

Comment & Response Matrix

1. Introduction

This comment and response matrix summarizes written submissions received to date on the Draft Official Plan Update. Further, the matrix includes a number of anonymous comments that were received during the April 17, 2016 and the April 24, 2016 public open houses. Comments have been largely organized in chronological order and in many instances have been categorized by primary issue. Responses to the comments acknowledge where revisions to the Plan have been made. Where a revision has not been made, a reason for such is offered. Please note that due to the length of some submissions planning staff have paraphrased the content of the comment. If you feel your comments have been paraphrased in a manner which has resulted in the primary issue being missed, please be sure to notify City staff of the oversight. If you have provided comments to the City but do not see them in the matrix please forward such to Greg Newman, Manager of Policy Planning at: opzb_update@cityofkingston.ca.

The following section identifies six “key issues” raised by a number of stakeholders warranting in-depth review and consideration in the advancement of the third draft to the Official Plan. The information provided under the title of each issue identifies how the matter was considered by City staff and our consultant.

2. Key Issues:

The following sections provide a summary of key policy issues identified through the community consultation process. Responses to these issues as well as proposed changes to Official Plan policies to address these issues, where appropriate, are also included.

Issue 1: Infill & Intensification

The City has received a considerable amount of feedback throughout the course of the Official Plan update regarding “infill” and “intensification” and, more specifically, the issues that arise when increased density is proposed in neighbourhoods that are considered “stable areas”. One of the challenges voiced by the community has been the lack of clarity regarding where infill and intensification are intended and what form (e.g., massing, density and height) development should take given contextual considerations. Taking into account the feedback provided by the community, the City has made the following key policy revisions:

- Section 2.2. of the current Official Plan presents “Centres” and “Corridors”, illustrated in Schedule 2, as areas within which intensification will be focused. The current Plan; however, provides little cross-reference to these policies thereby compromising their application in the review development. Revisions made throughout Section 2.2 of the Plan, support the goal of seeing the majority of intensification directed to areas identified as “Centres” and “Corridors”. The Plan further acknowledges that such areas are, or may be, subject to specific policies that clarify expectations regarding built form (e.g., Williamsville, the Central Business District, etc.). It is important to acknowledge that new centres or corridors are also contemplated and may be established through the completion of a Secondary Plan or Special Policy Area Plan, undertaken through a comprehensive program of public consultation and multiple opportunities for engagement.
- Section 2.6 of the current Plan speaks to “Stable Areas” and “Areas in Transition”. Revisions to this Section have been made to clarify expectations regarding the form of development that is expected to occur within an area considered, on the basis of identified neighbourhood characteristics, to be “stable”. A series of policy “tests” have been added under Section 2.6.3 of the Plan to identify the type of infill and/or intensification that is appropriate within a stable area, and the type of development that is not appropriate. Further, policy revisions have been made under Section 2.6.5 to identify when proposals for intensification within a stable area may result in destabilization. Where identified, such proposals would necessitate an Official Plan amendment and/or the completion of a broader land use study used to determine the suitability of a proposal.

A further and noteworthy change to Section 2.6 is the removal of the “Areas in Transition” policies. These policies were reportedly confusing and in some cases contradictory to defining and protecting stable areas from incompatible forms of development, specifically through infill and intensification. The removal of the “Areas in Transition” policies will require that proposals for infill and intensification, outside of centres and corridors, demonstrate compatibility as considered within a stable area.

- Section 3.3.C of the Plan outlines a framework for reviewing High Density Residential development. Revisions to this section of the Plan have been made to provide greater clarity regarding the locations within which high density residential land use will be directed. The objective of the revisions is to ensure that high density development is situated in locations that will optimize the use of public transit and provide opportunities for lessened reliance on the private automobile by bringing people closer to amenities such as parks, open space and commercial land use. While the Plan now includes a list of arterial and



collector roads that are considered not appropriate for high density residential development, policy exceptions have been made to acknowledge instances where high density development may have been intended through secondary planning activities, or may be appropriate considering urban design and land use compatibility.

- Several comments have been provided regarding the need for policy directives that support a transition in building heights moving from an area that is considered appropriate for intensification and high density residential development (i.e., centre or corridor) to an area that may be considered stable, and perhaps configured with a lower density. To this end, policy language has been provided in Sections 2.6, 2.7, 3.3 and Section 10.

Issue 2: Ribbon of Life

The current Official Plan policy framework as it relates to the “ribbon of life”, which is characterised as a natural area along the shorelines of a waterbody, establishes a 30 metre water setback. The intent of the policies, provided under Sections 2.8.3 and 3.9.2, is to protect the “shoreline ecology” and the “quality of the waterbody”. It is important to note that throughout the City there are situations within which a 30 metre setback is either unachievable, due to factors such as lot configuration or physical impediments to meeting the setback, or impractical due to the nature of a use and its relationship to the water (e.g., marina, dock and boat launching facilities, etc.). While the policy framework provides exceptions for those uses that are inherently connected to the water, the explicit use of a 30 metre setback in the Official Plan appears to add unnecessary constraint (i.e., the need for an Official Plan amendment) to supporting activities that are able to uphold the intent of the “ribbon of life” policies (i.e., protection of shoreline ecology and water quality).

The challenge with establishing performance standards in an Official Plan is that the practice does not allow for flexibility which may be warranted in specific circumstances. For example, if one were to propose development with a water setback of 28 metres, the current policies would require an Official Plan amendment. The process of amending the Official Plan requires that a proponent demonstrate consistency with provincial policy objectives (i.e., Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)) and conformity with the overall purpose and intent of the Official Plan. Through an OPA, the proponent would need to submit technical studies, including an *environmental impact assessment*, to demonstrate that the intent of the OP will be upheld. The process of amending an Official Plan to garner relief from a performance standard that may otherwise be implemented through zoning controls is considered unnecessarily onerous. If the 30 metre water setback were established in the underlying zoning by-law, relief from this standard could be requested by way of a minor variance or a zoning by-law amendment application. The process associated with both a minor variance and a zoning by-law amendment involves public notice, technical agency review, and opportunities for public comment. The test associated with reviewing an amendment to a zoning by-law is that the relief sought must conform with the policies of the Official Plan. If the policies of the Plan are clear in their intent, demonstrating conformity through a zoning by-law amendment, or through a minor variance, becomes much easier.

If the policies were established with some degree of flexibility and reinforced through an associated performance standard established in the implementing zoning by-law, then the same degree of review and scrutiny would occur without the necessity of an Official Plan amendment. With clearly defined policies the benefit to the public remains the same with or without specific performance standards, which can be established in the underlying zoning by-law.

The updated Official Plan accordingly proposes revisions that clarify the intent of supporting a “ribbon of life” (i.e., enhance water quality, minimize soil erosion, provide plant and animal habitat, and contribute to the overall health of the ecosystem) and requires that development proposed within 30 metres of the waterfront be subject to an environmental impact assessment needed to demonstrate no negative impacts; it should be noted that the findings of an environmental impact assessment could recommend that a water setback greater than 30 metres be implemented. Revisions to Section 3.9.2 also identify that a naturalized buffer along the waterfront can be used to screen views of development from the water and to create natural spaces for passive recreation, again clarifying the intent of supporting a “ribbon of life”. If it can be demonstrated, through a zoning by-law amendment or minor variance, that the intent of these Official Plan policies will be upheld, relief from the 30 metre buffer will be considered, provided all other applicable policy matters are satisfied.

