

From: Mitchell Schulz [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 4:59 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Cc: Gourlay, Keone <Keone.Gourlay@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Re: CP100219 - 5310 Russman Road - Request for Public Comment Follow Up

Your attachment(s) were cleaned by Check Point Sandblast Threat Extraction.

[Click here](#) to restore the original(s) or contact your system administrator.

To whom this may concern,

This message is concerning the

proposed Official Community Plan Amendment at 5310 Russman Road

Please see the subsequent forwarded email from my previous response.

Attached are some more point form comments and concerns as due to being busy with work I have not had time to write an additional formal email in such short notice.

- Currently on Cranbrook Hill, there is already a 16 (maybe 14) lot subdivision sitting empty and undeveloped. This has been the case for years. There is no reason more green space should be developed prior to using the land here on Cranbrook Hill and else where in the city already and more easily properly zoned. This provides no benefit to the current residents and significantly impacts the current feel and character of the area.
- The large-scale disruption that clearing and developing the parcel would pose to residents, agriculture, and livestock for a number of years. This is both when clearing, drilling wells, digging septic, and so on.
- About half of the block being proposed will remain green belt, and this land will have a no-dev. clause attached. The city quotes this as an attempt to preserve the natural rural and recreational qualities of the area while simultaneously destroying very actively used downhill mountain biking, walking, and horseback riding trails. In reality, it is likely that due to the steep slope and soil composition, the land is physically unsafe to build on.
- The previous point would result in maximum 4.3 acre lots for a 12-plot subdivision. This would result in the backing and therefore well, septic field, and other amenities likely backing onto what is currently active agricultural lands for the majority of the lots. The others on the slope side will be pushed westward as they nor their facilities will be able to be built on the slope as it could degrade its quality. This is assuming relatively even lots, which based on the proposed boundary likely won't be feasible due to the terrain, and would mean tighter-packed smaller lots on the westside near the fields.
- Not only would this likely set the precedent for further potential major subdivision of other large currently agriculturally designated lots up here, it would result in the deforestation of 52 acres of property up here, for no benefit to others in the community as current agricultural zoning may provide.

- This destruction of nearby local ecosystems through this development that is currently, I believe, healthy enough forest will result in less habitat for the wildlife that makes Cranbrook Hill so special. It will both be pushed 1. towards current residents or 2. towards city residents. Thus increasing human-wildlife interactions temporarily and decreasing its presence on the hill overall. While I don't have data on this, I am the third generation of my family living on the hill. Even in the last 40 years from when my father was a kid, the density and presence of frogs, toads, snakes, and salamanders (I mention them specifically as the presence and abundance of amphibians and reptiles are key bio-indicators when talking about ecosystem health) has dropped significantly. While there are many factors that could impact this trend, the role of human development on the hill over the past 40 years cannot be overlooked. Applying this logic to this proposal, the wild feeling and overall 'natural health' of the hill will suffer to some degree in the short and long term.
- The city already struggles to maintain our roads adequately, having not ever paved the back side of Cranbrook Hill. Regardless of the presence of a set contract, the fact that the other side of the hill servicing a large number of residents is so incredibly poorly maintained; this both from lack of desire and care on the city's part and from extremely poor execution from the work they chose to do. If the city can't take care of our roads adequately for the residents, positioned comparatively to the rest of the city at the top of the property tax bracket already living on the hill, why exactly should they commit to the additional maintenance that an increase of ~45-100 residents will bring?
- Water has historically been very scarce on the hill. To dig 12 relatively close wells, and expect good amounts of water in each seems very unlikely and if they do dig, how will that impact the functionality of the wells of current residents? If a new resident in the subdivision hits the wrong seam when drilling, it could result in effectively "breaking the dam" rendering current water pressure of existing wells even more dicy or potentially unusable. This is obviously theoretical and could happen with any new well drilled, it's just exacerbated significantly when talking about 12 new small lots in close proximity. In this case, if the land cannot sustain a well, does the city plan to extend the existing city sewage system to this sub division; and what does this mean for such utilities in relation to the rest of the hill?

