

Property Information/Details

Location Description	Lot 77 Block 308 Plan 4204
City of Yellowknife Community Plan No. 5007	Section 2.3.2 Housing Section 4.5 Niven Residential Section 5.1 Environment and Climate Section 5.3 Municipal Infrastructure
City of Yellowknife Zoning By-law No. 5045, as amended	Section 3 Roles and Responsibilities Section 4 Development Permit Process Section 5 General Development Regulations Applicable to all Zones Section 8 General Development Regulations Applicable to Residential Zones Section 10.1. R1 – Low Density Residential
Civic Address:	2 Findlay Point
Access:	Findlay Point cul-de-sac (vehicular and pedestrian)
Municipal Services	Municipal piped sewer and water services; External garbage pickup

Recommendation:

Planning and Environment Division recommends refusal of Development Permit application PLDEV-2026-0013 for a 'Multi-Unit Dwelling' requesting a variance to decrease the minimum rear yard setback requirement.

Proposal:

The applicant has submitted an application for a Development Permit and Variance to construct a six-unit Multi-Unit Dwelling at 2 Findlay Point. The proposed three-storey building would contain three one-bedroom units and three two-bedroom units. The application also includes a request for a rear-yard setback variance and proposes the use of a car-sharing service, in accordance with Zoning By-law No. 5045.

Background:

The subject property is located at 2 Findlay Point within the Niven neighbourhood and is designated Niven Residential under Community Plan By-law No. 5007. The property is zoned R1 – Low Density Residential under Zoning By-law No. 5045. The site is currently undeveloped and is situated within a residential cul-de-sac characterized by a mix of single detached dwellings, duplexes, and fourplexes. Municipal water and sewer services are available to the property, and the surrounding area is fully developed with residential uses.

The application has undergone several revisions throughout the review process. The original plans, submitted on February 23, 2026, proposed six on-site parking spaces; however, the parking layout did not comply with the City's Development Standards. Revised plans were subsequently submitted on March 3, 2026, which reduced the parking supply to incorporate a car-sharing service and included a request to vary the required rear-yard setback for the principal building from 6.0 m to 3.0 m. Following circulation of the application and receipt of public comments, the applicant further revised the proposal by reducing

the requested rear-yard setback variance to a requested 0.5 m and relocating the exterior staircase to minimize overlook and privacy impacts on neighbouring properties to the rear.

SUPPORTING STUDIES AND REPORTS

- Niven Phase VII General Subdivision Drawings, January 30, 2008, DM# 360388
- Niven Lake Development Scheme (2007 By-law No. 4438)
- PLDEV-2026-0013 Submitted Drawings (February 23, 2026), DM# 823228
- PLDEV-2026-0013 Revised Drawings (March 3, 2026), DM# 823225
- PLDEV-2026-0013 Revised Drawings (April 20, 2026), DM# 823231

Assessment of the Application:

JUSTIFICATION

A development permit is required for any development that is accompanied by a variance, as stated in Section 4.8 of Zoning By-law No. 5045, as amended, authorized under section 23 of the *Community Planning and Development Act*. Section 4.8.1 of Zoning By-law No. 5045 authorizes that variances related to yard setbacks may be approved by the development officer.

LEGISLATION

Community Planning and Development Act

The *Community Planning and Development Act* establishes the framework for the City to regulate developments within its boundaries. As stated in section 16. (1) and 25. (1) of the *Act*, a development authority, being a development officer appointed under section 52, shall, subject to any applicable conditions, approve an application for a development permit for a use specified in a zoning bylaw as a permitted use of land or of a building, if the development authority is satisfied that the applicant meets all the requirements of the bylaw.

Under section 23. (1): “A zoning bylaw may authorize a development authority to approve an application for a development permit in respect of a proposed development that does not fully conform with the bylaw, if the development authority is satisfied that the proposed development would not (a) unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood; or (b) detract from the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land”.

Community Plan By-law No. 5007, as amended

Section 3(1) of the *Act* states that the purpose of a community plan is to provide a policy framework to guide the physical development of a municipality, having regard to sustainability, the environment, and the economic, social and cultural development of the community.

This 2019 Community Plan is a comprehensive outline of the goals and objectives for the City with directive policies to accomplish the objectives. All applicable policies of the Community Plan are to be considered and applied at the time of development.

Niven Lake Development Scheme 2007, By-law No. 4438

The Niven Lake Development Scheme provides planning direction for the development of the neighbourhood and assists in interpreting the intent of the Community Plan and Zoning By-law. As a Council-approved planning document, it provides guidance on housing density, neighbourhood design, transportation, open space, and development patterns, and may be considered when evaluating the compatibility and appropriateness of development applications within the Niven area.

Zoning By-law No. 5045, as amended

The purpose of a zoning by-law is to guide the physical development of a municipality by offering regulations to the use and development of land and buildings within the municipal boundary of the City.

The Development Officer is authorized to receive and process development permit applications as referred to in section 3.1.1 of the By-law. The Development Officer is also authorized to evaluate variance applications as defined in the criteria set in sections 4.8 and 4.9 of the By-law.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Community Plan By-law No. 5007, as amended

The Plan identifies the Niven Residential Land Use designation as a “residential area that is located adjacent to the downtown core and provides easy access to the core of the City by vehicle and alternative transportation modes. It will continue to be a mix of low, medium and high density residential uses with some mixed use activities”.

The proposal generally aligns well with the intent of the Niven Residential designation. The proposal also makes efficient use of existing municipal infrastructure, supports housing diversity through a mix of one- and two-bedroom units, and incorporates bicycle parking, landscaping, and a car-share component that reduce reliance on private vehicles. These elements are generally consistent with the Community Plan's broader goals of encouraging sustainable, compact, and complete neighbourhoods.

Notwithstanding the proposal's consistency with the Community Plan's land use policies, concerns remain regarding the site-specific impacts of the development. The application includes a request for a rear-yard setback variance and proposes a parking arrangement consisting of one parking stall and one car-share vehicle. Furthermore, the subject property is located within a relatively small cul-de-sac that already contains a concentration of residential development. While the Community Plan supports residential intensification, it provides limited guidance regarding the appropriate scale and configuration of individual developments. As such, the key planning considerations for this application relate not to the appropriateness of the residential use itself, but rather to whether the proposed development can be accommodated on the site in a manner that is compatible with surrounding properties and consistent with the development standards and objectives of Zoning By-law No. 5045.

4.5 Niven Residential Objectives and Policies			
Planning and Development Objectives:		Policies:	
4.	To support a mix of residential types and densities.	4-a.	A variety of residential single unit and multiple unit dwelling types will be permitted.

Niven Lake Development Scheme 2007, By-law No. 4438

The Niven Lake Development Scheme identifies on-street parking, landscaped boulevards, and cul-de-sac centre islands as traffic-calming measures intended to create a safe and pedestrian-friendly neighbourhood environment. While the proposed Multi-Unit Dwelling is consistent with the residential land use envisioned for the area, the limited on-site parking provision may result in increased reliance on on-street parking by residents and visitors. This has the potential to increase congestion, limiting vehicle circulation within the cul-de-sac, and diminishing the balance between vehicle use and pedestrian activity that the neighbourhood was intended to achieve.

Zoning By-law No. 5045, as amended

The proposal generally complies with the R1 Zone because a Multi-Unit Dwelling is a permitted use. Accordingly, the application does not require rezoning and is consistent with the range of residential uses contemplated by the Zoning By-law. However, while the use is permitted, the scale and intensity of the development must still be evaluated in the context of the surrounding neighbourhood. The proposed six-unit building represents a higher concentration of dwelling units than is currently found on most individual lots within the immediate area and raises questions regarding compatibility with the established character of the cul-de-sac.

Evaluating the Request for Variance to the Side Yard Setback (Section 4.9):

The application requires a rear-yard setback variance. Under Section 4.9, a variance should not be approved where it would unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, materially interfere with neighbouring lands, or adversely affect the use, enjoyment, value, or development of adjacent properties. The volume of public feedback received suggests that neighbouring residents have concerns regarding privacy, building scale, and compatibility. While public opposition alone is not determinative, the concerns raised are relevant to the variance analysis and should be considered when evaluating whether the variance satisfies the intent of Section 4.9.

Further consideration should also be given to whether the variance is the result of a site-specific constraint or whether it is necessary to accommodate the scale of development. While the rear-yard setback reduction has been significantly reduced through revisions to the application, the variance remains associated with a six-unit building on a constrained lot within a small residential cul-de-sac. In evaluating the request, consideration should be given to the impacts of the building massing, parking demand, and increased residential intensity, and whether these factors result in a development that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood and consistent with the intent of the By-law and R1 Zone.

Site Planning Considerations (Section 7.1):

The development generally provides adequate pedestrian access, active transportation opportunities, and can likely accommodate drainage and municipal servicing requirements; however, concerns remain regarding its response to winter conditions, parking demand, and overall compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood. In particular, the concentration of six dwelling units on a constrained cul-de-sac, combined with limited on-site parking and the absence of dedicated visitor parking, raises concerns regarding snow storage, on-street parking pressures, vehicle circulation, and the long-term value and enjoyment of the surrounding residential area.

Grading (Section 7.3):

The Lot's proposed finished grade generally follows the Niven Phase VII General Subdivision Grading Plan, with positive drainage proposed to be directed towards Findlay Point and the Lot's rear yard. The submitted drawings indicate that portions of the site will be altered to accommodate parking and access, including blasting and grading of existing rock, while the rear portion of the lot is proposed to remain at natural grade with existing vegetation retained. This generally aligns with Section 7.3 where grading is limited to the areas required for site access and development, and where the natural contour of the land is retained to the extent practical. However, while the concept appears generally supportable, more detailed grading and drainage information should be required to confirm compliance with Section 7.3 and to ensure that surface drainage will not adversely affect adjacent properties or the public storm drainage system.