In addition to policies respecting a “ribbon of life”, it is important to note that lands along the Rideau Canal have been explicitly designated Environmental Protection Area (EPA), pursuant to policies in Section 3.10.A; being part of the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site. The EPA designation is defined by a 30 metre setback from the high water mark of the Canal. Land use activities within the EPA designation are limited to those related to open space, conservation or flood protection, and must be approved in consultation with the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, and/or Parks Canada, as appropriate. Recreational or education activities may also be permitted subject to environmental impact assessment and the demonstration of no negative impacts in accordance with Section 3.10.2 of the Official Plan.

Issue 3: Wellington Street Extension

City Council has determined that the issue of the Wellington Street Extension (WSE) will be re-examined as part of a larger secondary planning exercise for the North King’s Town area, which will include the Old Industrial Area, Inner Harbour area, and Montreal Street corridor. Major road extensions identified in Section 4.6.35 of the Official Plan, specifically pertaining to the planned Wellington Street Extension and Mid-Block Arterial, will be re-examined following the completion of the Secondary Plan, as will any other references to the WSE, such as the site-specific policy for 8 Cataraqui Street (Section 3.18.17.b). If amendments to the Official Plan are warranted as a result of the Secondary Plan, they will be considered at that time. As part of this Official Plan update, a new policy (Section 4.6.35.1) has been added to acknowledge that the WSE will be examined as part of a secondary planning process.

Issue 4: Building Height

Further to the comments provided under Issue 2, the broad use of performance standards (e.g., yard setbacks, building height, parking limits, etc.) in an Official Plan can limit flexibility and necessitate amendments that would otherwise be required from an implementing zoning by-law. The test in reviewing a zoning by-law amendment is whether or not the amendment conforms with the policies of an Official Plan. Taking this into account, it is important that the intent of the policies of the City’s Official Plan be clear and, where appropriate, directly linked to the implementing provisions of a zoning by-law.

As it relates to controlling building height, the City may provide, through Official Plan policy, that the intent in maintaining an existing built form (height) is to protect against impacts to cultural heritage resources, to maintain a human-scale along the streetscape, or to limit shadowing at the pedestrian level. The Plan may also identify that specific properties or locations of the City are ideal for the siting of a “landmark” building or a building that exceeds the existing height and massing of neighbouring buildings subject to demonstrating compatibility and the control of potential impacts. There may be areas within the municipality, or land use designations, within which general expectations regarding built form are provided (e.g., building heights within a Traditional Main Street designation shall generally be between two and four storeys, being 7 to 14 metres). In those areas for which the City has undertaken a detailed planning study or secondary planning activity, which identifies at the block level expectations regarding built form, more explicit policies may be warranted. It is in these areas that a Plan may identify limitations regarding building height so as to ensure built form expectations, defined on the ground, are clear.

Issue 5: ‘Mineral Resource Areas – Wollastonite’

The Provincial Policy Statement (2014) requires that mineral resources be protected for the long term (Section 2.4.1). In accordance with Section 2.4.2.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement, the City is required to identify “known mineral deposits” as well as “significant areas of mineral potential”. The Official Plan shows the known mineral deposit of Wollastonite as Mineral Resource Area – Wollastonite on Schedule 3-C. In addition, a Mineral Reserve Area overlay is shown on Schedule 12 which corresponds to the significant area of mineral potential. These areas were delineated in the Official Plan based on information provided by the Province. As per Section 3.17.A.5 of the Official Plan, a distance of 500 metres from the edge of the Mineral Resource Area - Wollastonite designation is considered as an influence area. The intent of the influence area is to offer mutual protection from encroachment by incompatible uses for either sensitive land use or the extraction and processing activities in areas protected for mineral resource protection.

In accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement, a qualified person submitted documentation to the Province to support the expansion of the known deposit area on Schedule 3-C. The Province has confirmed that they support the use of the information provided by the qualified person. The expansion of the Mineral Resource Area –Wollastonite in the third draft is unchanged from the second draft, as it reflects the findings of the qualified person. The Wollastonite Reserve Area on Schedule 12 has been revised in the third draft to reflect the revised boundary of the known mineral deposit.

Issue 6: Planning Process and Public Consultation

The Official Plan is the key planning policy document which sets out land use planning goals, objectives and policies to guide growth and development in the City of Kingston. The City is required to pass, and regularly review, an Official Plan by the Province of Ontario through the provisions of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13 which states that an Official Plan shall contain “goals, objectives and policies established primarily to manage and direct physical change and the effects on the social, economic and natural environment”. The City of Kingston Official Plan’s policies provide direction for growth, infrastructure, transportation, health, safety, environment, energy, cultural heritage and urban design within the context of land use planning.

Official Plans are required to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, which provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The intent of the Official Plan is consistent with the City’s Strategic Plan and is meant to be a broad, long-term vision document. The Official Plan is implemented by detailed Zoning By-laws, municipal by-laws, guidelines or any other relevant governing documents adopted by Council, which cannot be contrary to the Official Plan. Since land uses are constantly evolving, the City generally avoids prescriptive policies in the Official Plan to allow for a more



flexible approach, except where detailed background studies have been done supporting prescriptive policies. This approach prevents costly official plan amendment processes and encourages local investment while still allowing for a public process to be captured through rezoning applications or other *Planning Act* processes such as plans of subdivision, consent or minor variances.

Bill 73, the *Smart Growth for Our Communities Act*, received Third Reading and Royal Assent on December 3, 2015. The Bill made changes to the *Planning Act* and the *Development Charges Act*, 1997. While the changes to the *Development Charges Act*, 1997 are all now in force, the majority of the *Planning Act* changes remain to come into force on a day to be named by proclamation by the Lieutenant Governor. Some of the proposed amendments include enhancements for relevant notices, a requirement that Official Plans contain a description of the measures and procedures for informing and obtaining the views of the public and a requirement that notices of passing of Zoning By-law Amendments contain a description about the effect, if any, that the written and oral submissions had on the decision. In conjunction with Bill 73, the Province is currently considering new Ontario Regulations and changes to existing Regulations to reflect and elaborate on the revisions contained in Bill 73. The City will consider if any changes are required to the Official Plan if and when the revisions to the *Planning Act* and any associated Ontario Regulations come into force and effect.

In response to comments received from the public on the Five Year Official Plan Update, City Council has directed Planning, Building and Licensing staff to review the community consultation practice associated with development applications, including the practices of other municipalities. This review is being undertaken as a separate study outside of the scope of the Five Year Official Plan Update. If, during the process of this separate review, it is determined that revisions are required to the Official Plan policies, they will be recommended at that time. Section 9.12.4 of the Official Plan outlines public consultation and notice policies. The notice requirements outlined in the Official Plan comply with the requirements of the *Planning Act*. For current information on all active development applications across the City, please refer to DASH, the City's new online Development and Services Hub: <https://www.cityofkingston.ca/business/dash>.