My name is Mitchell Hayden Schulz, my phone number is [REDACTED], and my address is 972 Glendare Pl., Prince George British Columbia

From: Mitchell Schulz [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Land Use Amendment on Cranbrook Hill
Date: January 15, 2026 at 4:43:16 PM PST
To: devserv@princegeorge.ca

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my written opposition regarding the amendment that would allow a 12-lot residential subdivision to be built on Cranbrook Hill. There are many reasons that I feel this amendment is not only unnecessary but also disruptive to the local community, both living on Cranbrook Hill and Prince George as a whole.

First, the land proposed to be developed is currently the location of well-established walking, horseback riding, and most prominently, downhill biking trails. These trails have been around since I was a kid, over 20 years, and have given our local athletes and competitive hobbyists alike a much more challenging recreation ground to hone their skills. The degree of technical difficulty is not available anywhere else in town, and this

would permanently destroy a well-known and very frequently used outdoor recreation attraction in our community.

Secondly, the road situation on the hill is concerning. The city already has trouble adequately maintaining the entirety of this neighbourhood within city limits. There have been many mistakes made regarding the installation of long-term drainage; regardless of the year, at minimum, there are at least three days where there are multiple cars in the ditch, with one major pile-up in the last 2 years. The city has not installed any barriers in the steepest sections, and more traffic up and down is not what we need. And this is only speaking on the front side of the hill.

Regarding the backside access, which is also within city limits, the maintenance is incredibly worse. Despite requests and the common sense long-term solution of paving the hill, the city has continued to top the hill with dirt, improperly and inadequately packing the material, resulting in constant maintenance for it to end up a complete washboard in less than a week. This has been such an issue that I know many residents on that side have avoided using a route (the backside) that would be much more convenient as the condition of the road was abysmal for the entirety of the last two summers. At one point, there was a recycled asphalt topping put on which held up for a period of time until the city grater came down the hill and disrupted its integrity, rendering the 'fix', if it could be called that, useless.

I've already called twice this year about plowing issues, leaving a 2.5ft tall berm 10 feet away from residential mailboxes and was told "after a big dump of snow, many details are missed for the sake of efficiency". What that says to me is that the city is already unable to or even care about adequately maintaining the road up here for the current residents, and so in no way should we increase the traffic by ~45-100 residents (assuming the homes would only be single-family).

Lastly, though this list is not exhaustive, is the general disruption of the rural environment and farming community. Clearing that much land, especially the lots on steep gradients, will result in a significant increase in heavy traffic for a period of years; this not even taking into account the continued disruption that will occur when building were to start. There are no developed services such as water or septic, and as such, additional heavy machinery will be required beyond that required to build a normal home. This constant disruption will affect wildlife, resulting in less habitat and increased results of a negative interaction with residents. The large amount of noise caused by development will cause stress to both livestock and residents alike, and will cause further resentment towards the city from existing residents. There is no lack of space around the city such as University Heights, Westgate, Malaspina Landing to name a few that are already in development and to my knowledge do not require land use amendments and have existing city infrastructure to support their development.

I believe I speak for many on the hill saying that this proposed amendment and subsequent development is not something that is desired in the slightest. As such, I will be bringing a petition around over the coming weeks to gather further signatures to display the opinions of the current residents on Cranbrook Hill.

As a side note, the fact that I found out about this only 2 days ago from a post on the private Cranbrook Hill community page is kind of ridiculous. As a young man, I am adapted to be online, and the information this proposition was in the works shows how little the city wants the residents to know about what is going on. As a community with a large elderly population, many of whom are quite old school and don't get their news online, how would you guys expect them to know and in turn be able to provide support or opposition? It's almost as if that's what was being banked on, and feels icky to keep things tame.

Please let me know any other information regarding this proposition as the process continues.

Sincerely,
Mitchell Schulz



972 Glendare Pl. Prince George bc

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Klee Leman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 8:39 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Proposed Development Russman Road

You don't often get email from countersphere@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Klee Leman
404 Peardon rd.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to provide some input into the proposed 12-lot subdivision for Russman road off of Cranbrook Hill road. Myself and several other nearby residents are aware of some factors that make Russman road unsuitable for the proposed development. Firstly, the forested area that Russman road leads into is and has been a prime spot for mountain biking in our city and development in this area would degrade the trails and atmosphere of the terrain and would be hugely detrimental to the ability of mountain bikers to participate in the sport they love in such an attractive and easily accessible location. Secondly, the beginning of the road begins directly on a sharp corner that would be hazardous for any vehicles attempting to turn on or off of this road as other vehicles would have no sight line moving toward the entrance to the road. Thirdly, the road leads into sloped unstable land that would be problematic for long-term safety and stability of any buildings constructed too close to the slopes going down eastward toward the city center. Lastly, a subdivision would harm the aesthetics of the surrounding area as the neighborhood is known for its historic homes and rural setting and a subdivision would degrade the character of the area for those who enjoy the historic charm of older smaller buildings. These considerations must be taken into account before further progress on the topic is made and these considerations taken together make Russman road an inappropriate setting for the proposed development.

