowners to be engaged and involved seems to have been manipulated to create an 'us' and 'them' culture where people like me, are portrayed as enemies of the broader community, who oppose any changes to neighbourhoods. Not true.

I, along with many others look forward to re-invigorating the downtown commercial area and understand that changes will be necessary. Including importantly, utilizing the current vacant and underutilized lots already located in the downtown core and adjacent corridors. I live on 55th Street. I remember when there was a gas station which I used to go to, close to Bruno's pizza. A multi-use neighbourhood!

I am not saying that I will be immediately supportive of all proposed developments. There will be some projects which I may not fully support. However, I am much more likely to be ok with a development if I feel there has been constructive dialogue fostered ideally by the City, between the developer and residents.

I would like the City to consider a public, fair and transparent process for decision-making related to development and land use. Having worked for many years in these areas, I am most familiar with Territorial land use planning processes as well as land and water and environmental process. These are public processes where the developer (or proponent) needs to consider seriously the views of affected individuals and respond to public 'Information requests' with options or clarification for aspects of the development. Ultimately, this type of participatory process pays dividends. Even if I did not at first agree with a particular development, the fact that my views and that of other residents were considered for possible changes in order to help retain the overall character of my neighbourhood, would lead to more support and trust for City council processes and development objectives. In the broader view, this type of dialogue is what builds a sense of community and shared responsibility amongst residents for coming up with workable solutions. One example I can think of is the 'good neighbour' agreement between the department of health and the day shelter. While this type of agreement may not suit all needs, it at least provides a process for continued improvement and dialogue with the parties involved.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to put forward my views.

Marie Adams

Presentation to the City of Yellowknife Proposed Zoning By-Law Statutory Public Hearing
November 27, 2021

Barb and Emery Paquin

My wife, Barb, and I are here today to speak in support of the section of the proposed Zoning By-Law that would see the vacant parcel of land in Kam Lake located adjacent to Grace Lake Blvd and Enterprise Drive continue to be designated as Growth Management.

Since building our home on Grace Lake Blvd. in 2014, the sub-division has developed into a healthy, thriving neighbourhood founded on the outdoor lifestyle and recreational opportunities the area has to offer.

At the time, the City described the larger-than-normal lots as opportunities to build homes in a quiet, pristine natural setting with active recreational activities in the area located north of the sub-division.

This was the vision expressed by the City at-the-time and one we believe represents a good faith agreement with residents that still exists today.

There are Members of this Council who have expressed a desire to have the vacant land bordered by Grace Lake Blvd. and Enterprise Drive re-zoned for commercial and light industrial use.

We are not disputing that land is required for businesses to expand. One of the keys to any successful city is a prosperous and profitable business community.

However, we remind Council that another key to ensuring a successful city is providing residents with neighborhoods they want to live in.

We became aware last spring that the City advertised for engineering services to design and construct a 106 lot Kam Lake Industrial Expansion. The proposed plan would have seen industrial lots come within 30 metres of the existing Grace Lake residential property boundaries. The Request for Proposals was subsequently withdrawn. At the time we argued these plans were pre-mature given the area was zoned Growth Management, an Area Development Planning process had not been initiated and neighbours had not been consulted.

At the time, several Councilors referred to our actions as the NIMBY, or-not-in-my-backyard, syndrome

The reality is nothing could be further from the truth.

We recognize the City needs land for commercial and industrial purposes as much as residential neighbourhoods are needed for residents and tax payers to live in. The challenge for planners is how best to reconcile these apparent opposing needs and inconsistent land uses.

We suggest the solution is to ensure adequate and effective buffers and green space are put in place.

To this end we ask, no we urge, Council to approve that section of the By-Law that maintains the land adjacent to Grace Lake Blvd and Enterprise Drive as Growth Management. This neutral designation should remain in place until area development planning discussions are concluded with all affected parties.

While we are not opposed to eventually expanding Kam Lake industrial activities into this vacant area, we are opposed to this taking place without full consideration of the interests and rights of the neighbouring Grace Lake residents who, in 2013, in good faith accepted the City's invitation to invest in the neighbourhood and build our homes in a quiet, pristine natural setting.

Some may argue that the Community Plan already identifies this land as Kam Lake industrial and, for this reason alone, should be re-zoned commercial and light industrial. I would remind Council that the Community Plan also establishes the general goal of reducing land use conflicts and incompatible uses and endorses the concept of buffers and setbacks as a meaning of accomplishing this goal.

Our second issue we would like to discuss today is with respect to the proposed permitted and discretionary uses within the designated management zone of Kam Lake.

The proposed Zoning By-Law identifies 'automotive wrecker' and 'heavy industrial' as discretionary uses within the Kam Lake Management Zone. In our opinion, these land uses are inconsistent with the overall proposed use of the area, which is to provide an area for commercial and light industrial uses. By allowing these heavy industrial activities to remain as discretionary uses, uncertainty is created by enabling Councils to approve land uses that are inconsistent with the intended land use of the Management Zone; and create potential conflict with the existing adjacent Grace Lake North residential sub-division.

So, to conclude, we support the section of the proposed Zoning By-Law that would maintain the area adjacent to Grace Lake Blvd and Enterprise Drive as Growth Management. We ask that Council maintain this 'neutral designation' as City planners, business owners and residents sit down to discuss the future development of the area.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to express our thoughts to you today.