Vehicular Access and On-Site Traffic (Section 7.4):

While six dwelling units are unlikely to generate significant traffic from a city-wide transportation perspective, the impacts are more pronounced at the local level. Findlay Point functions as a residential cul-de-sac with limited opportunities for vehicle circulation. Additional vehicle trips associated with residents, visitors, deliveries, service providers, and contractors may increase traffic activity within an area that was not originally designed to accommodate higher-density development. The concentration of vehicle movements within a confined roadway network may affect the comfort and safety of pedestrians and residents using the cul-de-sac.

Landscaping (Section 7.5):

Per the R1 Zone, a minimum of 100% of the minimum front yard area is required to be landscaped. The proposal generally complies with the landscaping requirements of the By-law. The site plan provides the required landscaped areas, includes a mix of trees and shrubs, and incorporates the retention of existing natural vegetation and bedrock where practical. The proposed landscaping will assist in maintaining the visual character of the site and is consistent with the By-law's objective of encouraging the preservation of natural site features within residential developments. Since the required landscaped area is less than 500m², it was incorporated as part of the site plan drawing.

Parking and Driveways (Section 7.8):

Per Table 7-3 of the By-law, six 'type B' parking spaces and three bicycle parking spaces are required on-site. The development relies on the car-share provisions of the Zoning By-law Section 7.8.10 and therefore technically complies with parking requirements. However, concerns remain regarding the practicality of the proposed parking arrangement. The proposal contains six dwelling units, including three two-bedroom units, and does not provide dedicated visitor parking. While car-share programs may reduce vehicle ownership among some residents, they do not eliminate the need for visitor parking, service vehicles, deliveries, or temporary parking demands. Given the limited size of the cul-de-sac and the potential for existing on-street parking demand, there is uncertainty as to whether the proposal can accommodate its parking needs without increasing reliance on public streets. This concern is further amplified by the limited availability of curbside parking during winter months when snow storage reduces usable roadway width and parking opportunities. As a result, there remains concerns that the proposal may generate parking pressures that are inconsistent with the intended function and capacity of the surrounding street network.

Provision of Recreation Space (Section 8.1.3):

The proposal contains six dwelling units and is therefore not subject to the balcony or indoor recreation space requirements applicable to developments containing more than 15 dwelling units. Furthermore, the subject property is located within proximity to existing public open space and trail networks within the Niven neighbourhood, satisfying the intent of the outdoor recreation space requirements.

Multi-Unit Dwelling (Section 8.2.6):

The development generally satisfies the intent of these sections by providing pedestrian access, landscaping, garbage storage, and emergency vehicle access. However, concerns remain that overflow parking associated with the development may increase reliance on on-street parking within the cul-de-sac, which could affect vehicle circulation and the efficient movement of emergency and service vehicles, particularly during winter months when snow storage reduces available roadway width.

Conditions of Use (Section 10.1):

The purpose of the Low-Density Residential Zone is to provide an area for lower density residential development that encourages a mix of dwelling types and compatible uses.

A key consideration is whether the proposal respects the scale, massing, and pattern of surrounding development. While residential development is appropriate in this location, the proposed building introduces a larger, more dense, residential form than is typical within the immediate context. In particular, it is not evident that the proposed vehicle circulation and parking arrangement sufficiently address the practical demands associated with six dwelling units, nor that the site design mitigates concerns related to neighbourhood compatibility, parking overflow, and the functioning of the surrounding cul-de-sac. As such, the proposal does not appear to fully satisfy the intent of Section 10.1.

Servicing / Safety / Parks & Recreation / Community / Reconciliation

The proposal was circulated to internal departments and reviewed from the perspectives of servicing, safety, parks and recreation, and community impacts. While no significant concerns were identified regarding the provision of municipal services, parks and recreation access, concerns remain regarding neighbourhood safety, vehicle circulation, and parking demand within the constrained cul-de-sac environment. These concerns have been considered in the overall evaluation of the application.

Stirling Park and Moyle Park, two municipal parks serving the Niven neighborhood, are located within walking distance of the subject lot. Given that the building features three 2-bedroom units, it is possible that it will attract young families, making the park's close proximity a valuable asset for residents and their lifestyles.

City Departments / External Agency Consultation

As directed in section 4.5.1 of Zoning By-law No. 5045, a request for comments was circulated to City Departments as part of the Notice of Application. Comments were reviewed and considered, and are summarized in the table below:

No.	City Department	Comments	Consideration
1.	Public Works and Engineering	No concerns identified.	No consideration is required.
2.	Community Services	No concerns identified.	No consideration is required.
3.	Lands and Building Services	No concerns identified.	No consideration is required.
4.	Protective Services	<p>Over the last year-and-a-half, MED has received several complaints at Findlay Point regarding the ongoing construction. These ranged from contractors letting garbage and construction materials blow around into public and adjacent properties, contractors blocking access to private driveways, contractors not communicating early and clearly to other residents of their activities, illegal parking of contractor vehicles, and others. From our records we conducted 10 visits to the area in 2025 in response to complaints, 2 so far in 2026. These visits were responses to complaints, or follow ups to previous complaints.</p> <p>Overall I assess that the concerns of local residents in the area are valid. We should give serious consideration before approving this permit. There needs to be a clear understanding of how we expect the Contractors/Developers to behave and respect other local residents.</p>	<p>While the concerns identified by Municipal Enforcement Division (MED) are not directly related to the proposed land use, they are relevant in assessing the capacity of the site and surrounding street network to accommodate construction and development activity. Given the constrained nature of the cul-de-sac, the limited opportunities for staging, parking, and vehicle circulation, and the concerns raised regarding parking and access, the history of enforcement complaints provides additional context supporting concerns about the impacts of further intensification within the Findlay cul-de-sac.</p>

Public Consultation

A Notice of Application was mailed to neighboring residents within 30m of the subject property as part of the notice of application, per section 15. (1) (h) of the *Community Planning and Development Act*. A Notice of Application was also posted on-site and on the City’s website. As a result of the Notice of application, there were sixteen written submissions received and considered by the City of Yellowknife regarding this development. All comments received have expressed concerns with the development. issues identified related to increased traffic, pedestrian safety, building scale, privacy, neighbourhood character, and the effects of additional residential density within the cul-de-sac. A table listing all public comments received can be found at the end of the Report under Appendix A.

Public Notice of the decision will be posted at the site, as well as on the City's Capital Update, in conjunction with the date of decision of the permit. Commencing on the date of approval, the application will be subject to a 14-day appeal period. If not appealed within this 14-day period, the decision will be considered effective starting on the 15th day.


CAVEATS / OTHER LEGAL AGREEMENTS

It is the developer's responsibility to comply with applicable conditions specified within the registered Purchase Agreement.

Conclusion:

While the proposed use is permitted within the R1 Zone and generally supports broader housing objectives in the Community Plan, concerns remain regarding neighbourhood compatibility, parking demand, traffic circulation, residential enjoyment and amenities. In particular, the impacts associated with the proposed scale of development, when combined with the requested variance and the constrained nature of the cul-de-sac, raise concerns regarding the long-term function and character of the surrounding residential area. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal can be accommodated without adversely affecting neighbouring properties or the established residential character of the neighbourhood within Findlay Point.

Prepared [and refused] by:


Bassel Sleem, RPP, MCIP
Planner II

JUNE 19, 2026
Date

Attachment: Refused Drawings Development Permit PLDEV-2025-0013, DM# 828993

Appendix A: Public Comments received during Notice of Application period, DM# 823193

Appendix B: Applicant's Response to Public Comments, April 20, 2026, DM# 823224



CITY OF YELLOWKNIFE

April 4, 2026

Dear Edwin,

RE: PLDEV-2026-0013 Notice of Application (Public Comments)

As directed in section 4.5.1 of Zoning By-law No. 5045, a request for comments was circulated to City Departments and adjacent neighbours on March 18, 2026. As a result of the Notice of application, the following comments were received considered for analysis.

Public Comment No. 1

I own and live at [REDACTED] and have a few questions about the proposed building at 2 Findlay:

- Did the height requirement change in the last 10 years? I'm fairly sure that when we built our place, we were not allowed to build as high as is proposed here without a variance?
- How does the "provide a car share service" requirement actually work? Is there any sort of enforcement mechanism that guarantees that tenants actually have access to a car share? Or is it just "provide a car share parking spot which may or may not actually have a shared vehicle?" How does the city guarantee that this continues to be used as a car share parking spot?

PS - I noted that the plans for 2 Findlay show a power line extending from the street light to the building? Services in Niven are all required to be underground. Probably just an oversight?

Planner's Response

The maximum building height in the R1 Zone is 12m. This has been the case since [Zoning By-law No. 5045](#) got adopted on March 14, 2022.

Section 7.8.10 of Zoning By-law No. 5045 allows required parking to be met through a car share service. In the R1 Zone, the ratio is one car share vehicle for every six required parking spaces. The requirement would be to provide the parking space, the vehicle, and the service for the duration of the development.

Regarding enforcement mechanisms, the car share requirement would be a condition of the Development Permit. The property owner would also be required to enter into a Development Agreement with the City to provide and maintain the car share service. The City typically conducts an inspection after two years to confirm the service has been implemented and is operating as intended.

Thank you for pointing out the overhead power line – the application has been circulated to Department of Public Works and Engineering, so they will ensure utility connections are installed according to standards.

Public Comment No. 2

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed 6-unit development at 2 Findlay Point.

If approved, this project will significantly increase the density of our small residential court. Findlay Point would become one of the highest-density courts in Yellowknife, following Bartesko, Lanky, Sissons, and Beck Court, which all have apartment buildings. This is a notable shift for a street that currently consists of primarily single-family homes, with only nine such lots in total.

Approval of this development would result in more than 20 separate dwelling units on Findlay Point, placing considerable strain on infrastructure that was not designed to support this level of density. Additionally, four properties on the court have already been approved for, or are currently seeking, height and/or setback variances, further intensifying the impact on the neighborhood.