3. Comment & Response Matrix

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
1.	V. Schmolka	2015-11-05	Planning Process Ribbon of Life Terminology Habitat Institutional Transportation Public Space	<p>a) Noted that Ministries and Agencies should be provided with Draft 2.</p> <p>b) Confusion between “buffer”, “setback”, “ribbon of life” and “adjacent lands”. Is an “approved environmental impact assessment” always necessary within the 30 m ribbon of life? Or is that 30 m area not to be disturbed without very good and explicit reasons? See, for example, 3.9.2.</p> <p>c) Requests that the definition of habitat of endangered species and threatened species reference federal Species at Risk Act (SARA).</p> <p>d) Question regarding wording of housing need in Section 2.3 – the number of housing units is not a certainty, as such consider changing “will be needed” to “are estimated to be needed”.</p> <p>e) Question regarding EPA, flood plain and prime agricultural land for Collins Bay Institution – shouldn’t the secondary plan also include updated mapping to identify prime agricultural land and margins of the floodplain and EPA areas?</p> <p>f) Questions re “Ribbon of Life” policy – what is the date on which a lot of record has to be on the books to be covered by this section? What circumstances would it be acceptable for an existing development to expand into the “ribbon of life”? How do sections 3.10.A.8 and 6.1.32 interact with Section 2.8.3?</p> <p>g) Suggests inclusion of clarifying text at the end of Section 3.4.C.7 of the</p>	<p>a) Ministries and Agencies were circulated notice of Draft 2 and will be kept informed of all subsequent versions.</p> <p>b) Definitions of “buffer” and “adjacent lands (natural heritage)” have been revised in the draft Official Plan Update. The “ribbon of life” is intended to be a 30 metre “buffer” along the waterfront. In the context of natural heritage features, a setback refers to the distance measured from the edge of a developed area to the natural heritage feature. Please also see Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>c) The definition of “Habitat of Endangered Species and Threatened Species” provided in the Official Plan is consistent with that provided in the Provincial Policy Statement.</p> <p>d) Section 2.3 indicates that the total number of new units needed is approximate.</p> <p>e) Council directed staff to remove Collins Bay Institution as a secondary plan area taking into consideration the local desire to support potential prison farming activities.</p> <p>f) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>g) Thank you, change will be made. The suggested wording adds helpful clarity to the policies.</p> <p>h) The policy language identified in Section 3.8.14 will be strengthened to</p>