Regards,
Klee Leman
404 Peardon rd.

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Andrea Heslenfeld <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 4:06 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Cranbrook Hill subdivision proposal

You don't often get email from aheslenfeld@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Andrea Heslenfeld and I understand the city of Prince George is considering the development of a 12 lot subdivision on Cranbrook Hill. I am writing because my husband and I are residents of this neighborhood and we strongly oppose this proposal for several reasons.

We feel this development will add a significant strain on the road conditions and public safety in this area that can already be difficult to manage and is not set up to support additional traffic. It will threaten the existing wells of those currently living in this area who rely on them. It will rob Prince George residents of the magnificent recreation trails that are used regularly by cyclists, horses, and pedestrians to stay healthy. Perhaps most importantly, this development would also reduce the already decreased wildlife habitat of local animals of Prince George.

We believe more community engagement should be done to listen to the residents of Cranbrook Hill and Prince George as a whole. Developing this proposed subdivision will do so much irreversible damage.

Thank you,

Andrea Heslenfeld
Guy Paterson
1136 Kluss Rd
Prince George, BC
V2M 7C6

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: ken shalansky [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 3:25 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Development on Cranbrook hill

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

To whom it may concern

I would like to state that I am adamantly against the proposed development of 12 lots and removing them from the ALR

- Currently on Cranbrook Hill, there is already a 16 (maybe 14) lot subdivision sitting empty and undeveloped. It is just not owned by the owner of a real estate and dev. company that has *at least* one indirect (once removed) tie to the city council.
- The large-scale disruption that clearing and developing the parcel would pose to residents, agriculture, and livestock for a number of years. This is both when clearing, drilling wells, digging septic, and so on.
- About half of the block being proposed will remain green belt, and this land will have a no-dev. clause attached. The city quotes this as an attempt to preserve the natural rural and recreational qualities of the area while simultaneously destroying very actively used downhill mountain biking, walking, and horseback riding trails. In reality, it is likely that due to the steep slope and soil composition, the land is physically unsafe to build on.
- The previous point would result in maximum 4.3 acre lots for a 12-plot subdivision. This would result in the backing and therefore well, septic field, and other amenities likely backing onto what is currently active agricultural lands for the majority of the lots. The others on the slope side will be pushed westward as they nor their facilities will be able to be built on the slope as it could degrade its quality. This is assuming relatively even lots, which based on the proposed boundary likely won't be feasible due to the terrain, and would mean tighter-packed smaller lots on the westside near the fields.
- Not only would this likely set the precedent for further potential major subdivision of other large currently agriculturally designated lots up here, it would result in the deforestation of 52 acres of property up here, for no benefit to others in the community as current agricultural zoning may provide.
- This destruction of nearby local ecosystems through this development that is currently, I believe, healthy enough forest will result in less habitat for the wildlife that makes Cranbrook Hill so special. It will both be pushed 1. towards current residents or 2. towards city residents. Thus increasing human-wildlife interactions temporarily and decreasing its presence on the hill overall. While I don't have data on this, I am the third generation of my family living on the hill
I have been up here over 20 years and while there is no data - there is a significant decrease in interactions with:
Frogs, birds, deer, bears, moose, coyotes, cougars, and even birds.
- The city already struggles to maintain our roads adequately, having not ever paved the back side of Cranbrook Hill. Regardless of the presence of a set contract, the fact that the other side of the hill servicing a large number of residents is so incredibly poorly maintained; this both from lack of desire and care on the city's part and from extremely poor execution from the work they chose to do. If the city can't

take care of our roads adequately for the residents, positioned comparatively to the rest of the city at the top of the property tax bracket already living on the hill, why exactly should they commit to the additional maintenance that an increase of ~45-100 residents will bring?