Recent experience with development on Findlay Point demonstrates the challenges we are already facing. The multi-family project at 7 Findlay Point was approved with only three parking spaces and no requirement for a car-sharing service. Since construction began in 2024, residents have made repeated calls to Municipal Enforcement regarding contractor vehicles. It is common to see five to six vehicles double- and triple-parked within the court, creating congestion, safety concerns, and near-miss incidents. Despite these ongoing issues, enforcement has been limited, and residents have had to manage the consequences.

The current proposal for 2 Findlay Point raises similar, if not greater, concerns. The plan relies on a car-sharing service in lieu of providing adequate on-site parking. However, this is not a realistic solution in Yellowknife. There is only one car-sharing service operating in a city of approximately 21,000 residents, with just two vehicles available. This service is rarely seen in the Niven Lake area and cannot reasonably be expected to meet the transportation needs of multiple additional households.

In practical terms, this development will result in additional vehicles being introduced to a court that already has no available street parking. Without sufficient parking infrastructure, the issues currently experienced at 7 Findlay Point will be repeated and amplified.

I want to be clear that I am not opposed to development on this lot. I would support a smaller scale project, such as a duplex, triplex, or four-plex, which could more reasonably accommodate resident parking and better align with the character and capacity of the neighborhood.

Given the existing challenges with parking enforcement and the demonstrated limitations of current infrastructure, it is unclear who will support residents when these issues inevitably worsen if this development is approved. To date, Municipal Enforcement has not been able to adequately address ongoing parking concerns on Findlay Point.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the City to reconsider the scale of this proposal and prioritize a development that is more appropriate for the size, layout, and capacity of Findlay Point.

If the proposed 6-unit development at 2 Findlay Point is approved, it will increase the number of garbage and compost containers to 20+ placed in the court on a weekly basis.



Current street parking on Findlay Point



7 Findlay Point

4/5-unit development. The City of Yellowknife previously approved this development with 3 parking spaces.



Public Comment No. 3

I am writing to express my extreme dissatisfaction with a proposed 6 plex in Findlay Point. I know the bulk if not all the residences in the area express the same view. While I appreciate the need for more

residential units, at what point does the city draw the line. This extreme densification (overpopulation) of the cul-de-sac will have many negative consequences. First off there are multiple significant safety concerns with this many proposed people crammed into such a small area. I have almost been hit 3 times by vehicles with the current added pressures of vehicles in the cul-de-sac. The driver did not even see me on each event. I have called by-law a number of times but those are generally short-term remedies. There have been vehicle collisions, an increase in parties, and unsafe driving (spinning doughnuts). Additionally, most homes have multiple children residing which are also at a significant risk with the overpopulation of this area as it is. It is no longer safe to have our children play outside at Findlay Point, which is such a shame as this was initially a huge selling feature when we purchased our home in 2023.

As it stands there are two 4 plex units, one of which is not yet finished, multiple duplexes in the immediate area, one house with a suite being built and only 2 stand alone homes all in one small cul-de-sac. Currently our home is valued at over 1 million dollars and I pay significant property taxes for essentially just snow removal once a year. This will significantly impact our property value, views of the area including sun with a tall building and further noise pollution. Multiple times a week if not most days, access to my house is impeded by illegally parked vehicles. This is a concern if emergency vehicles need to get in, I have to get out fast, or if anyone in general needs to access our homes such as to fill propane and for any deliveries, etc. With the cul-de-sac being treated like one giant parking lot of multiple vehicles left everywhere it also effects garbage pick up and snow removal for Findlay Point, which is a massive problem for current residents, never mind adding another potential 12 or more individuals to this lack of space. Also to note, multiple tour buses and city taxis also frequently pull into Findlay Point to drop off and pick up tourists who seek to hike trails in the area.

If you would like further evidence of the congestion, I am more than happy to submit photos. I have lodged formal complaints to by-law as well as the land development unit over issues in our court. Our quality of life has been negatively impacted over the last 2.5 years of building and increased use of the area. There are fuel spills (environment attended) there is garbage flying all over. The city cannot keep tabs on the issues as is, let alone 6 more units and up to 12 (or more) people and potential animals/pets residing there. I think it would be naïve to think a ride sharing program will be utilized or enforced. Coincidentally, a rideshare program in Niven has been previously explored and resulted in the determination that it would not be sustainable as several cars would need to always be available in order to ensure the success of this program in such a space where the walking distance to the “city” core is too far for residents to not have immediate access to a readily available vehicle. These individuals will have no choice but to purchase or bring their vehicle with them, resulting in attempting to park it in the cul-de-sac. The reality is all residents currently in Findlay Point have at least 1 if not 2 vehicles. This also includes other modes of transportation such as snowmobiles and boats. I am sure the rideshare concept was included in the application to strategically attempt to get ahead of concerns that will arise and to try to satisfy current residents with the false idea that the massive parking issue would be “taken care of.” Currently, the 4 plex beside us also indicates it was only built for 3 spots. Already, vehicles are struggling with finding parking for these units and will park as they please wherever they so choose. There is limited to no parking already on Moyle due to the other condos in the area. There have been several calls to bylaw and permitting with complaints. There have been little to no resolve, there is no parking now and it is increasingly dangerous. We are almost hit every other week with parking all over. Additionally, there are children, pedestrians, and many pets such as resident’s dogs running around during the same occurrences. It is a huge safety issue with speeds and congestion already.

It certainly feels the city does not value its residents opinion. I had gone to a previous appeal hearing for the 4 plex in the court and it appeared the city had made up its mind and the hearing was simply to satisfy its obligations. That board at the hearing also indicated if there was issues we could call bylaw as if it would easily rectify problems, it has not.

While I would prefer another stand alone house in the court, from my view point a duplex would be the maximum occupancy of that lot. Another 4 plex would cause the same issues as described.

We chose this cul-de-sac for a quiet, safe, and private location. At what point does the city act on behalf of the best interests for their current residents who are actively choosing to support Yellowknife, without the same support provided back. If there were more rural options or larger lots that would be great so we could have some choice, multi dwellings could have the spaces to develop the necessary parking for their residents, and we would not have to be put in these extremely dissatisfactory living situations.



Public Comment No. 4

I live across the street from 2 Findlay Point. I am not convinced that the installation of a car share service for the 6 units will be effective. Yellowknife is predominantly a car-driven city and with 6 working adults or families, one or two cars to share will not be sufficient.

I think it is very likely that each tenant will own a vehicle, regardless of the fact that a car share exists. This will add 6 or more additional vehicles to our small court's limited street parking and clutter the neighborhood unnecessarily. The same can be said of 7 findlay point which also already has a variance for the same issue. This will essentially make the variance pointless, since nearly every working family in yellowknife owns a car, if not 2.

It seems shortsighted to put so many units on our street with no parking available. It does not acknowledge the reality of living in yellowknife.

Public Comment No. 5

I am writing as a resident currently building a home with a secondary suite at [REDACTED] While I support the goal of increasing housing options in Yellowknife, I am concerned that a proposed 6-plex is not well suited to the limited context of this small cul-de-sac.

Findlay Point already contains a high concentration of multi-unit dwellings within a very confined space. Even at current density levels, congestion, parking shortages, and safety concerns are ongoing issues. The tight layout limits visibility and requires vehicles, pedestrians, and children to share the same space, increasing risk as density rises.

Parking is a particular concern. While a car-share program has been suggested as mitigation, such arrangements are voluntary and difficult to enforce long-term. The cul-de-sac is already used as overflow parking, which can impede access for residents, service vehicles, snow removal, and emergency response.

Given the site's physical constraints, a 6-plex would likely intensify these pressures beyond what the space can reasonably accommodate. A lower-density option, such as a single-detached home or duplex, would be more consistent with the scale, safety, and livability of Findlay Point while still allowing for growth.

Public Comment No. 6

I'm not opposed to housing or infill in principle, but after going through the application materials, I'm more concerned, not less. My issue is with this specific proposal on this specific lot.

The first problem is that the application does not even feel fully settled. Different parts of the package say different things about basic numbers, such as parking and total floor area. One page of the application notes 6 parking spaces, while showing two, and different total gross floor areas are noted on different pages as well. The variance write-up also states a "functional and compliant parking arrangement at the front and rear of the site," which does not align with what the later drawings show. I do not think a rear-yard variance should be approved based on plans that remain inconsistent.

I am also not convinced this is a minor variance. The application states that the building encroaches into the required 6.0 m rear yard by 1,970 mm at one end and 2,973 mm along the remainder of the rear elevation. That means much of the building is sitting at roughly 3 m from the rear property line instead of 6 m. For a building of this size, that is a significant reduction, not a small adjustment. Yellowknife City Bylaw 5095 states a minimum setback of 6 m for a reason, and this proposed change raises obvious concerns about privacy, overlook, shadowing, separation, and the overall intensity of the building at the rear of the lot.

The proposed "mitigation" of a fence does not really solve the main concerns either. A fence does not address upper-storey overlook, shadowing, light spill, or the overall mass of a three-storey building this close to the rear yard.

There are also major site issues that still seem unresolved in the drawings. The basement plan states that the detailed design for that level is to be completed after the development permit, and the extent of the full-height basement excavation is still to be determined on site. The plans also state that rock will be blasted and graded, and that pumping is required for basement drainage. Those are

not minor details that should be figured out later. They go directly to grading, drainage, retaining, snow handling, and the risk of impacts on neighbouring properties.

Parking is another serious concern. I understand the bylaw may allow car share, but this application still does not show how 1 regular stall plus 1 car-share space is realistically supposed to work for 6 units, visitors, service vehicles, and winter conditions without creating spillover parking problems on the street and for nearby residents.

I am also concerned that the building is being designed right up to the maximum height while the site is still being regraded. Before any decision is made, the City should require a clear final height calculation based on finished grade, along with a single consistent final site plan and proper details for drainage, excavation, parking, privacy, lighting, and snow storage.

The current package does not clearly demonstrate that the requested rear-yard variance will avoid impacts on neighbouring properties, and it does not provide sufficient confidence that the site can function properly as proposed.