No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>Plan regarding the supply of parking spaces on site: "...where it is not feasible to provide the required number of parking spaces on site or at an acceptable off-site location."</p> <p>h) EPA areas, natural hazard lands, buffers, significant environmental features and areas, wetlands, and escarpments should never be accepted by the city as part of a parkland dedication. These lands have no development value. Requests clarification regarding circumstances where the city could reduce the parkland dedication or cash it would receive from a developer by taking land that has no development value? Section 3.8.14 should read "Conditions including but not limited to the following, <u>are</u> deemed by the City to be unsuitable for use <u>as part of a parkland dedication</u>."(3.8.14)</p> <p>i) Requests clarification that the adaptive re-use of built heritage resources in open space (in Section 3.8.2(f)) would not permit the relocation of built heritage resources into open space.</p> <p>j) Questions regarding the "Ribbon of Life" policies (3.9.2).</p> <p>k) Requests reference to "secure and appropriate" bicycle parking (4.6.52).</p> <p>l) Question regarding public process required for redesignating Natural Heritage "A" features (6.1.21).</p> <p>m) Requests identifying "air quality improvement" as a benefit of trees (6.1.27).</p>	<p>be consistent with Section 6 of the City's Parkland Dedication By-law, which provides that the City will not accept the conveyance of land, for park purpose that is considered, by the City, to be unsuitable as parkland.</p> <p>i) Policy will be clarified to specify that this will only apply to built heritage resources that already exist on the site. Adaptive re-use of built heritage resources within an Open Space designation is appropriate.</p> <p>j) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>k) Requested policy changes are aligned with the Transportation Master Plan. Enabling policies supporting "secure and appropriate" bicycle parking will be made throughout the plan, where appropriate. There is a need to provide bicycle parking for visitors in a convenient location, which may not have secured or limited access.</p> <p>l) Natural heritage "A" features are designated as Environmental Protection Areas on the Land Use Schedules of the Official Plan. Policy 6.1.21 has been modified to clarify that an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) is required to re-designate a Natural Heritage "A" feature. An OPA is a public process.</p> <p>m) Section 6.1.27 has been revised to include air quality improvement as a benefit of trees.</p>
2.	S.Cliff-Jungling	N/A	Terminology Stable/Intensification Ribbon of Life Tourism Heritage	<p>a) Remove subjective term "innovative" (2.1);</p> <p>b) Use of "are related to" is ambiguous and broadens policies unnecessarily (2.1.5.e)</p> <p>c) Use of "considerably" is too vague and should be replaced with "significantly" (2.1.7.a).</p> <p>d) Section 2.3 Principles of Growth should provide greater attention to intensification that may occur by way of conversion of larger suburban homes into smaller units with less focus on new units within high-rise buildings.</p> <p>e) Too little emphasis on small scale intensification (2.4.3).</p> <p>f) Intensification should be tied to non-residential development (2.4.5).</p> <p>g) Stable areas and areas in transition policies are problematic. Means of classifying an "area in transition" favours land speculators and developers.</p> <p>h) Concerns regarding development, or the expansion of existing development, within the ribbon of life (2.8.3).</p>	<p>a) The use of the term "innovative" in Section 2.1 is tied to encouraging "high quality design" and the policy directive is reinforced in Section 6.2.1 with additional clarity of intent (i.e., help development reduce its ecological footprint).</p> <p>b) The policy changes have been modified to lessen ambiguity and to demonstrate consistency with provincial policy.</p> <p>c) The qualifier (i.e., considerably) has been removed. The intent of this policy subsection is to reduce water consumption, the magnitude of which cannot be adequately controlled through high-level official plan policy.</p> <p>d) The narrative at the beginning of Section 2.3 of the Plan has been modified to acknowledge intensification opportunities that may be available in the suburbs.</p> <p>e) Section 2.4.3 speaks to the broad goal of achieving increased residential densities throughout the entire City.</p> <p>f) A new policy has been added to acknowledge the potential to intensify</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>i) Requesting changes to tourism policies in Sections 2.9.3 and 2.9.4 – promote active tourism including individual tourists who want to come ‘play’ and encourage travellers who come by train, bus etc.</p> <p>j) Does not support new Section 2.9.5 re Smart City – we do not need more ‘technology’ to magically solve problems.</p> <p>k) Resilience is more than risk management. Reliance on technology makes City less resilient (2.10).</p> <p>l) Requesting that Kingston “develop a clear local sense of heritage”, rather than cultural heritage already established by upper levels of government (7.1).</p>	<p>non-residential land uses in new Section 2.3.2.</p> <p>g) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>h) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>i) Section 2.9.3 has been revised to acknowledge the alternative means by which visitors arrive at the City.</p> <p>j) This policy reflects Council’s priorities as outlined in Kingston’s Strategic Plan 2015-2018.</p> <p>k) The current best practices for resiliency in the context of land use planning relate to risk management tied to climate change, major weather events, associated natural hazards and the impacts of such on infrastructure and human health and safety. The policy heading will be modified to clarify the underlying intent.</p> <p>l) Reference will be added to the City’s Culture Plan, in particular to support places for arts and culture in the inner city. The plan’s heritage policies (guided by provincial requirements) and local initiatives work together to create a local sense of heritage. The City continues to proactively identify and conserve its heritage resources through research, working group review, and resultant Part IV and Part V designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.</p>
3.	Land Conservancy of KFL&A (P. Mackenzie, Chair, Land Acquisition Committee)	2015-03-23	Waterfront	<p>a) Would like to ensure that Salmon and Snake Islands are designated as EPA as part of the OP update and new ZBL, and that it will not be possible to build any residences on them.</p>	<p>a) Salmon and Snake Islands are already designated Environmental Protection Area in the City’s Official Plan (Official Plan Amendment Number 16, approved by Council on April 23, 2013, By-law Number 2013-98). Salmon Island is zoned Environmental Protection Area Zone ‘EPA’ in Zoning By-law Number 76-26. Snake Island is zoned Harbour Open Space Zone ‘OS3’ in Zoning By-law Number 8499. The current Official Plan designation and zoning do not permit residential uses on either of the islands.</p>
4.	C. Booth	2015-03-30	Woodlands Stable/Intensification Urban Boundary Employment Lands EIA	<p>a) Our current OP and related policies have failed to protect woodlands within the urban boundary. In the past 5 years since our last OP update the vast majority of woodlands reviewed for development have been deemed not worthy of protecting due to invasive species through the EIA process. Invasive species are present in every corner of our planet so their presence cannot be used as a rationale for not protecting a woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can our OP and related policies be updated to prevent this from continuing to happen? What policies can be added to help us achieve the 30% forest cover target in our last OP? 	<p>a) The Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study (CCRNHS) was completed by the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority (CRCA) in August 2006. The study identified a system of natural features and areas, including wetlands, woodlands, valleylands and significant wildlife areas within the City of Kingston and Loyalist Township. The findings of the study were used to formulate the natural heritage policies and natural heritage mapping in the City’s Official Plan.</p> <p>Significant woodlands are identified as Natural Heritage “B” features in the City’s Official Plan. In significant woodlands and the adjacent lands extending 50 m from the significant woodlands, development and site alteration is not permitted unless it has been demonstrated that there</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will current forest cover be assessed and included in the OP? What definition of Significant Woodland will be used in our OP? Will it be consistent with Ontario Nature's guidelines for identifying Significant Woodlands? How will OP policies be strengthened to protect Contributory Woodlands? Contributory woodlands have been consistently lost to development in Kingston despite goals in our previous Official Plan. <p>b) I strongly support intensification within the urban boundary and do not support the proposed expansion for employment lands. I support the proposal by Vicki Schmolka to reallocate space within the existing boundary from unused institutional and commercial lands. I am very concerned that the Urban Boundary expansion could lead to justification for a third crossing and further sprawling housing developments in the east-end.</p> <p>c) I would like to see an improvement in the EIA process to avoid biased results. When a developer is funding the EIA there is an inherent risk of bias, as the consultant wants to please the developer and be rehired. This phenomena (called 'sponsorship bias') is well-documented in medical research (i.e. when drug companies sponsor research studies the outcomes are consistently skewed). Have other municipalities figured out a way to avoid this bias? In Kingston the consistent outcomes of EIAs (always downgrading woodlands to not be worth protecting) certainly indicates that sponsorship bias may be occurring and that an improvement in the EIA process is needed.</p> <p>d) The meeting was well done this evening, however, I share the concerns expressed at the meeting about the limited audience. I was concerned to hear that the City had met with stakeholders in the development community but has not made efforts to meet with other important stakeholders such as neighbourhood associations, environmental organizations, etc.