- Water has historically been very scarce on the hill. To dig 12 relatively close wells, and expect good amounts of water in each seems very unlikely and if they do dig, how will that impact the functionality of the wells of current residents? If a new resident in the subdivision hits the wrong seam when drilling, it could result in effectively "breaking the dam" rendering current water pressure of existing wells even more dicy or potentially unusable. This is obviously theoretical and could happen with any new well drilled, it's just exacerbated significantly when talking about 12 new small lots in close proximity. In this case, if the land cannot sustain a well, does the city plan to extend the existing city sewage system to this sub division; and what does this mean for such utilities in relation to the rest of the hill?

The city had been very quiet about this proposal regarding direct consultation with residents, leaving us to rely on Facebook posts from the citizen to find out the first stage was unanimously approved by a council without notification to the residents.

Thank you
Ken Shalansky
6282 Cranbrook Hill Rd, Prince George, BC V2M 7C7

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Dana Thomsen [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 3:00 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Fw: Opposition to proposed 12 lot residential subdivision on Cranbrook hill

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

Dear City of PG,

I am writing in opposition to the land use amendment proposed to build a 12-lot residential subdivision on Cranbrook hill.

I believe this would be damaging for the following reasons:

- this is zoned as AR and the character and peace of the location is due to most properties being small farms
- traffic would significantly increase
- low noise and peace of the area, which is a huge selling feature of this rural zone in town would be obliterated
- continued encroachment of urban dwellings would reduce property sizes and the ability to farm and keep animals

A 12-lot subdivision would significantly change:

- Traffic and safety on the hill
- Noise and overall peace and quiet
- The rural/agricultural character of the area
- Long-term development pressure (this likely wouldn't be the last proposal)

As a neighbourhood, we want to preserve the current zoning and character of the area.

Dana Thomsen

(my address is 8832 westcrest drive, Prince George BC, v2m7c8)

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: R G Purnell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 2:23 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Fwd: Cranbrook Hill land use zoning amendment

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

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: R G Purnell [REDACTED]
Date: January 15, 2026 at 3:54:15 PM PST
To: devserv@princegeorge.ca
Subject: Re: Cranbrook Hill land use zoning amendment

To whom it may concern,

Gwynneth and Roger Purnell of 5756 Cranbrook Hill Road, Prince George, BC V2M 7C6 - would like to add our voices in opposition of the proposed land use rezoning which would see a 12-lot subdivision being built in this rural and agricultural area of the city.

As a long-term residents and members of the Cranbrook Hill farming community, we have concerns pertaining to a number of things, notably:

Water: another 12 family homes on our only aquifer will put further pressure on water supply to all of our homes. Our well is as deep as it can go and we do run out of water often enough to make us very aware of our water usage.

Slope Stability: removing trees and shrubbery from the hill is likely to impact the stability of the building area and possibly lead to more rapid erosion and slides.

Wildlife: you may not be aware that the area in question is home to a variety of wildlife, notably a large herd of deer, foxes and moose amongst others. Over the last few months there have been marmots, fisher, porcupine and a variety of owls seen at that specific corner.

Traffic volume: it doesn't take much to make our commute up and down Cranbrook Hill road difficult. Weather being the least of it. Workmen from the City and BC Hydro frequently work on this stretch of the hill, making us wait in either direction while equipment is used. Heavy vehicle and construction traffic will only add to the already poor condition and frustrations of this road.

Noise, more dogs and people pestering our livestock is a real concern for us personally. More electric light would also be required which would further encroach on the dark sky nights we currently enjoy.

It's lovely living in this area of the City and it would be such a shame to change the character of the neighbourhood with a housing

estate. I hope you will take the time to review the development plan in view of the concerns brought to you by the current residents of Cranbrook Hill.

Kind regards,
Gwynneth and Roger Purnell

5756 Cranbrook Hill Road
Prince George BC V2M 7C6

Sent from my iPhone

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Opposition to Proposed 12-Lot Subdivision at the Top of Cranbrook Hill (5310 Russman Road)

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed 12-lot subdivision at the top of Cranbrook Hill.

We have been residents of Cranbrook Hill for 27 years and are very familiar with both the unique nature of this area and the day-to-day realities of living and travelling on this road. While the natural beauty and character of Cranbrook Hill are important, our concerns go far beyond aesthetics.