Public Comment No. 7

In regard to the proposed development at 2 Findlay Point, I do not believe this is an appropriate location for a six-unit dwelling, for several important reasons.

Findlay Point is already experiencing a high level of density, with approximately 15 existing multi-unit residences. Introducing an additional six units would further strain an already overcrowded area.

The cul-de-sac currently offers limited space for garbage and recycling collection, and it is unclear how additional capacity would be accommodated. Similarly, the proposal references a car-share component; however, I would be interested in reviewing a detailed plan, as it is difficult to see how such an arrangement would be feasible in this location.

The height of the proposed three-storey building is another concern. It would significantly exceed the scale of surrounding properties and appear to tower over neighboring homes. This raises questions about whether it aligns with existing height restrictions and the overall character of the area.

In addition, the requested setback variance appears substantial. Given the relatively small size of the lot, attempting to accommodate six units seems excessive and incompatible with the site's limitations.

The development would also likely lead to increased traffic within the cul-de-sac, which is not designed to handle higher volumes. Furthermore, there is currently no adequate provision for on-street parking for residents or their guests, which would exacerbate existing challenges.

I strongly believe that new developments should enhance a neighborhood rather than detract from it. In this case, I am confident that the proposed project would have a negative impact on the character, livability, and functionality of the area, affecting current residents in a meaningful way.

Given the size and constraints of the lot, a duplex would be a far more appropriate and reasonable option. As it stands, the current proposal feels disproportionate and unfair to the existing residents.

Public Comment No. 8

I am writing to voice my concerns with the application for the 6-unit complex on our small cul-de-sac at Findlay Point.

We have recently seen a lot of development in our small neighbourhood, with two separate 4-unit complexes on the street. This has made parking very complicated, with construction and sub-trade trucks parking two and three abreast on the daily and causing significant safety concerns to residents. A 6-unit apartment building in such a small space, without any parking, would make our small street unimaginably overcrowded, and more so than it already is. This is a huge concern for the residents, many of whom have young children who play outside most of the year. The sheer volume of vehicles coming in and out of a small space with no exit (cul-de-sac) must be considered for safety and risk reduction. A 6-unit structure is not appropriate for such a small lot, on an already very high-density street.

I do not agree with the application for variance to decrease the setback proposed. At best, this property could be appropriate for a duplex, with on-property parking and garbage/compost disposal. This would require variance of setback, especially by 3 metres. There would essentially be no backyard or space between joining units to allow natural light into homes. The current size and elevation of the proposed project would dwarf the next-door duplex and significantly limit light coming into their units and backyard. It would be much more appropriate and in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood to have a unit with similar elevation and size to 131 A/B Moyle Drive.

A car-share service is not feasible in Niven for 6-units. Our location is close enough to downtown to walk or bike for some, but during long and cold winters, it is mandatory for most non-downtown dwellers to have vehicle access. There are no comparables of other buildings that have been able to operate exclusively with a car-share services, and there are only two (and not always in operation) cars. There is also official trail access to the fire-break trail on our street, which furthers parking challenges as tourists drive in daily to park and hike on those trails. Furthermore, a garbage disposal unit would take up a significant amount of space and require a garbage disposal truck to be able to access that space. As it currently stands, street parking that is so desperately needed will be limited due to the access for garbage.

I am asking the city to please reconsider this project. A duplex would be reasonable; a balance between the density that Yellowknife needs but does not exceed the capacity of our small cul-de-sac. Building a huge apartment-style complex on a small single-family home lot would cause massive inconvenience and safety concerns for the neighbourhood, and also to the future inhabitants of said complex. I am very concerned about traffic, congestion, and the safety of my young children. Please take that into strong consideration.

Public Comment No. 9

I am writing to formally object to application PLDEV-2026-0013 for the proposed development at 2 Findlay Point.

While I am not opposed to densification, housing development or infill in principle, my concerns relate specifically to this proposal on this particular lot.

To begin with, the application package itself appears incomplete and presents conflicting information, such as the number of parking spaces where one section references six parking spaces while the drawings appear to show only two. Similarly, the variance rationale describes a “functional and compliant parking arrangement at the front and rear of the site,” which does not align with the submitted plans (no room for parking at the rear end of the site). Given these discrepancies, it is difficult to assess the proposal with confidence, and I do not believe a rear-yard variance should be approved based on incomplete or inconsistent information. This submission seems to show a developer who knows their project is not following bylaws, they are asking for some flexibility showing incomplete building plans to then move forward with a more ambitious plan to maximize their benefits, at the expense of the neighbours quality of life and property value.

Another major issue I have is the way the application is written, as the developer suggests the variance is minor and “does not create adverse impacts on adjacent properties”. I do not agree with the applicant’s characterization of the requested variance as minor. Allowing this huge 6 unit in that small lot does not make any sense and would go against city bylaws. The proposal seeks to reduce the required rear-yard setback from 6.0 metres to approximately 3.0 metres—a 50% reduction which is a substantial deviation from the requirements of Zoning By-law 5045. By comparison, the previous Zoning By-law 4404 only permitted rear-yard variances of up to 25% at the discretion of the Development Officer, which further underscores that a 50% reduction cannot reasonably be considered minor.

Although the lot has an irregular shape, the need for this variance comes from the fact that they are trying to build a six-unit building rather than from inherent site constraints. The building reaches the maximum allowable height of 12 metres while also extending significantly into the rear setback. At the same time, they are not clear on how much blasting they will do and what height the building will have. In this context, the “practical constraint” cited by the applicant is self-created. A smaller or differently configured building could likely comply with the bylaw without requiring such a significant variance. Again this is a sign that the developer is requesting minimal variance and will then build a much more ambitious project, at the detriment of the neighbours.

The degree of encroachment is also considerable. The application notes that the building projects into the rear yard by up to approximately 3 metres along much of the rear elevation, placing a large portion of the structure at roughly half the required setback distance. When combined with the building’s height and massing, this represents a significant intensification at the rear of the lot. Elements of the design appear to conflict directly with bylaw provisions. Under Table 10-2 of Zoning By-law 5045, unenclosed steps may only encroach up to 40% into a reduced setback. Based on the proposed 3.0-metre setback, this would require a minimum distance of 1.8 metres from the property line. However, the current design shows steps located as close as approximately 1.02 metres, which does not comply with the bylaw.

The applicant says that a 2-metre fence will mitigate the encroachment, which is quite negligent to say. In their submission, I see they are not treating bylaws and the neighborhood with respect when they say the reduced setback “does not result in adverse effects on neighbouring properties and will support compatibility with the surrounding residential area” which is quite arrogant statement to

make when you look at the incomplete proposal submitted for this huge 6 unit building in a small lot. A fence of this height cannot mitigate overlook from upper-storey windows, balconies, or raised entrances. The plans indicate that the lowest-level units are elevated to a point where sightlines over the fence would still be possible, further reducing its effectiveness. A fence also does not address broader impacts such as shadowing, light spill, or the overall mass of a three-storey building located so close to the rear property line.

There are also important site-related issues that remain unresolved, they should be clearly defined and assessed prior to any approval. Again, we've seen that type of development in town before where the developer is not clear on what they are planning to do, they then build and the city gives them a minimal fine, while the developer maximizes its profit, at the expense of the neighbours. A few examples: The basement design is noted as incomplete, with details to be finalized after the development permit stage. The plans also indicate that rock blasting, grading adjustments, and pumped drainage systems will be required, with final conditions to be determined on site. These are not minor details—they directly affect grading, drainage, snow management, and the potential for impacts on neighbours.

Parking is another area of concern. I don't understand how a six unit building could be allowed in a cul-de-sac with multiple duplex, quadruplex already allowed without proper parking being planned for. While the bylaw may allow for car-share provisions, the proposal does not demonstrate how one standard parking stall plus one car-share space will adequately serve six units, along with visitors and service vehicles, particularly under winter conditions. This raises a strong likelihood of overflow parking affecting the street and surrounding properties which are already full of cars parked in the street. The unit is not built downtown, buyers will use their multiple cars to commute, it will become a problem for the whole neighbourhood.

In evaluating the variance against the criteria set out in Section 4.9.1(a)(i) and (ii) of Zoning By-law 5045, I do not believe the proposal meets the required standard. The combined effect of a 50% reduction in rear-yard setback and a building height of 12 metres will materially interfere with neighbouring properties in several ways.

Privacy: Windows, balconies, and stairs located very close to the rear property line will create direct overlook into adjacent homes and outdoor spaces.

Sunlight access: The scale and proximity of the building will reduce natural light to neighbouring yards and dwellings, affecting their usability and overall livability.

Lighting impacts: Required exterior lighting for safety—particularly with multiple rear entrances—will be located much closer to adjacent homes due to the reduced setback. This increases the likelihood of light spill into neighbouring bedrooms and outdoor areas, affecting comfort and sleep.

Taken together, these impacts are significant and go beyond what could reasonably be considered minor or acceptable within the intent of the bylaw. I just bought my house [REDACTED] and having a huge 6 unit building encroaching in [REDACTED] neighbours backyard will severely decrease the value of my property, while impacting my quality of life.

Finally, given that the site grading is still to be finalized, I believe the City should require a clear and consistent final site plan, including confirmed building height based on finished grade, as well as

detailed information on drainage, excavation, snow storage, lighting, and privacy measures before making any decision.

For all of the reasons outlined above, the application does not demonstrate that the requested variance meets the criteria of Zoning By-law 5045 or that it will avoid undue impacts on neighbouring properties. I request that the Development Officer deny the variance application.

Public Comment No. 10

We are writing in response to the City's request for public comment regarding the application for a development permit/variance at 2 Findlay Point, which seeks to reduce the required rear-yard setback from 6.0 metres to 3.0 metres to accommodate a proposed six-unit dwelling.

After reviewing the application and considering the intent of the Yellowknife Zoning By-law 5045, we do not support the requested variance for the reasons outlined below.