</p>	<p>will be no negative impacts on the natural heritage features or areas or ecological functions. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) submitted to the City in support of development applications are reviewed by City staff and the CRCA, and in some situations, by staff from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.</p> <p>The adjacent land width for significant woodlands is proposed to be increased to 120 m in the Official Plan Update. As well, new policies have been added around tree conservation (6.1.27 and 6.1.28). Changes have also been made to Section 2.8.2 to indicate that the City will take steps to achieve a doubling of the urban forest cover by 2025.</p> <p>The City, with support from the CRCA, does intend on updating the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study. However this will not be done as part of the Official Plan Update.</p> <p>The third draft of the Official Plan Update includes the following definition of significant woodlands: "an area identified by the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study in 2006 or identified using criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry which is ecologically important in terms of features such as species composition, age of trees and stand history; functionally important due to its contribution to the broader landscape because of its location, size or due to the amount of forest cover in the planning area; or economically important due to site quality, species composition, or past forest management history"</p> <p>As indicated in the third draft of the Official Plan Update, the City encourages the preservation of all woodlands as shown on Schedule 8 of the Plan, and the consideration of all woodlands in the preparation of an environmental impact assessment. This includes both significant and contributory woodlands.</p> <p>b) The Employment Lands Strategy (2015), adopted by Council, recommends the expansion of the Urban Boundary to accommodate prestige industrial lands immediately north of the St. Lawrence Business Park. As proposed, the lands will be designated "Deferred Area", recognizing the anticipated long term growth and built out of the site.</p> <p>c) Thank you for the comment. However, this issue is outside the scope of the Official Plan update. It should be noted that Environmental Impact Assessments submitted in support of development applications are peer reviewed by staff from the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority, and if needed, by staff from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					<p>d) The City has had an extensive public consultation program as part of the Official Plan Update process. Staff have met with representatives of the development community as well as several neighbourhood associations through open houses and coffee chats and also through individual meetings.</p>
5.	H. Wevers	2015-03-30 2015-04-20 2015-05-01 2015-05-12 2015-10-28 2016-02-20	Heritage Site Specific Estate Residential Open Space	<p>a) Request heritage designation for Aragon Road and inclusion of Aragon Road as an Area of Heritage Character in Section 7.3.D of the OP, and as a Special Policy Area in the OP.</p> <p>b) Aragon Road has much heritage value both in its farmhouses and farm buildings, and as a landscape. When would the old Kingston Township Heritage Buildings study be completed and would it be used to amend the Official Plan under the current effort?</p> <p>c) Aragon Road and its adjacent land and water is an important heritage and environmental area. From Schedule 8-B of the Official Plan, it can be seen that Aragon Road is a natural linkage with the northern branch of the "Linkage and Corridor" along the extension of Unity Road east of Battersea Road through the extensive wetland and creek that empties in the River Styx. Request for addition of Aragon Road to Schedule 8-B (Natural Heritage B – Linkages and Corridors)</p> <p>d) Would it be possible to schedule the update to the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study in the near future? Is it at all possible to make it part of the current OP update?</p> <p>e) Esther Marsh Bay, which borders on the donated land by the Graham family to the former Kingston Township, and currently part of the public open space, should be designated as a "locally significant wetland."</p> <p>f) Also interested in the draft amendment to the Official Plan regarding estate residential developments around Colonel By Lake.</p> <p>g) Would you have a map of text about a rule called "wave surge" that prohibits building or installing a permanent structure on the Pump House Steam Museum site at the bottom of West Street? I understand there is such a thing for wetlands and shorelines but downtown? Any info would be welcome.</p>	<p>a) Properties along Aragon Road are being reviewed as part of the ARA heritage properties project. Recognition of Aragon Road for its heritage value would occur through the processes of the Ontario Heritage Act.</p> <p>b) The work on the Kingston Township Historical Properties will not be completed in time to be fed into the Official Plan Update project. Typically, individual property designations are not part of an Official Plan amendment. It would only be after full development of the area as a Heritage Conservation District that it would be identified in the Official Plan with associated policies.</p> <p>c) Linkages and corridors on Schedule 8-B of the Official Plan were determined through the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study (2006) undertaken by the CRCA. According to the CRCA, these linkages and corridors were selected based on a regional landscape assessment by which larger core habitat areas can be linked by the least distance approach. This scale precludes the smaller corridors that species use, which would typically be addressed at a site-specific scale through an environmental impact assessment. The Aragon Road area did not have features that made it stand out at the landscape scale.</p> <p>d) The work on an update to the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study is currently planned to begin in late 2016 unless delayed by other initiatives. This work will not be able to be included in the Official Plan Update, but the findings will be included as a separate amendment once it is complete.</p> <p>e) Locally significant wetlands on Schedule 7 of the City's Official Plan were determined through the Central Cataraqui Natural Heritage Study (CCRNHS). As indicated in the CCRNHS, locally significant wetlands include evaluated wetlands that were not classified as provincially significant by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) but have local value that should be recognized. Designating a wetland as a locally significant wetland would require that the wetland be evaluated. The MNR evaluates wetlands using the Southern Ontario Wetland Evaluation System, which indicates that generally wetlands smaller than 2 hectares are not evaluated. It</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					<p>should be noted that the shoreline of Colonel By Lake adjacent to Cecil Graham Park is designated Environmental Protection Area in the City's Official Plan.</p> <p>f) At this point, the only implementation that will come out of the Estate Residential Review into the five-year Official Plan update is an amendment to Schedule 13 (Detailed Planning Areas) to recognize the proposed "Waterfront Area Designation" locations conceptually as a Future Special Policy Area. Now that the Waterfront Master Plan has been completed, the Waterfront Area Designation special policy area study will commence later this year. Any proposed policy changes from the remainder of the Estate Residential Review and the special policy area study for the proposed Waterfront Area Designation would be done through a separate Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>g) The OP does not refer to "wave surge" but does speak to "wave uprush", defined in the City's Official Plan as: <i>The rush of water up onto a shoreline or structure following the breaking of a wave; the limit of wave uprush is the point of furthest landward rush of water onto the shoreline.</i></p> <p>Section 5.0 of the Official Plan deals with the Protection of Health and Safety. Sections 5.7 and 5.8 relate to "wave uprush" and "natural hazard mapping", respectively. Proposals for development or site alteration in areas constrained by floodplains and areas of potential "wave uprush" necessitate consultation with the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority and applications for approval (permits). Schedule 11 to the OP identifies "Constraint Areas" which include areas of "wave uprush".</p>
6.	S. Reid	2015-03-31	Site Specific	a) Concerns over the redevelopment of Richardson Stadium at Queen's West Campus (i.e., noise, light trespass, and intensity of operation).	a) The potential for negative compatibility matters (e.g., noise, light, loss of privacy, etc.) is a key land use planning consideration set out in Section 2.7 of the Official Plan. Site Plan Control (9.5.32.c) policies also provide a mechanism for addressing the potential for noise and light through site design.
7.	D. Campbell	2015-04-01	Downtown Wellington Extension	<p>a) Would like to ensure innovative and attractive future development in the downtown.</p> <p>b) Is opposed to the WSE and provides examples of other cities that are trying to remove/remedy waterfront roads/highways.</p>	<p>a) Section 8 of the Official Plan speaks to Urban Design and includes policy directives that support enhancements to the character of valued streetscapes, community areas and landscapes. A policy has been added to promote innovation in building design to create an interesting and varied built environment.</p> <p>b) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
8.	C. Branscombe, Martin Group of Companies	2015-04-07	Site Specific	<p>a) 2880 Princess Street: Consider re-designating the whole property as Arterial Commercial (currently designated Arterial Commercial in the south and Residential in the north). Intention for the northern portion of the parcel is to develop multi-unit residential.</p>	<p>a) Site specific changes in land use designation are not being contemplated as part of the comprehensive Official Plan update. The sought after land use change would need to proceed by way of an owner-initiated Official Plan Amendment to accommodate a full and transparent Planning Act process.</p>
