
Subject: FW: Handout Communication addressing Agenda Item E1 - February 3, 2026

From: Tammy McLeod <Redacted>
Sent: Sunday, February 1, 2026 7:10 PM
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@princegeorge.ca>; Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Re: Handout Communication addressing Agenda Item E1 - February 3, 2026

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

Apologies! For Feb 2.

On Sun, Feb 1, 2026, 7:06 p.m. Tammy McLeod <Redacted> wrote:

Dear Mayor Yu and Members of Council,

I am submitting this correspondence regarding Agenda Item E1 – External Building Scheme and Covenant Support.

I want to begin by stating that I support the intent behind this item. Restrictive covenants and building schemes matter. They exist to protect established neighbourhoods, and many in our community were in place long before annexation into the City. When these areas were absorbed, zoning was deliberately aligned to respect those agreements. Residents have purchased homes in these areas relying on that framework.

Where I part ways with Agenda Item E1 is in the response being proposed.

As an experienced internal auditor who spent eight years addressing corporate governance and process integrity issues, and who now studies Public Administration, I am concerned by what I see in the most recent rezoning file I obtained through a Freedom of Information request. The issue is not a policy gap, but a breakdown in process and governance from intake to the bylaw passing.

Adding another policy layer does not fix that. It simply manages the fallout after the damage is done and protects council from administration failures.

Restrictive covenants are not hidden or obscure instruments. They are found through routine title searches, offered in real estate sales disclosures, and existing land-record systems. When they are treated as optional or secondary, Council is placed in the position of making decisions on incomplete information, and residents are left to absorb the consequences.

This is not theoretical. It affected me when I had to sell my home in a covenanted area to run my home based business to align with bylaw provisions. It now affects my daughter with her first home purchase, located directly adjacent to a home the City has rezoned contradicting the private restrictive covenant. It also affects many friends and fellow residents who purchased in these areas with reasonable expectation that these covenants are respected.

Creating another bylaw or policy mechanism does not restore trust. It shifts associated financial and emotional risks onto residents who did everything right. That is not fair, and it is not good governance.

Rather than advancing a new bylaw at this time, I respectfully ask that Council implement an external process auditor, blind hired, to independently review how covenant identification, disclosure, internal systems use, staff knowledge, and learning and development are functioning across the application process. Without addressing these root causes, the City will continue to expend taxpayer resources revisiting the same issues rather than resolving them. This auditor is needed to address broader structural issues that exist in our administration processes that are costing taxpayers.

For these reasons, while I support the objectives of Agenda Item E1, I do not support advancing a new bylaw or policy solution at this time. The appropriate response is ethical administration, sound systems, and accountability and not insulation from the consequences of avoidable process failures.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy McLeod
143 Duncan Place

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.