Starting with the rationale provided for the rear yard variance, the applicant indicates the requested variance is minor in nature, reflects practical constraints related to the irregular shape of the lot, and does not increase the building density and unit count. We respectfully disagree with this analysis for the following reasons.

- The requested 50% variance in the rear yard setback distance is not minor in nature. This can be clearly inferred by the previous zoning By-law 4404 which only permitted the Development Officer to allow a rear yard variance up to 25% as per section 3.5(2).
- Although the lot at 2 Findlay Point does have an irregular shape and may pose some practical constraints, the proposed 6-unit dwelling is simply too big to accommodate the lot. The design reaches the maximum allowable height of 12 metres and encroaches 50% into the required 6 metres rear yard setback. The "practical constraint" cited by the applicant arises directly from the density and scale of the building they have chosen to place on the lot. In other words, the constraint is self-created rather than inherent to the property.
- If the variance is approved, the rear yard setback would be reduced to 3 metres. Under Table 10-2 in Section 10.1 of Zoning By-law 5045, unenclosed steps may encroach only up to 40% into a reduced setback. This means the steps must remain at least 1.8 metres from the property line. The current design places the steps just 1.02 metres from the property line, which does not comply with the requirements of Table 10-2 and directly contradicts the by-law.
- The applicant proposes to install a 2-metre fence as a mitigation measure to privacy, separation and site definition concerns. We do not believe a fence would effectively mitigate these concerns, especially related to privacy, considering it would be less than 3 metres from a 12-metre-tall building (and potentially only 1.02 metres from unenclosed steps and balconies). According to the proposed building plan, the lowest-level unit would be at an approximate 2 metre height, enabling a view above the 2-metre fence, rendering the fence ineffective.

Turning now to the evaluation criteria guiding the Development Officer in their decision to grant a Variance, subsections 4.9.1(a)(i) and (ii) of zoning By-law 5045 state that the proposed Variance must not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood or materially interfere or affect the use, enjoyment, or value of the neighbouring parcel of land.

The 50% reduction in the rear yard setback must be considered in combination with the 12-metre proposed height of the building to fully understand the impact of the interference of the proposed building. The combined effect of height and reduced setback would have a substantial impact on the use, enjoyment and privacy of indoor and outdoor spaces of neighbouring dwellings and raises significant concerns:

- Privacy: Rear-facing windows, stairs and balconies positioned as close as 1.02 metres from the rear property line, will have a direct view into neighboring dwellings and full view overlooking their usable outdoor space, resulting in an unavoidable loss of privacy.
- Sunlight access: The size and height of the proposed multi-unit dwelling combined with the reduced setback would substantially diminish sunlight in the usable outdoor space of neighbouring properties, directly interfering with their use and enjoyment. Reduced natural light within the homes themselves would further diminish residents' quality of life.
- Floodlighting impacts: Section 8.2.6(a)(vi) of Zoning By-law 5045 requires multi-unit dwellings to install floodlighting to ensure safety and security. In this proposal, three of the unit entrances are located at the rear of the building, which means the rear yard will require substantially more lighting than is typical for a residential property. Because residents will be using exterior stairs to access these units, the lighting will need to be brighter and activated more frequently to maintain safe access. With the reduced rear yard setback, these floodlights would be positioned much closer to neighbouring homes. As a result, the lighting would shine directly into the bedroom windows of the adjacent residences, materially interfering with sleep, privacy, and overall wellbeing.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed site plan contradicts Zoning By-law 5045, and the requested variance does not meet the criteria set out in the By-law and would result in undue interference with neighbouring properties. The scale and design of the proposed building are incompatible with the constraints of the lot, and the impacts on privacy, sunlight, livability, and outdoor enjoyment are significant.

We respectfully request that the Development Officer deny the variance application.

Public Comment No. 11

We are writing to you today to respectfully share our concerns regarding the proposed development and requested variances at 2 Findlay Point. While we appreciate the ongoing development in our community, there are a few specific aspects of this proposal that we believe require careful reconsideration.

First, we would like to address the requested 50% variance on the rear setback. Over the past ten years, the City has removed or expanded almost all of the zoning restrictions that previously existed for this area (when we built our building the height limit was 8m, max number of units was 2 and even the type of siding was regulated). Consequently, setbacks are now the only remaining structural restrictions in place to protect neighborhood density and layout. Given that so much has already been altered, granting a 50% variance on the sole remaining safeguard is a significant decision that should not be made lightly.

Additionally, we would like to address the car share aspect of the proposal. For a car share program to function effectively, it requires several cars to be available within walking distance. When availability is limited to just one vehicle, users inevitably become frustrated by scheduling conflicts and lack of access, which ultimately drives them to purchase their own personal vehicle(s). A single-car setup does not effectively mitigate the parking or traffic footprint of a new six-unit development, unless there is a plan to develop car sharing in the wider neighbourhood.

We ask that the City carefully weigh these points when considering this development. Thank you for your time, the opportunity to provide feedback, and your attention to this matter.

I would add that if we had to choose between a car share and additional on-site parking at the rear, we would prefer the car share... we just need to find a way to add more car share vehicles in the given area.

Public Comment No. 12

I'm writing to share my concerns about the proposed development at 2 Findlay Point.

I live [REDACTED], and to be honest, this proposal is very concerning for us. From what we understand, this would be a three-story multi-family building going up extremely close to our home. There appears to be little to no space between the two properties, which means this building would be directly overlooking our yard. That's a huge loss of privacy for us and will really change how we're able to use and enjoy our home.

The developer has mentioned to you in a letter that a fence would be added to provide privacy, separation, and a clear boundary between properties. However, there doesn't appear to be any actual plan or detail showing that a fence will be built. Without something concrete in the plans, it's hard to rely on that as a real solution, especially given how close this building would be to our home.

Parking is already an issue on our cul-de-sac. It's a tight, high-density court as it is, and there simply isn't room for more vehicles. Adding multiple new units without proper parking will spill cars onto the street, make things more congested, and create ongoing frustration for everyone who lives here.

What's also frustrating is that directly across from 2 Findlay, there is already a multi-unit rental building being constructed. That alone is going to increase traffic, parking pressure, and density in a noticeable way. Adding another multi-family development right across from it feels like too much for such a small, family-oriented street.

Findlay Point has always been a quiet, community-focused cul-de-sac where kids can play safely and neighbors know each other. Increasing the density this much is going to change that dynamic in a big way. More traffic in a confined space also raises safety concerns, especially for children and pedestrians.

I also can't help but feel that this proposal is more about maximizing rental units than fitting into the neighborhood. It doesn't seem to take into account how close it is to existing homes or the impact it will have on the people already living here.

On top of that, there are practical concerns, things like snow removal, garbage collection, and even emergency vehicle access. Our street wasn't designed to handle this level of density.

I'm asking that this proposal be seriously reconsidered, or at the very least scaled back to better fit the space and the neighborhood. There needs to be proper distance between buildings, realistic parking, and clear, enforceable plans for privacy measures like fencing and not just general statements.

Public Comment No. 13

The development of 2 Findlay Point as a 6-unit multi-dwelling will undoubtedly not support neighbourhood character as suggested in Edwin Shu's letter of information to Bassel Sleem. It will in fact *"result in adverse effects on the neighbouring properties"* and will not *"support compatibility with the surrounding residential area or respect neighbourhood character."* A single-dwelling or at the very least a duplex unit would be more suitable for the proposed application of land for Findlay Point. This would ensure that the cul-de-sac does not get even further overpopulated with residents beyond its capacity.

The residential area in discussion, Findlay Point is already currently facing its own significant challenges, including overpopulation which has turned it into an unsafe parking lot with no boundaries. This has great impacts on safety of its residents and visitors and the ability of services attempting to gain access into Findlay Point. This includes propane and other necessary delivery services, emergency services, garbage pick up, and snow removal. There have been several occasions where services have attempted to reach a house but have not been able to due to many vehicles being parked every which way. I personally, have been trapped in my driveway on multiple occasions with a vehicle full of children unable to get them to their destination.

In his letter Edwin mentions *"a functional and compliant parking arrangement at the front and rear of the site."* It appears there are 2 potential parking spots on the site plans at the front of the building, but I do not see a rear parking arrangement on any plans. Please advise as to what this means as this letter is currently attached in the site plans on the City of Yellowknife's Active Development Applications webpage for 2 Findlay Point. Edwin's letter and the application submitted plans also do not mention any *"Car Share Service in lieu of 6 parking spaces"* (sourced from the Notice of Application). The Notice of Application appears to be the only mention of this plan. Also please note even 6 parking spaces would not suffice as quite often 1-unit occupies 2 or more individuals so that would be potentially 12 parking spaces the Car Share Service would need to provide in order to be more realistic as to what this over-populated parking dilemma may result in. This all does not speak to the addition of potentially 6-12 or more individuals plus potential animals being added into the cul-de-sac. This will be especially apparent with the 2-bedroom units as those could potentially bring an additional resident/renter as well! Currently, all housing units on Findlay Point consist of all multi-dwelling units (with the exception of only 2 single dwellings). Also to note that this does not include any company or visitors the units may also have during any given time. Moyle Drive and Findlay Point both see a large number of tourists and individuals from all over Yellowknife and the surrounding area who come to hike nearby trails. The safety of these individuals also needs to be factored into this application proposal.

An example of the realistic parking spots required is provided by looking at all of the new developments on Moyle, 123 and 130 Moyle Drive, both 4-plex units, and the 19-unit NWT Housing Corporation building on Moyle, and on Findlay Point (5 (includes rental suite), 7 and 8 Findlay Point both 4-plex units). Every single one of those units came with one or more residents who most certainly do have a vehicle(s). In reality residents who do not currently own vehicles will quickly get one or more if they do not already have one prior to moving in. All 4 of the Habitat for Humanity Home residents all have multiple vehicles, as do both 4-plex units (130 Moyle and 8 Findlay Point) and many of the 19-unit building also have vehicles beyond the capacity of the small parking lot provided there. Many of the Niven Heights Condos and Villas residents also park overflow vehicles on Moyle. Also, 123 Moyle Drive currently under construction is set to contain 4 additional units as well. Both houses currently being built on Findlay Point (5 and 7 Findlay Point) each have rental suite(s) that will also have renters who have vehicles. When it is -30 for months again next winter all of these individuals plus the additional proposed 6-unit multi-dwelling will not pay to live in Niven and happily park somewhere along already overcrowded Moyle. Taking a drive down Moyle on a Saturday or Sunday is very claustrophobic and you instantly regret having to take that road, but it is the only way in and out.