9.	J. Grenville	2015-03-30 2015-09-25 2015-10-29 2016-02-01 2016-02-23	Stable/Intensification Student Housing Planning Process Williamsville Community Benefits	<p>a) Topics of interest for the OP Review: Pro-active consultation with Queen's, and balance between intensification and preservation of stable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>b) Need for the public consultation process to be articulated in the Official Plan.</p> <p>c) Need for the City to provide stronger guidance in terms of what is acceptable with respect to Studies and Reports. It would be a good idea to indicate in the OP that guidance will be provided. For reference, here's the link to the City of Ottawa's section for the preparation of studies and plans - http://ottawa.ca/en/development-application-review-process-0/guide-preparing-studies-and-plans</p> <p>d) Williamsville Main Street (Section 10E) – would like to ensure that the changes in the OP which softened the direction which the OP currently provides, are still retained in the zoning by-law.</p> <p>e) Pleased to see that some attention has been paid to 9.5.25, however would like to see a stronger statement relating to its use. Please remove “underground parking” from 9.5.25 (community benefits to be considered for density bonusing). The OP does not define underground parking as an objective and it is not clear that underground parking is a community benefit.</p> <p>f) Looking for explicit references in the Official Plan to a study that will provide information on the form and location for intensification and also to a date in the Official Plan by which this information will be available. Given the provincial direction to identify appropriate locations and form for intensification, what will be included in the Official Plan regarding this matter? What urgency will this project have?</p> <p>g) The new official plan should clearly articulate how and when the public will be consulted. The draft Official Plan makes reference to the development of a Community Engagement Plan but needs to include reference to the requirements of the recently revised Planning Act and also to provide a time line for completion of the Community Engagement Plan. What steps will be taken to amend the City's processes so that they are compliant with the Planning Act? When will this happen?</p>	<p>a) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report (Infill and Intensification).</p> <p>b) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report (Public Process and Consultation).</p> <p>c) The City is considering terms of reference for technical studies required in support of Planning Act applications. The example provided from the City of Ottawa will be reviewed in the advancement of this work. Section 6.2.9 of the OP allows the City to request a peer review when considered necessary.</p> <p>d) The Comprehensive Zoning By-law project is currently underway. This comment has been added to a separate tracking matrix to ensure it is considered in the advancement of zoning standards for the Williamsville Main Street area. The Zoning By-law project will include multiple opportunities for public input.</p> <p>e) Section 9.5.25, which pertains to density bonusing, will remain unchanged as part of the OP update. A stand-alone OP amendment will be made concurrent with the introduction of Community Benefit Guidelines to afford the public with an opportunity to comment on the subject matter in a more focused and transparent manner.</p> <p>f) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report (Infill and Intensification). As part of the process, the City is intending to provide additional and specific guidance about the location and form of intensification. Secondary planning of areas that are experiencing fundamental change will be used to guide the form and location of intensification in specific areas. The timing of these secondary planning processes is to be determined. Please refer to the proposed policies in Sections 2.2, 2.6, and 3.3.C.</p> <p>g) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report (Public process and Public consultation).</p> <p>h) A policy has been added to Section 2.3 to recognize the need to evaluate residential intensification, stemming from the findings of the Central Accommodation Review, in the areas near to the campuses of Queen's University and St. Lawrence College.</p> <p>i) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report (Infill and Intensification).</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>h) Will the next draft of the Official Plan provide additional information on the Central Accommodation Review such as what area will be included and when it will be completed?</p> <p>i) Re: protection of stable areas – recommend that the OP be clarified so that residents can understand when an OPA is required and so that the Planning Department has a clear basis on which to make a recommendation to Council.</p> <p>j) Also recommend that the content of a Comprehensive Report be clearly stated in the Official Plan and that part of the requirements should be an explanation when an OPA is not required for a project such as the Frontenac Street and Johnson Street developments.</p> <p>k) The <i>Planning Act</i> that refers to the special meeting of council does not have any restrictions and simply refers to discussion of the “revisions [to the Official Plan] that may be required.” (s. 26, 3(b)). It appears that the City of Kingston may not be meeting the requirements of the <i>Planning Act</i> if there is a restriction on what can be presented and discussed at the Special Meeting of Council on 23rd February.</p>	<p>j) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report (Public process and Public consultation).</p> <p>k) The <i>Planning Act</i> provides that the intent of the Special Meeting of Council is to consult on revisions that may be required. Anyone who wished to speak at the Special Meeting of Council was given the opportunity to do so in accordance with the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>
10.	Williamsville Community Association	2015-05-18 2015-12-21 2016-02-23	Planning Process Stable/Intensification Williamsville Student Housing Community Benefits	<p>a) The planning department should adopt a common staff interpretation of the Official Plan which does not undermine the Plan’s goals regarding protecting the integrity of existing neighbourhoods.</p> <p>b) Public participation should be permitted (encouraged) when the comprehensive report and draft zoning by-law are considered by the Planning Committee. The current practice of holding the formal public meeting prior to the availability of the staff recommendation and proposed by-law is inadequate and contrary to the intent of the Planning Act.</p> <p>c) The sequence of the planning and development process should be: zoning approval, followed by site plan approval, followed by the approval of permits related to demolition/construction, followed by construction.</p> <p>d) The rezoning application process should require that no site activity occur until the disposition of the application has been determined and any related permits have been issued.</p> <p>e) The posting requirements related to properties undergoing development should be ongoing and relate to the current status of the development proposal.</p> <p>f) The development process should ensure that, during demolition/construction site hoarding is presentable and suitable for the project location. Neighbourhood disruption in terms of traffic, noise</p>	<p>a) The policies of the Official Plan are to be read as a whole and no single policy or group of policies is intended to be given greater weight than any other policy or group of policies, except as it relates to the clarification of secondary plan policies as described in Section 9.2.6. Recommendations provided by the planning department are required to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conform with the Official Plan.</p> <p>b) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>c) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>d) A municipality does not have the authority under the <i>Planning Act</i> to prevent legal site activity when an application is being processed.</p> <p>e) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>f) A new section 9.10.4 has been added to the Official Plan to identify the City’s objectives as they relate to construction activities and the need to respect community interests, particularly in instances of infill development. Section 9.12.3 of the Plan allows the City to request a Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>g) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>h) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>i) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>j) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>and dust is kept to a minimum and site activity is limited to normal working hours.</p> <p>g) The intensification policies of the Official Plan require clarification to ensure that the goals of the plan with respect to neighbourhood stability and heritage conservation are effectively implemented.</p> <p>h) Locations where intensification is to occur should be designated and include maximum heights and densities.</p> <p>i) Neighbourhoods in transition should be places in a separate land use category which includes policies to guide redevelopment in that specific portion</p> <p>j) Appropriate transition should be required between areas of intensification and lower density residential neighbourhoods</p> <p>k) The type and location of infilling permitted within established neighbourhoods should be defined.</p> <p>l) Intensification projects should be required to complement and or blend in with adjacent heritage elements.</p> <p>m) The PPS on intensification is being used to over-ride the policies of the Official Plan even when that plan contains policies designed to implement the PPS. The PPS needs to be amended to respect the intended role of official plans before the urban core neighbourhoods are destabilized by over-intensification.</p> <p>n) The current draft does not provide any guidance on where additional intensification should occur within the urban core. With the exception of the Central Kingston Residential Intensification Study there is no indication of providing this direction in the future. This is a vital consideration in the protection of stable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>o) The requirement for a peer review of all Williamsville Main Street development proposals could be added to the section 10E, something that would provide excellent information for the scheduled review of the Williamsville Main Street Study.