First, we are deeply concerned about access and safety at the proposed location. The corner at the top of Cranbrook Hill is already problematic. Vehicles frequently park there, and visibility and maneuverability are poor. Adding regular traffic in and out of a subdivision at this location would create a significant safety risk for residents and for anyone travelling the road.

Second, water availability is an ongoing and serious issue throughout Cranbrook Hill. Newer builds in the area have already highlighted how difficult it can be to secure reliable water access. Many neighbours have had to drill 500 feet or more to find water, and in some cases water must be trucked in. We are concerned about whether a proper hydrogeological assessment has been completed for this proposed development. If water must be trucked up the hill, this will significantly increase heavy vehicle traffic on an already stressed road.

Third, Cranbrook Hill Road requires repairs every year due to its current traffic load and steep grade. While residents have come to accept this ongoing maintenance, the road is already pushed to its limits. Increased residential and construction traffic will only accelerate its deterioration. We do not believe the road can safely or sustainably support the additional traffic this development would generate.

Finally, we are concerned about the loss of access to natural areas. This proposed development would effectively remove a section of land that is currently enjoyed by not only Cranbrook Hill residents, but also the broader community, including hikers and the biking community. This access to nature is one of the defining and most valued aspects of this area.

We strongly urge you to carefully consider the concerns raised by those of us who live here. We travel this hill multiple times a day, in all seasons, and understand its challenges firsthand. Developers and decision-makers may not fully grasp these realities, but residents do. Please listen to the voices of those who know this road, this land, and this community best.

Sincerely,

Sue and John MacDonald

6748 Swanson Road Prince George BC V2M 7C8



From: Dean Toll [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 10:02 AM
To: Gourlay, Keone
Subject: RE: CP100219 - 5310 Russman Road - Request for Public Comment Follow Up

To whom it may concern,

Re: potential development of a 12-lot subdivision on Cranbrook Hill and the related extra vehicle traffic.

Cranbrook Hill Road is steep, narrow, windy and has limited visibility on numerous sections. Pedestrians or bicycle traffic need to be keenly aware while navigating the hilly section as vehicles tend to over drive whether its summer or winter.

For safety, perhaps the city needs to have new subdivisions provide a certain number of upgrades to the infrastructure due to the projected increased traffic

- Clear back brush/trees along the road r/w for better visibility on curves
- Construct an adjacent pedestrian foot path
- Widen the road surface where terrain allows

Thank you.

Dean & Bonnie Toll
6283 Cranbrook Hill Road.

From: Roger Wheate [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2026 5:07 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Re: 12 lot subdivision on Cranbrook Hill

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

What is the plan for road access to/from this proposed subdivision ?
A junction on that bend of the Cranbrook Hill Road could be a potential traffic hazard especially for vehicles turning left from the subdivision - which most cars would be doing to access the bowl.

Sincerely,
Roger Wheate

576 Willmann Road
Prince George, V2M 7C8

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe

From: Sheri [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2026 5:02 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Fwd: subdivision cranbrook hill

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

To whom it may concern

This email is to write about my concerns about the potential development of the 12 lot subdivision:

Cranbrook Hill is within the city limits, but mostly zoned AR. It is quiet, rural and spacious. We do not have city water, sewer, or garbage services and the road up the hill is already narrow and winding and can be challenging in the winter.

A 12 lot subdivision would significantly change:

- Traffic and safety on the hill
- Noise and overall peace and quiet
- interfere significantly with our vast wildlife that exists in that area (moose, deer, coyotes, foxes, bears - to name a few)
- affect migratory birds
- The rural / agricultural character of the area
- long term development pressure of future subdivisions that will inevitably follow
- the location of the road going into that subdivision - it is on a sharp corner and would affect the traffic patterns

I am absolutely against this development and our rural and AR zoning need to be sustained!

Thank you

Sheri Grantham
6282 cranbrook hill road

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Tyler Patterson [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 9:35 AM
To: Gourlay, Keone
Subject: Re: CP100219 - 5310 Russman Road - Request for Public Comment Follow Up

Good Morning. Resending my comments below to include full mailing address and an addition to my well water comment. Thank you.

I am writing this as a Cranbrook Hill neighbour to ask that amendment application no. CP100219 5310 Russman Road rezoning application NOT go ahead. This is not a good location for a subdivision, however small, as the access to it would be unsafe. Also 12 more lot locations on Cranbrook Hill in said location can put a strain on the underground aquifer if all properties decide to install a water well. I ask that a well-water assurance to all existing Cranbrook Hill neighbours be a part of the re-zoning decision.