Therefore, having insufficient parking spaces for residents is not a realistic option for this proposed project for a 6-unit dwelling. A single-dwelling or at the very least a duplex unit would be a much more viable option for this lot in discussion. The number of residents an additional 6-unit dwelling accounts for needs to be in an area where individuals are able to walk to places with ease and access. Findlay Point currently has *“a Walk Score of 7 out of 100 due to the location being deemed as a “Car-Dependent” neighborhood so errands require a car.”* YK Car Share has already looked at the option of having this type of program in Niven and deemed it unrealistic due to the fact that many cars would need to be readily available for residents at any given time. The distance residents have to travel is too far in order for this type of Car Share Service program to work in Niven.

Historically, appeals are a common theme in this same neighbourhood, including in 2023 for 130 Moyle Drive and for 7 Findlay Point. Interestingly, both appeals also highlight the significant concerns with necessary parking not being available. This appears to be a common theme that has been consistently overruled and accepted to continue as such. Each time the statement *“there are no negative impacts”* is provided without any action for unhappy concerned residents. Just down Niven Drive similar issues of traffic and parking appeals were also noted in 2022 for Hagel Drive Niven Lake Phase 5/The View (70-units) and in 2024 for 110 Hagel Drive (24-unit multi-dwelling). Additionally, to note the appeals in 2015 with the 19-unit NWT Housing Corporation building on Moyle Drive across from the Niven Heights development.

I am also seeking clarity as to the following statement: *“as a mitigating measure for the reduced rear yard setback, we propose the installation of a fence along the rear property line section **without a fence.**”* I am wondering how a fence is proposed without a fence? Several times in Edwin’s letter, he mentions the fact that 2 Findlay Point is on *“an irregularly shaped lot”* and deems this variance request is *“site-specific and reflects practical constraints related to the irregular shape of the lot.”* It is therefore arguable that this encroachment into the rear yard setback would in-fact *“create adverse impacts on adjacent properties.”* If the fence is proposed but not actually going to happen then the following statement will be incorrect: *“the proposed fencing will further ensure that the reduced setback does not result in adverse effects on neighbouring properties and will support compatibility with the surrounding residential area.”* Please note that previously in his letter, Edwin claims there

will be no “*result in adverse effects on neighbouring properties.*” This is a contradicting statement that raises questions as to the validity of one’s word when attempting to get an application approved.

The ability to keep our children, elderly, and pets safe on Findlay Point is also of concern as people, vehicles, animals, tourists, and construction are everywhere. A single-dwelling or at the very least a duplex unit would be more suitable for this remaining lot on Findlay Point. Please consider the safety of the residents who already pay a lot to live somewhere they once felt safe.

Public Comment No. 14

I am writing to provide formal comments regarding the development application for 2 Findlay Point (File: PLDEV-2026-0013).

After reviewing the submitted plans and supporting materials, I have several concerns related to zoning compliance, neighbourhood impact, and the practical implications of the proposed design.

1. Rear Yard Setback, Building Massing, and Property Value Impact

The proposed reduction of the rear yard setback from 6.0 metres to approximately 3.0 metres represents a significant deviation from the requirements of the Zoning By-law. A reduction of this magnitude—approximately 50%—does not appear minor in nature and materially alters the spatial relationship between properties.

When combined with the proposed building height (approaching the maximum allowable), the reduced setback results in a structure that is both visually and physically imposing relative to adjacent properties. The building mass, when placed so close to neighbouring property lines, creates a sense of overdevelopment that is inconsistent with the intended character of the area.

This proximity is not only a planning concern but also a financial one. The presence of a large, multi-unit structure at such a reduced setback can reasonably be expected to negatively affect neighbouring property values. The diminished sense of space, increased overshadowing, and loss of visual openness are all factors that can reduce market desirability and long-term value for adjacent homeowners.

2. Privacy Impacts from Rear-Facing Stairs and Openings

Of particular concern is the placement of exterior stairs, entrances, and associated circulation areas directly at the rear of the building, facing neighbouring properties.

Based on the drawings, these elements appear to be located extremely close to the rear property line. This creates a direct line of sight into adjacent yards and potentially into interior living spaces. The elevated position of these access points further exacerbates the issue, effectively overlooking neighbouring properties and eliminating any meaningful sense of privacy.

This design introduces a continuous and unavoidable intrusion into the use and enjoyment of nearby outdoor and indoor spaces.

3. Floodlighting and Light Intrusion

The proposal indicates that lighting will be required for safety and access, particularly at the rear of the building where multiple unit entrances are located.

Given the reduced setback, any required floodlighting will be positioned in close proximity to neighbouring properties. The frequency of use (due to multiple units and shared access points) suggests that lighting will be activated regularly, including during nighttime hours.

This raises serious concerns regarding light spill into adjacent homes, particularly into bedroom windows, resulting in sleep disruption, reduced privacy, and overall diminished residential amenity.

4. Parking Provision and Car-Share Assumptions

The proposed parking strategy raises practical concerns. The allocation of only two dedicated parking spaces, supplemented by reliance on car-share arrangements, does not reflect typical vehicle ownership patterns in this neighbourhood.

There is no clear mechanism outlined for how the use of car-share spaces would be enforced or managed over time. Without enforceable controls, it is highly likely that residents will rely on on-street parking, thereby increasing pressure on already limited parking availability in the area.

This creates a foreseeable spillover effect that will negatively impact existing residents and the overall functionality of the neighbourhood.

5. Impact on Neighbourhood Character and Livability

The combination of reduced setbacks, increased building mass, direct overlooking, and intensified use introduces a form of development that is not consistent with the established character of the area.

The resulting loss of privacy, increased lighting intrusion, and parking congestion are all factors that can reasonably be expected to negatively affect both the enjoyment and value of neighbouring properties, as well as the overall livability of the neighbourhood.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposed development raises substantial concerns with respect to zoning compliance, privacy, lighting impacts, and parking feasibility. The cumulative effect of these issues suggests that the proposal does not meet the intent of the Zoning By-law, particularly in terms of maintaining compatibility with surrounding properties and protecting residential amenity.

I respectfully request that these concerns be given careful consideration in the review of this application.

Public Comment No. 15

This letter is submitted to voice my concerns with respect to the application for the 6-unit complex planned for the already-overpopulated small cul-de-sac, Findlay Point in Niven Lake subdivision.

If allowed to proceed, this development would tip the scales on the balance of pleasantly quiet to an unnecessarily busy neighbourhood, with two existing, separate 4-unit complexes on the street.

Even without this proposed complex, parking is complicated, as beyond the contractors' various vehicles and trucks, causing significant safety concerns and inconvenience to residents, once the units themselves are populated, there will be difficulties navigating the spaces allotted.

A 6-unit apartment building in such a small area, without parking allowances, given people still rely on various modes of transportation which warrant need for turning around and spaces to park, would render our small street unimaginably overcrowded.

Residents of Findlay Point are extremely concerned about the City of Yellowknife allowing not only further development of what is supposed to be a higher-end neighbourhood (i.e. nicely spaced living quarters for professionals and small families with young children), but that there is no regard to maintaining safety of its residents.

The sheer volume of vehicles coming in and out of a small cul-de-sac must be considered for risk reduction. A 6-unit structure is not appropriate for Findlay Point, an already high-density street. Of note, official trail access from our street to the firebreak below, which we all enjoy as access to nature, furthers traffic challenges as tourists drive in daily to park vehicles while they hike.

Beyond the safety factor, there seems to be a lack of enforcement for respect of the environment regarding two projects on-going with a particular developer, one at 7 Findlay and another on Moyle, whereby construction materials, garbage, pink insulation and other debris are piled high then scattered over surrounding lots, forest, and roads. As there must be building inspection to enforce various legislated codes, there must also be serious consideration to residents' standard of living.

To live well, we need space between building units to allow natural light into homes. The current size and elevation of the proposed project at 2 Findlay would dwarf its neighbours, significantly limiting light and living space. It would be much more appropriate and in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood to have a 2-unit building with 2-story elevation and smaller footprint.

Car-share service is not feasible in Niven Lake, especially for six units. While close enough for some to walk or bike downtown, during long and cold winters it is almost mandatory to have vehicles. Nobody in Yellowknife we are aware of has been able to operate exclusively with car-share services, currently only two cars (not always in operation). Parking is essential, on-site (i.e. not on the street).

Furthermore, a garbage disposal unit at 2 Findlay not only would take up a significant ratio of available space on that lot but requires access by a garbage disposal truck including turnaround.

I seriously urge the City to reconsider this project at all, certainly to deny the proposed variance. A duplex would be reasonable, providing for increased population density without exceeding the capacity of our small cul-de-sac.

2026:



Public Comment No. 16

My wife and I are writing to formally oppose the Development Permit and Variance Application (File No. PLDEV-2026-0013) for the proposed multi-unit dwelling at 2 Findlay Point.

Our concerns are based on a review of the Notice of Application and submitted plans.

1. Rear Yard Setback Variance is Not Minor

The application proposes reducing the rear yard setback from the required 6.0 metres to approximately 3.0 metres, with encroachments of approximately 1.97 m to 2.97 m along the rear elevation.

A reduction of this magnitude (up to 50%) is significant and not minor in planning terms. Rear yard setbacks are intended to provide:

- Adequate separation between properties
- Privacy for adjacent residents
- Space for drainage, snow storage, and maintenance

Reducing this setback compromises these functions and does not maintain the intent of the Zoning By-law.