</p> <p>p) The draft Official Plan does not provide any indication of when or how the City of Kingston will participate actively with Queen's University as a stakeholder to achieve mutual goals with respect to housing strategy and student accommodation nor how the City will engage the University more closely in areas of concern between the municipality, the community and the University.</p> <p>q) The Central Accommodation Review reference has been replaced with reference to an intensification study in 2.3.2.1 and 3.3.D.14 (Central Kingston Residential Intensification Study). Despite the</p>	<p>k) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>l) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>m) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>n) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>o) The Williamsville Main Street Study is used in the review of development applications and the recommendations of the Study have been incorporated into the OP. Section 6.2.9 of the Official Plan allows the City to request a peer review of information and studies submitted in support of development.</p> <p>p) Any secondary planning work undertaken for the future use and development of lands in the near campus neighbourhoods of Queen's University and St. Lawrence College will include consultation with representatives of each institution and the broader community.</p> <p>q) A policy has been added to Section 2.3 to recognize the need to evaluate residential intensification, stemming from the findings of the Central Accommodation Review, in the areas near to the campuses of Queen's University and St. Lawrence College.</p> <p>r) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>s) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>t) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>u) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>v) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>w) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>x) Thank you for your comment. The city will be initiating a separate Official Plan Amendment to amend this section, so all proposed revisions to this section have been removed from the OP Update. The separate amendment will have its own consultation and will also include Guidelines to clarify the intent and process for all stakeholders. Your comment will be incorporated into the separate amendment to clarify that underground parking is not a community benefit.</p> <p>y) The purpose of initiating the Official Plan Amendment and preparing Guidelines described in item x) is to improve clarity, consistency and transparency for the public, land owners, developers, City Staff and Council Members in the process related to negotiating and securing community benefits.</p> <p>z) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>urgency to move forward with this as a priority issue there is no further explicit information, no indication as to when it will be undertaken nor to the area that is covered other than the Campus Expansion Area for Queen's.</p> <p>r) Despite the City's recognition of the need for "providing better guidance on where intensification should occur" (5 August 2015 meeting) neither of these two recommendation have yet been implemented in draft 2. As long as there are unexpected and specious arguments used at OMB hearings and in comprehensive reports to bolster the contention that neighbourhoods are in transition, it is difficult to understand the earlier statement that "existing residential areas are considered stable, unless otherwise identified by this Plan" (3.3.6) and to put it into context. The WCA recommends one of the two possible approaches as described above.</p> <p>s) The intent in Draft 1 to protect only the "interior of stable areas" meant that the edge of stable areas would be continuously under threat, eventually destroying stable neighbourhoods. The removal of the reference to the "interior of stable areas" in Draft 2 makes the OP clearer in terms of the City's intent to protect "stable areas."</p> <p>t) The public consultation procedures should be included in the OP now rather than waiting for direction from the Province.</p> <p>u) The Planning Act appears to be quite explicit that "at least one public meeting" be held "for the purpose of giving the public an opportunity to make representation in respect of the proposed by-law." (section 34, 12.a.ii). The process in place in the City of Kingston does not allow the public an opportunity to make representation when the draft zoning by-law amendment is presented at a Planning Committee meeting. This change needs to be noted as part of the OP review and the process needs to be changed as soon as possible.</p> <p>v) The OP should provide direction to prepare a guide that will direct what is required in all studies and plans and that all reports should indicate the qualifications of the person who prepared the report.</p> <p>w) Recommend that the OP contain direction on how the Public Meeting Report and the Comprehensive Report are to be prepared and what information is to be contained in these reports.</p> <p>x) Request that underground parking be removed from the list of community benefits.</p> <p>y) The OP needs to contain more prescriptive direction so that Williamsville residents have some assurance that the inappropriate use of the density bonus provisions by City planners will not happen</p>	<p>aa) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>bb) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>cc) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>dd) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>ee) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>ff) Earlier iterations of the City's Official Plan included specific topics / subject matter in the margin. This has been revised due to accessibility formatting requirements.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>again.</p> <p>z) Concern around the intensification of Williamsville District. The draft Official Plan needs to provide information (or the direction that will be taken to prepare the information) about “where” and “what form” intensification in Kingston will take. Additional work in this regard is needed.</p> <p>aa) PPS 2014 clearly states that “planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations...for intensification and redevelopment” (1.1.3.3). Attached letter from the Minister of Municipal Affairs which states that the City’s Official Plan will provide “certainty to everyone in the community about where intensification and redevelopment may occur and what form it may take”.</p> <p>bb) Recognize that Council has approved a study on nodes and corridors.</p> <p>cc) Support the recommendations that are included in the Coalition of Kingston Communities Planning Brief that was presented to the Mayor and Planning Committee Chair earlier this month. Very interested to see how the next draft of the OP reflects these recommendations.</p> <p>dd) Recommend that Section 3.3.6 re stable areas be clarified so that there is less chance of ambiguity, so that residents can understand when an OPA is required and so that the Planning Department has a clear basis on which to make a recommendation.</p> <p>ee) The requirements for a Comprehensive Report to the Planning Committee should be clearly stated in the Official Plan - see comments on Draft 2 (December 2015), section titled Comprehensive Reports. Part of the requirements of the Comprehensive Report should be an explanation of why an OPA is not required for a project such as the Frontenac Street and the Johnson Street developments.</p> <p>ff) Where the OP refers to the requirement for an OPA (such as 3.3.6) that section should be marked Official Plan Amendment (in the margin or as a title) to draw attention to the requirement and to make it easier to read where an amendment to the Official Plan is required.</p>	
11.	R. Fonger	2015-04-17 2015-07-28 2015-09-30 2015-11-05 2015-12-03	Stable/Intensification Transportation Architectural Design Planning Process Height Limit	<p>The following is a summary of the key issues presented by Mr. Fonger and the Our Neighbourhood community organization.</p> <p>a) Submissions identify a need for reform in the way development applications are processed by the City. As noted, there ought to be an opportunity for public participation when a comprehensive report and draft zoning by-law are considered by Planning Committee. Current process is noted as inadequate and contrary to the intent of the</p>	<p>a) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report regarding the development approvals process and opportunities for public participation.</p> <p>b) By-laws passed under the Municipal Act are used by the City to regulate construction activities (e.g., noise by-law, property standards by-law, site alteration by-law, tree by-law, etc.). The City’s Site Plan Control Guidelines identify that a Construction Agreement may be required where there is a significant amount of off-site works</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
		2016-02-23	Heritage Density Secondary Plan Terminology Student Housing Views	<p>Planning Act. Administrative policies in the Plan ought to be amended to recognize process changes.</p> <p>b) Submissions present alternative procedures to be advanced in the review of a development application and in the control of construction activities (e.g., hoarding, traffic, noise, dust, hours of site activity, etc.). Administrative policies in the Plan ought to be amended to recognize process changes.</p> <p>c) Intensification policies of the Official Plan require clarification to ensure that goals regarding neighbourhood stability and heritage consideration are effectively implemented. Specifically,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Locations where intensification is to occur should be designated and include maximum heights and densities; ii) Neighbourhoods 'in transition' should be placed in a separate land use category, which includes policies to guide redevelopment in that specific location; iii) Appropriate transition should be required between areas of intensification and lower density residential neighbourhoods; iv) The type and location of infilling permitted within established neighbourhoods should be defined; v) Intensification projects should be required to compliment and/or blend in with adjacent heritage elements. <p>d) The 'reasonable reader' should be able to determine the difference between a 'stable area' and an 'area in transition' as well as the locations to which low, medium and high density residential policies apply.