Thank you, Tyler Patterson
6762 Cranbrook Hill Road. Prince George BC V2M7C7

From: Sasha.Krasovska [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2026 12:57 AM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Re: Community Plan for a Residential Subdivision at 5310 Russman Rd

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

To add to our email below - our full address is 5226 Cranbrook Hill Rd, Prince George, BC, V2M7C4

Thank you!

Sent from [Proton Mail](#) for Android.

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

On Wednesday, 01/14/26 at 21:48 Sasha.Krasovska [REDACTED] wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter is to inform you that we are strongly opposed to the community plan for a residential subdivision at 5310 Russman Rd, Prince George. We oppose this planned land amendment and would like to preserve the current zoning and character of the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,

Aleksandra Krasovska and Mark Adams,
Owners of the property at 5226 Cranbrook Hill Rd.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Kathy Faulder [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 18, 2026 4:06 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>; keone.gourlay@princegeorge.bc
Subject: Request for public comment 5310 Russman Rd.

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

Hello,

I am re-submitting our letter below, as per the request for comment for this property, with the required name and mailing address.

On behalf of Kathy Faulder and Randy Elmquist - Owners and residents of 5250 Cranbrook Hill Road, Prince George BC V2M 7C4. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

I am writing in response to the proposed amendment to Schedule 12 (Future Land Use Plan) of the City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025, which is intended to facilitate a rural residential subdivision at 5310 Russman Road.

I oppose the proposed amendment.

The appeal of Cranbrook Hill lies in its rural character—both in appearance and population density. This rural setting, with its expansive green space, abundant wildlife, and limited foot and vehicle traffic, is a primary reason many of us chose to purchase homes here. The proposed amendment would fundamentally alter the character and charm of Cranbrook Hill, undermining what it means to live in this community.

Additionally, the road leading up Cranbrook Hill is narrow, steep, and characterized by sharp corners and switchbacks. The increase in traffic volume resulting from an additional 12 homes would present a significant safety concern. This concern would be compounded during the development phase, which would require substantial heavy service and construction traffic. The scope of work required to develop these properties could take years to complete, during which time neighbouring residents would experience ongoing disruption and a loss of the peaceful lifestyle that currently defines Cranbrook Hill.

Cranbrook Hill is one of Prince George's most desirable semi-rural neighbourhoods, and our property taxes reflect this. Allowing this amendment to proceed would permanently and negatively change the nature of this community. I would be deeply saddened to see the rural character of Cranbrook Hill diminished in this way.

For these reasons, and others, I respectfully submit my opposition to the proposed amendment.

Sincerely,

Kathy Faulder

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Craig C [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2026 3:06 PM
To: Gourlay, Keone
Subject: Fwd: Schedule 12: Future Land Use Plan - Subject Property 5310 Russman Road

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

From: Craig C [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Jan 14, 2026 at 8:01 PM
Subject: Fwd: Schedule 12: Future Land Use Plan - Subject Property 5310 Russman Road
To: [REDACTED]

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

From: Craig C [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Jan 14, 2026 at 7:32 PM
Subject: Fwd: Schedule 12: Future Land Use Plan - Subject Property 5310 Russman Road
To: [REDACTED]

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

From: Craig C [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Jan 14, 2026 at 7:31 PM
Subject: Schedule 12: Future Land Use Plan - Subject Property 5310 Russman Road
To: <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
CC: Craig C [REDACTED]

Hello,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed bylaw change to Schedule 12, Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025, concerning the property located at 5310 Rusman Road.

This area is a rural, country environment and is home to some of the largest remaining old-growth trees in Prince George city limits. These trees are irreplaceable and contribute significantly to the natural character, environmental health, and heritage of our community. They should not be destroyed to accommodate inappropriate development.

Cranbrook Hill Road is already inadequate for the current level of traffic. It is narrow, lacks proper shoulders, has tight corners, and can be unsafe. Under winter conditions, the road can be particularly treacherous due to snow, ice, limited visibility, and these tight corners. Introducing additional

development will significantly increase traffic on a road that is not designed to handle it safely year-round. At a minimum, the road would need to be widened and upgraded with proper shoulders before any further development is even considered.