2. Inconsistency with R1 Zoning Intent

The property is zoned R1, which is typically intended for low-density residential development. The proposal introduces a 6-unit, three-storey building (plus basement), representing a substantial increase in density and built form intensity.

While infill development is important, this scale of development combined with reduced setbacks is not consistent with the intent of low-density zoning and may negatively affect the character of the surrounding area.

3. Parking Deficiency and Car Share Substitution

The revised plans indicate only 1 parking space plus 1 car-share space in lieu of the required 6 parking spaces.

This represents a significant reduction in on-site parking. Given Yellowknife's context:

- Limited public transportation options

- Winter conditions that limit active transportation
- High reliance on personal vehicles

It is unlikely that a car-share model will adequately meet resident demand. This will likely result in overflow parking onto nearby streets, impacting existing residents and creating potential safety and access concerns.

4. Functional Site Constraints and Snow Management

The site plan identifies multiple competing uses within a constrained site, including:

- Parking and access areas
- Snow piling areas
- Waste collection area
- Reduced rear yard space

With the rear yard setback reduced to approximately 3 metres, there is limited space to accommodate snow storage without affecting access, visibility, and usability of the site. This raises concerns about the long-term functionality of the development, particularly during winter months.

5. Variance Justification Relies on Site Constraints

The rationale provided cites irregular lot shape, bedrock conditions, and grading challenges. However, these are typical conditions in Yellowknife and should be addressed through appropriate building design and site planning.

Variations should not be used to maximize development at the expense of established zoning standards. Approving this variance risks setting a precedent for similar reductions on other properties.

6. Limited Effectiveness of Proposed Mitigation

The proposed rear yard fence does not adequately mitigate the impacts of reduced setback, particularly with respect to privacy, spatial separation, and overall site intensity.

Conclusion

Based on the above, the requested variance is not minor, does not maintain the intent of the Zoning By-law, and raises concerns regarding parking, site functionality, and neighbourhood compatibility.

I respectfully request that the City deny the variance and require the development to comply with the existing zoning requirements.

Public Comment from Municipal Enforcement Division

Over the last year-and-a-half, MED has received several complaints at Findlay Point regarding the ongoing construction. These ranged from contractors letting garbage and construction materials blow around into public and adjacent properties, contractors blocking access to private driveways, contractors not communicating early and clearly to other residents of their activities, illegal parking of contractor vehicles, and others. From our records we conducted 10 visits to the area in 2025 in response to complaints, 2 so far in 2026. These visits were responses to complaints, or follow ups to previous complaints.

Overall I assess that the concerns of local residents in the area are valid. We should give serious consideration before approving this permit. There needs to be a clear understanding of how we expect the Contractors/Developers to behave and respect other local residents.

Applicant Response to Public Comments

Development Permit Application PLDEV-2026-0013 — 2 Findlay Point, Yellowknife NT

Submitted by: Edwin Shu | April 20, 2026

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

I am grateful to the City for the opportunity to respond to public comments received regarding application PLDEV-2026-0013. I want to thank all my neighbors who took the time to review the application and provided comments. I have reviewed all sixteen submissions carefully and take the concerns of my neighbours seriously. I am also a resident of the Niven Lake area and have a direct, personal interest in maintaining the character, safety, and liveability of Findlay Point — this is not an absentee development.

Before addressing the specific issues raised, I wish to make three preliminary observations that are relevant to the weight the Development Officer should assign to the public record.

Similar Themes Across Submissions

A review of the sixteen submissions reveals that several comments raise similar themes and, in some cases, draw on comparable language and framing — which is not unusual when neighbours with shared concerns discuss an application together or draw from similar sources of information. The car-share argument, references to overcrowding, the Table 10-2 / 1.02 metre steps analysis, the By-law 4404 / 25% historical comparison, and the 'self-created constraint' framing appear across a number of submissions in closely related form. This reflects a common set of concerns held by a group of like-minded neighbours rather than a broad range of independent perspectives, and the Development Officer may wish to take this into account when weighing the overall record.

Photographs Depict Construction Conditions, Not Occupancy Conditions

The photographs submitted in support of several comments — showing vehicles double- and triple-parked across the cul-de-sac — document the active construction phase at 5 and 7 Findlay Point, which has involved large contractor trucks, trades vehicles, and delivery equipment. These conditions are temporary and attributable to a specific nearby construction project, not to the occupancy patterns of completed multi-unit residential buildings. It would not be reasonable to use construction-phase parking photos as evidence of what conditions will look like once the proposed development at 2 Findlay Point is complete and occupied.

Furthermore, I have my own photographic record showing Findlay Point with minimal vehicle presence on a Saturday evening — demonstrating that the street's baseline parking situation is not as dire as the submitted images suggest.

I am a Local Resident With a Stake in the Neighbourhood

I live in the Niven Lake area. I have a direct interest in ensuring this development is built responsibly, that construction is managed respectfully, and that the completed building contributes positively to the neighbourhood. Unlike the nearby construction project where lumber was stored on public streets creating the safety hazards referenced in several comments, I have sufficient on-site yard space to stage all

construction materials within the property throughout the build. This will be a condition I commit to in writing.

ISSUE 1: REAR YARD SETBACK VARIANCE

This is the central planning issue in the application and deserves a thorough response. Several comments characterize the requested variance as a 50% reduction that is 'not minor.' I want to address both the magnitude of the variance and the reasoning behind it directly.

Revised Variance Request: Reduced to Approximately 8.8%

In response to the public comments received, I am revising my variance request. Through a design refinement that relocates the exterior staircase from the rear and front elevations to the interior of the building, and shifts the building mass closer to the street and within the 6 meter setback, the required rear yard encroachment is essentially eliminated. The revised request represents an encroachment of approximately 528 mm — a variance of approximately 8.8% of the required 6.0 metre setback — not 50%.

REVISED REQUEST

Rear yard setback variance reduced from ~50% to approximately 8.8% (528 mm encroachment into the required 6.0 m setback) through building repositioning and staircase relocation to the interior.

This is a materially different proposition from what was originally circulated for comment, and the Development Officer should assess the revised design on its own merits. A 528 metre encroachment is a genuinely minor variance that reflects the practical geometry of an irregularly shaped lot — not an attempt to maximize development at the expense of neighbours.

The Variance Is Required by the Lot Shape, Not the Unit Count

Multiple comments suggest that the variance request is a consequence of trying to fit too many units onto the lot — that a duplex or single dwelling would not require a variance. This is incorrect, and I ask the Development Officer to verify this independently.

The lot at 2 Findlay Point is irregularly shaped. A duplex with a walkout basement — which may be the natural alternative on this topography — would face the same geometric constraints at the rear of the lot. The shape of the lot creates a practical constraint regardless of the number of units proposed. The variance need arises from the lot configuration, not from the density of the proposed building.

I would also note that the CMHC standard row house plan — two of which would constitute a duplex — would not comply with the required setback on this lot without a variance. This further confirms that the variance request is site-specific and geometry-driven, not density-driven.

Comparison With 7 Findlay Point

It is worth noting for the record that 7 Findlay Point was approved at a height of 14.5 metres and 3.5 meters rear setback. The proposed building at 2 Findlay Point will be within the 12-metre maximum permitted height under current zoning, and will likely sit lower in absolute terms than 3 Findlay Point, which was constructed on the existing high bedrock without blasting. At 2 Findlay Point, the lot will be blasted and

levelled, meaning the finished grade — and therefore the effective building height as experienced by neighbours — will be lower than the raw structural height suggests.

HEIGHT CONTEXT

7 Findlay Point: approved at 14.5 m. 3 Findlay Point: built on high bedrock, unblasted. 2 Findlay Point: will be blasted and levelled — effective height will be lower than 12 m maximum.

Grading Plan as a Condition of Approval

I am prepared to accept an approved grading plan as a condition of the Development Permit. This will provide the City and neighbouring property owners with certainty about finished grades, drainage, and the relationship of the building to adjacent properties before construction proceeds. This directly addresses the concerns raised in Comments 6, 9, and 16 about unresolved grading and drainage questions. The conceptual grading plans provided should be sufficient at the DP stage.

ISSUE 2: PARKING AND CAR-SHARE PROGRAM

Parking and car-share feasibility is the issue raised most frequently and most passionately across the sixteen submissions. I want to address it directly and honestly, while also pushing back on some of the assumptions that underpin the objections.

The Car-Share Commitment: Strengthened

I am committing to the following, to be incorporated as conditions of the Development Permit and Development Agreement:

- A minimum of one shared vehicle will be available on-site at all times for resident use.
- If demand exceeds availability of the on-site vehicle, access to additional car-share arrangements — including the existing YK Car Share network — will be provided and facilitated for residents.
- The car-share vehicle if electric will be charged using the building's rooftop solar PV system, creating a zero-marginal-cost mobility option for tenants.
- At least two electric bicycles will be provided, secured, and maintained on-site for resident use.
- The car-share and e-bike program will be a binding condition of the Development Agreement.

The 'Everyone in Yellowknife Needs a Car' Assumption Is Not Accurate

Several comments assert, as if it were an established fact, that every resident in Yellowknife owns one or two vehicles and that no tenant will use a car-share or go without a personal vehicle. This is not accurate, and I can speak to it from direct experience.

I currently have family and colleagues who do not own vehicles and do not intend to acquire one. The proposed development at 2 Findlay Point is intentionally designed to appeal to a different demographic: working professionals, young adults, and individuals who prefer a lower-cost, lower-consumption lifestyle with access to alternative transportation. E-bikes, car-share, and proximity to trails are features, not afterthoughts — they are part of the product offering that will attract exactly the residents for whom car ownership is not a priority.

It is also worth noting that the argument 'everyone will own a car regardless' proves too much. If accepted, it would make car-share provisions unworkable everywhere in Yellowknife, including in areas closer to downtown where the City has presumably already accepted them as valid parking mitigation. The by-law expressly permits this substitution.