Additionally, there are no existing city services in this area. There is no water, sewer, fire hydrants, sidewalks, garbage collection, or access to high-speed internet. Approving development without these essential services places existing residents at risk and ignores basic infrastructure requirements. If the City intends to move forward with development of this nature, full municipal services—including water, sewer, fire protection, sidewalks, garbage collection, and reliable high-speed internet—must be installed to safely accommodate increased growth, particularly at this already busy end of the hill.

This proposal is not suitable for the location and does not align with the rural character, infrastructure limitations, and environmental value of the area. I urge the City of Prince George to reject this bylaw change and protect both the community and the remaining old-growth trees on Cranbrook Hill.

Sincerely,

Craig Collins
5322 Cranbrook Hill Road
Prince George, BC
V2M 7C4

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Chelsea Brevik [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2026 2:41 PM
To: Gourlay, Keone
Subject: Re: CP100219 - 5310 Russman Road - Request for Public Comment Follow Up

Hello City Planners,

As a resident of Cranbrook Hill I ask that you do not approve the new proposed 12 lot subdivision off Cranbrook Hill Rd.

I have read the proposal that you sent and made some revisions to my original comments. While I appreciate that the proposed subdivision would maintain larger 2ha lots and include an area of green belt, I still feel like the city is overlooking several factors:

Cranbrook Hill already has a limited aquifer system. I am aware that an assessment was done and have read the aquifer assessment report. However, there are many properties already on the hill that have been unable to reach water when drilling wells (or they have become too cost prohibitive) and therefore rely on cisterns. It is concerning to think of 12 new properties adding strain on an already limited system that us existing residents rely on. Can the city ensure that adding that many new properties is not going to affect our water supply?

Prince George already has stripped many of the trees and started residential neighborhoods all along Tyner Blvd, upper Ospika Blvd, and University Way. Many of these lots have been vacant for years and years, subdividing and clearing more land does not make sense at this point. While all of these lots, that are already zoned residential, sit vacant can we please not prioritize adding more. I cannot accept that needlessly clearing land and leaving empty open lots is acceptable "strategic priority for economic diversity and growth".

Finally, who pays for this new road to access these proposed properties? As taxpayers and hill residents I do not feel that it is fair for the city to fund the installation of new roads on the hill when our existing roads are already strained and in need of repair.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter,

Chelsea Brevik
6315 Cranbrook Hill Rd
Prince George, BC
V2M 7C7

From: Monica Mattfeld [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2026 5:00 PM
To: Gourlay, Keone; devserv
Subject: Re: CP100219 - 5310 Russman Road - Request for Public Comment Follow Up

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in absolute opposition to the Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. CP100219, 5310 Russman Road.

This proposed development would take place on an already stretched rural road. Cranbrook Hill, from which Russman Road connects, is vastly busier than its original developers imagined. It is very steep, and as such it is prone to accidents (including residential and commercial traffic) - regardless of how well the City maintains it.

The proposed development would also take place on steep terrain with no existing infrastructure. How on earth will water and sewer be brought to the property when none of the existing properties on the hill have either? If wells and septic are the proposed pathway forward, the hillside in question (and run off from it), not to mention impacts to the already low water table, would be problematic.

Furthermore, the environmental impact on that property is atrocious. The area is habitat for deer, moose, bear, owls, and all manner of other animals and flora - surely, we as a city can do better in our community planning than to constantly spread into fragile ecosystems rather than learning to embrace greater urban density (including the reduced operating and development costs for the city associated with such moves).

As for road access, the city is already financially stretched when it comes to road maintenance. Does it really want to add to the cost of road clearing, paving, etc. when it cannot afford to properly maintain the roads it currently has? This is also the case with the roads already up on Cranbrook Hill - I suggest having a discussion with the head of your road maintenance department to get his opinion of adding yet more roads that needs upkeep and repair. That department is already cutting corners and is scraping the bottom of the barrel - there simply isn't enough money to pay for more.

Finally, the intersection of Cranbrook Hill Rd and Foothills is notoriously difficult and dangerous; increased traffic at that point will only exacerbate the situation and lead to further accidents.

As such, with infrastructure concerns, detrimental environmental impacts, an already over-burdened and hazardous road system, and an existing inadequate budget for road maintenance, adding yet more homes, along with a new road, truly would be a fiscally and ethically irresponsible decision.

As a resident of Cranbrook Hill, I cannot and will not support this proposed development.

If you wish to speak further about this, please reach out.

Sincerely,

Dr. Monica Mattfeld
7776 Westridge Dr.
Prince George, BC
V2M 7C8

From: Lesli Rae [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2026 4:48 PM
To: Gourlay, Keone
Subject: Re: CP100219 - 5310 Russman Road - Request for Public Comment Follow Up

As a resident of Cranbrook Hill i appose this action for a 12 lot subdivision. We chose this area for the quite, peaceful tranquility. If going through with this it will only lead to more and more sub divisions which we do not want up here! We totally appose this!

Lesli Rae
6827 Melmack Crescent, Prince George, BC V2M 7C9

From: Tyler Patterson [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 7:36 AM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Bylaw 9525 - 5310 Russman Road Rezoning

Good Morning.

I am writing this as a cranbrook hill neighbour to ask that amendment application no. CP100219 5310 Russman road rezoning application NOT go ahead. This is not a good location for a subdivision, however small, as the access to it would be unsafe. Also 12 more lot locations on cranbrook hill in said location can put a strain on the underground aquifer if all properties decide to install a water well.

Thank you, Tyler Patterson
6762 Cranbrook Hill Road.

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Karoline Patterson [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2026 2:03 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Concern re: Cranbrook Hill Land Use Amendment - Opposition

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

Good afternoon,

I am emailing in regards to the proposed land use amendment for a 12-lot residential subdivision to be built on Cranbrook Hill. To clarify, we are adamantly opposed to this zoning amendment, and any other amendments in future which change the zoning of Cranbrook Hill Road. We share the concerns of many of our neighbors regarding this zoning amendment proposal, and hope to preserve the area of Cranbrook Hill for residential and farmland use only. If a longer letter outlining specific reasons regarding our concern is required, we are happy to follow-up with a detailed letter.

Thank you,
Karoline & Tyler Patterson
6762 Cranbrook Hill Rd, Prince George, BC V2M 7C7

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Jamie Halvorson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 8, 2026 6:42 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Objection to Proposed Amendment to Schedule 12 - Cranbrook Hill

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

Hello,

I am writing in response to the proposed amendment to Schedule 12 (Future Land Use Plan) of the City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025, intended to facilitate a rural residential subdivision on the subject property 5310 Russman Road.

I respectfully but firmly oppose and reject this proposed amendment.

Although this area falls within city limits, it functions as a low-density, agricultural-residential neighbourhood with a distinctly rural character. Residents chose to live here for its quiet setting, scenic environment, mature trees, wildlife, and overall sense of peace and safety. The proposed amendment and resulting subdivision would fundamentally alter this established character.

Road Safety and Transportation Limitations

The existing road is steep, winding, and already hazardous, particularly during winter conditions. It was not designed to support increased traffic volumes. A 12-lot subdivision would significantly increase daily traffic from residents, visitors, service vehicles, and delivery drivers, creating serious safety concerns and accelerating road deterioration. In addition, there is no city bus or public transit service to this area, meaning all transportation relies on private vehicles, further increasing traffic volumes and safety risks on an already challenging roadway.

Lack of City Services

This area does not have city water, fibre-optic internet, or other urban-level services. In addition, there is no city garbage or waste collection service. Residents are required to transport and pay for garbage disposal independently. Increasing residential density without providing core municipal services raises serious concerns regarding infrastructure capacity, service equity, emergency access, and long-term maintenance responsibilities.

Traffic, Noise, and Maintenance Impacts

The proposed development would increase traffic, noise levels, garbage, and general activity, diminishing the quiet rural atmosphere that defines this neighbourhood. Additional vehicle traffic will also increase ongoing road maintenance demands in an area already facing challenges.

Incompatibility with the Official Community Plan Intent

Amending Schedule 12 to permit a rural residential subdivision at this scale is not consistent with the existing land use pattern or the expectations of current residents. The amendment would set a precedent that undermines the purpose of maintaining low-density, rural, and agricultural land uses in this area.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed amendment to Schedule 12 of the Official Community Plan and respectfully request that the City deny the amendment and preserve the existing future land use designation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this proposal.

Sincerely yours and stressed,

Jamie Halvorson
5233 Cranbrook Hill Road



This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.