Duplex Parking Would Be Worse, Not Better

Several comments suggest a duplex as the appropriate alternative, implying it would solve the parking problem. Let us examine that claim using the commenters' own assumptions.

A duplex with walkout basement suites on this lot would produce at minimum four occupancies (two main units, two basement suites). Using the commenters' own estimate of two vehicles per family, that is eight vehicles — significantly more than the six units proposed here, which are designed for a lower-car demographic with on-site car-share infrastructure. The lot cannot physically accommodate eight parking spaces. The parking problem the commenters describe would be worse under the duplex scenario, not better.

PARKING COMPARISON

Duplex + walkout suites (4 occupancies × 2 vehicles = up to 8 vehicles, no car-share). 6-plex with car-share + e-bikes + solar EV = lower vehicle demand by design, binding enforcement mechanism.

Construction Parking vs. Occupancy Parking

The photographs submitted across multiple comments document contractor and trades vehicles during an active construction phase at a nearby site — not the parking conditions of a completed, occupied residential building. Post-construction occupancy generates an entirely different and substantially lower vehicle volume than an active multi-trade construction project. These images should be understood as evidence of a construction management problem at a separate site, not as a projection of future conditions at 2 Findlay Point.

I further commit that all construction materials, equipment, and contractor vehicles for the 2 Findlay Point project will be staged and parked within the property boundary throughout the build. I have adequate yard space to accommodate this, and this commitment will be documented in writing.

ISSUE 3: PRIVACY, OVERLOOK, AND FENCING

Several technically detailed submissions — particularly Comments 6, 9, 10, and 14 — raise concerns about upper-storey overlook and the effectiveness of a 2-metre fence as mitigation. These concerns deserve a substantive response.

Staircase Relocation Resolves the Primary Overlook Concern

The revised design relocates the exterior staircase from the rear and front elevation to the interior of the building. This is the single most significant change in response to the privacy concerns raised, and it directly addresses the issue of elevated rear-facing access points overlooking adjacent yards. The stairs will no longer be positioned at the rear property line.

Trees as Additional Privacy Mitigation

In addition to the revised building configuration, I will explore the installation of taller, fast-growing native tree species along the rear property line as a supplementary privacy measure. Properly selected northern tree species can provide meaningful canopy screening within a few growing seasons, addressing upper-storey sightlines in a way that a fence alone cannot. This can be specified as a landscaping condition of the Development Permit.

Fence Commitment

I confirm that the fence referenced in the application will be constructed. This will be a condition of the Development Permit — it is not merely a statement of intent. The concerns raised in Comments 12 and 13 about the fence being mentioned without a concrete plan are noted, and I am prepared to have its installation and specification included as a binding permit condition.

ISSUE 4: DENSITY, NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER, AND ZONING

This Use Is Permitted by the Zoning By-law

The proposed development is a permitted use within the R1 zone under the current Zoning By-law No. 5045. The City made a deliberate policy decision when it adopted this zoning framework in March 2022 to allow multi-unit residential development of this scale in this zone. The question of whether six units should be permitted in the R1 zone is a policy question that was resolved at the time of zoning adoption — it is not a question for the Development Officer to re-litigate in the context of this specific application.

Several comments express frustration that the zoning has changed since they built their homes — Comment 11 notes the previous height limit was 8 metres and maximum units were two. That is precisely the point: the by-law has changed, and the current by-law governs.

Density in Context

I respectfully ask the Development Officer to compare the density at 2 Findlay Point against the existing development pattern in other areas within the City, where multiple multi-family buildings have been approved and built in close proximity. The Niven Lake subdivision has accommodated significant multi-unit development throughout. A six-unit building on a single lot, designed to high energy performance standards with green mobility infrastructure, is a responsible form of infill that contributes to the City's housing supply objectives.

Comment 3 — Characterization of the Neighbourhood

Comment 3 includes the assertion that 'I know the bulk if not all the residences in the area express the same view.' This is presented without basis. I am aware of residents in the area who support the project and who did not submit written objections. The absence of supportive written comments should not be interpreted as unanimous neighbourhood opposition.

ISSUE 5: APPLICATION COMPLETENESS AND CONSISTENCY

Comments 6 and 9 raise concerns about inconsistencies in the application package — specifically regarding the number of parking spaces noted on different pages, and the reference to rear parking that does not appear in the drawings. These are legitimate observations that I acknowledge.

The inconsistencies referenced relate to earlier draft materials that were included in the submission package in error. I have resubmitted a clean, consolidated application package that presents a single, consistent set of plans, specifications, and supporting documentation. Specifically:

- A single confirmed parking layout showing 1 regular stall and 1 car-share space, consistent across all documents.
- A confirmed, consistent total gross floor area on all pages.
- Removal of the rear parking reference in the variance write-up, replaced with the accurate description of the revised layout.
- A conceptual grading plan to be finalized as a condition of permit approval.

I accept that the “basement” design details cannot be fully specified at the development permit stage given the bedrock conditions that require confirmation through blasting. Final basement parameters will be established and permitted through the building permit process, which provides a separate and appropriate regulatory checkpoint.

ISSUE 6: TRAFFIC, SAFETY, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Several comments raise concerns about traffic volumes, pedestrian safety, and the capacity of the cul-de-sac to handle additional vehicles. These are reasonable concerns in principle, but several important points of context deserve consideration.

Traffic Impact Was Considered at Zoning Approval

I believe the City of Yellowknife assessed the traffic and infrastructure implications of multi-unit residential development in this zone when it adopted Zoning By-law No. 5045 in 2022. The permitted density and use types in the R1 zone reflect that assessment. The proposed development does not exceed the uses or densities contemplated by the current zoning framework. If the infrastructure is inadequate to support the zoning, that is a systemic issue that predates and extends well beyond this specific application.

Six Small Units Generate Less Traffic Than Assumed

The development proposes six small units — three one-bedroom and three two-bedroom — targeted at a demographic that, by design do not want the responsibility to own and maintain personal vehicles. The car-share EV, two e-bikes, and proximity to downtown are meaningful alternatives for this resident profile. The traffic generation of six small units with active transportation infrastructure will be materially lower than the commenters' assumption of twelve or more vehicles.

Emergency Access

Emergency vehicle access is a building permit and site plan requirement that will be confirmed through the permitting process. The proposed building does not introduce any unique constraint on emergency access beyond what already exists in the cul-de-sac, and the building's own access configuration complies with fire

and emergency access standards. Additional compliance requirements will be confirmed during building permit approval.

SUMMARY OF COMMITMENTS AND DESIGN CHANGES

The following table summarizes the specific commitments and design changes I am prepared to make in response to public comments, and which I ask the Development Officer to incorporate as conditions of approval:

Issue	Applicant Commitment / Design Change
Rear yard setback	Revised to 528 mm (8.8%) encroachment. Stairs relocated to the interior of the building. Building has been reconfigured.
Grading & drainage	Conceptual grading plan provided. It keeps natural drainage in mostly intact. Approved grading plan to be a condition of DP. Final basement parameters confirmed through building permit.
Car-share vehicle	Minimum 1 shared vehicle on-site at all times, plus if necessary, access to YK Car Share network or other car share alternative as backup. Binding Development Agreement condition.
E-bikes	Minimum 2 e-bikes provided, secured, and maintained on-site for resident use.
Privacy / fence	Rear fence installation as binding permit condition. Taller native trees where possible along rear property line as supplementary screen.
Construction management	All materials, equipment, and contractor vehicles staged within property boundary throughout construction.
Application consistency	Consolidated, consistent application package to be resubmitted resolving all document discrepancies.
Building height	Will not exceed 12 m. Effective height likely lower than 3 Findlay due to lot levelling. Compare with 7 Findlay approved at 14.5 m.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development at 2 Findlay Point is a purpose-built, high-performance housing project that is fully consistent with the current zoning framework, complies with all height restrictions, and provides a legally compliant and safe parking solution through a binding car-share commitment. The revised design — with the staircase relocated to the interior, the building repositioned to essentially eliminate the rear variance (reduce the rear yard variance to approximately 8.8%), and a comprehensive package of conditions including an approved grading plan, binding car-share and e-bike commitments, rear fencing, and privacy landscaping — directly addresses the substantive concerns raised in public comments.

The comments received, while numerous, largely reflect a shared set of concerns held by my neighbours who hold similar views about multi-unit development on this lot, and in several cases rely on assumptions about vehicle ownership and car-share feasibility that are not supported.

Finally, the Municipal Enforcement Division's (MED) submission confirms that the complaints received at Findlay Point over the past eighteen months relate entirely to contractor conduct during the active construction phase at a nearby development — not to the behaviour of residents in completed, occupied units. MED recorded 10 visits in 2025 and 2 in 2026, all in response to construction-related complaints: contractor vehicles illegally parked, debris and materials scattered onto adjacent properties, and inadequate communication with neighbours. I take no issue with MED's characterization of those complaints as valid — they are, and they describe exactly the kind of construction mismanagement that I am explicitly committing not to replicate. As stated elsewhere in this response, all construction materials, equipment, and contractor vehicles for the 2 Findlay Point project will be staged and managed entirely within the property boundary throughout the build, and I will accept this as a written condition of the Development Permit. What the MED comment does not do — and cannot fairly be read to do — is provide evidence that a completed, occupied six-unit building will generate enforcement issues. MED's own record is a record of construction complaints at a separate project. It is not a record of complaints against this application, this site, or occupied multi-unit residential buildings in the area. The MED's comments should be read for what it actually says: that construction conduct in the area has been problematic, and that clear expectations must be set for contractors and developers going forward. I agree entirely, and I invite MED to work with me directly to establish those expectations as conditions of this permit before construction begins.

I am available to meet with City planning staff at any time to discuss the revised design and proposed conditions, and welcome the opportunity to address any outstanding questions directly. In addition, I will be hosting an open neighbourhood session in the coming days, to which all neighbouring residents are invited — an opportunity to learn more about the project, the applicant, and the considerable effort that has gone into designing a building that will be a positive addition to Findlay Point.

Respectfully,

Edwin Shu,