</p> <p>e) How do you define:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) housing district? ii) neighbourhood? iii) peripheral area of neighbourhoods? iv) adjacent to or in proximity to commercial areas? v) an area that has access to public transit? vi) in proximity to parkland or open space? vii) edge of neighbourhoods? viii) adjacent to transit routes? ix) adjacent to community facilities? x) adjacent to areas of open space? 	<p>(e.g., road closures, stock piling of materials, traffic control planning, etc.) A new section 9.10.4 has been added to the Official Plan to identify the City's objectives as they relate to construction activities and the need to respect community interests, particularly in instances of infill development. Section 9.12.3 of the Plan allows the City to request a Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>c) The suggestions have been considered in making revisions to the Official Plan. City-wide density targets are included in Section 2.4.5 of the OP. Policy directives regarding area-specific density and height will not be added unless supported by a secondary planning process.</p> <p>d) The policy framework pertaining to where intensification is intended has been revised to enhance clarity and understanding.</p> <p>e) Various changes have been made throughout the OP to provide clarity on many of these matters; please see more specific details in subsequent comments below.</p> <p>f) Section 2.2.5 (Housing Districts) has been revised to acknowledge that such areas are planned to remain stable. Further, it is noted in this section that higher levels of density are promoted along major transit routes and in delineated "centres and corridors".</p> <p>g) The definition has been relocated as suggested and policy objectives tied to compatibility have been made clear.</p> <p>h) A policy has been added to Section 2.3 to recognize the need to evaluate residential intensification, stemming from the findings of the Central Accommodation Review, in the areas near to the campuses of Queen's University and St. Lawrence College.</p> <p>i) This has been revised to align with the Centres and Corridors approach being taken to guide intensification. In particular a 400 metre distance (i.e., 5 minute walk) is specified instead of the term "proximity".</p> <p>j) This policy section has been substantially revised to address concerns regarding clarity of intent and, more specifically, the City's expectations regarding where intensification will be directed.</p> <p>k) The first part of Section 2.6.1 acknowledges that "development" is promoted in areas where change is desired and that stable areas ought to be protected from development that may be destabilizing. No change is proposed to this section; however, greater policy clarity has been added throughout Sections 2 and 3 to better-describe where change through intensification is intended to occur.</p> <p>l) The characteristics described under Section 2.6.2 help to define a</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>xi) Secondary plan</p> <p>f) Section 2.2.5 should be revised to indicate that ‘Housing Districts are planned to remain stable, at current densities, unless specifically designated to authorize increased densities’. And the remainder of the policy should be revised accordingly.</p> <p>g) Section 2.7.1. Definition for “compatible” should be moved to Section 1.</p> <p>h) New Section 2.3.2.1 requires further elaboration regarding the details of any future intensification study arising out of the Central Accommodation Review.</p> <p>i) Section 2.4.4 introduces the ‘fuzzy’, undefined concept of the ‘peripheral area of neighbourhoods’ and sets the stage for similar policies which follow. This clause should be deleted as one of the changes intended to bring about clarity to the intensification issue.</p> <p>j) There is a need to ensure clarity and fit between Stable Areas and Areas in Transition. Some of these provisions appear to be carry-overs from the 1991 Plan. A fresh approach to language would be helpful.</p> <p>k) Section 2.6.1: Adaptive re-use should be emphasised and the words ‘development’ deleted.</p> <p>l) Section 2.6.2 a and b: What does this mean and why is it relevant?</p> <p>m) Section 2.6.2 c: What does ‘consistent standard of property maintenance mean’ and why is it relevant?</p> <p>n) Section 2.6.2 d: Why is this a criterion? Also, the use of ‘and’ means that all 5 conditions must be met setting the bar very high for confirming stability.</p> <p>o) Section 2.6.3 a and b: What are ‘interior portions’ of stable areas?</p> <p>p) Section 2.6.3 f: The word ‘discouraged’ should be changed to ‘prohibited’.</p> <p>q) Section 2.6.4: This current policy should be strengthened by adding a reference to the importance of maintaining the legacy zoning coverage which established, and has maintained, the unique qualities of our neighbourhoods and the related ongoing expectations of residents and property owners. Existing zoning that was originally intended to enable development which may now be considered to be inappropriate (eg. Sydenham Ward was pre-zoned for walk-up apartment blocks such as those between William and Bagot) should be carefully reviewed. Zoning strategies for maintaining stable neighbourhoods are required.</p>	<p>stable area.</p> <p>m) The standard of property maintenance, and the vacancy of land or building occupancy, can be indicators of stability or decline in a neighbourhood. Those neighbourhoods considered to be in decline may become the subject of review through a secondary planning exercise which would act to identify opportunities for renewal.</p> <p>n) The amount of development requiring Planning Act approvals (e.g., Official Plan or Zoning By-law Amendment, minor variance, etc.) in a specific area can be an indicator of change and variability in the characteristics of a neighbourhood. This change suggests that the neighbourhood may not be stable.</p> <p>o) The reference to “interior portion” of a stable area has been removed from this policy section.</p> <p>p) The section has been revised to state that redevelopment or intensification that is out-of-character “shall not be supported” in stable areas, and shall be further guided by the policies of 2.4.4 and 3.3.C.</p> <p>q) Zoning standards will be reviewed as part of the forthcoming creation of a new zoning by-law for the City of Kingston. Standards set to achieve a desired built form will be established in the by-law.</p> <p>r) Section 2.6.5 provides a policy framework for evaluating an Official Plan Amendment associated with potentially destabilizing development in a stable area. It is important to retain this section to provide clarity of expectations and rigour when considering an OP amendment.</p> <p>s) Section 2.6.7, 2.6.8 and 2.6.9 regarding “Areas in Transition” has been removed.</p> <p>t) The noted sections are considered in the review of Planning Act applications where there exists a potential for adverse effects. Technical studies (e.g., noise studies, traffic impact studies, environmental impact assessments, stormwater management and site servicing studies, etc.) must demonstrate that potential compatibility issues can be properly mitigated, if at all. When necessary, the City will require a peer review of a technical study to validate its findings and recommendations.</p> <p>u) The requested modification to the policy, which currently acknowledges the potential need for an official plan amendment, has been made.</p> <p>v) Infill is a subcategory of intensification and should have some</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>r) Section 2.6.5: The policies dealing with large scale development in stable areas, conflict with new Section 2.6.3 and should be deleted.</p> <p>s) Section 2.6.7: Clauses c and d require clarification/rationalization or modification Sections 2.6.8 and 2.6.9: the policies should be modified to include a requirement for the preparation of a neighbourhood study and a related official plan amendment to precede new development in Areas of Transition.</p> <p>t) The policies related to 2.7.3 Adverse Effects and 2.7.6 Mitigation Measures are commendable but often overlooked. How do we ensure that they are, not only addressed, but carefully implemented in the future?</p> <p>u) Section 3.3.6 should be replaced with the following: Areas designated as Residential are considered stable. Only minor changes in the predominant pattern of housing type, height or density, are permitted in accordance with Section 2.6.3.</p> <p>v) Section 3.3.7 appears to be redundant given the introduction of new Section 2.6.3.</p> <p>w) Section 3.3.8 should be consistent with Section 3.3.B.4. The proposed link to Section 2.6 does not clarify the terms 'moderate', 'edge of neighbourhoods', or the other 'adjacent' terms mentioned. As currently proposed this policy continues to authorize high density residential use anywhere within all downtown, and many outlying, neighbourhoods. Careful consideration should be given to options for improvement.</p> <p>x) Section 3.3.11: Areas where these are permitted should be designated based upon proven municipal service capacity and lot sizes capable of providing suitable parking, building setbacks, and on-site open space. In older City neighbourhoods this would allow residential densities to increase well beyond the 30 upnh maximum permitted in Low Density areas. The approaches being used in Innisville and London should be considered as their approach which requires owner occupancy will ensure that the secondary dwelling unit permission does not result in 2-unit rental accommodation.</p> <p>y) Section 3.3.A, B & C: The current policy does not indicate how to determine whether an area is currently subject to Low, Medium or High density residential policies. A mathematical or other suitable criterion is required and should be added. A suggested starting point would be to use the density of exiting development (exclusive of non-conforming uses and lands in other designations) within a 120 metre radius of the centre of the property as the measure of existing density.</p>	<p>specific guidance in the plan, especially for residential infill.</p> <p>w) The noted policy revisions have been considered and changes have been made to address sections lacking clarity. In particular, please note the change to sections 2.6 and 3.3.C.</p> <p>x) The Planning Act provides that municipalities shall have policies in their Official Plans that enable Second Residential Units and human rights matters prohibit planning on the basis of the user of land (i.e., renters or owners). The policies have been reviewed in consultation with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and are considered adequate.</p> <p>y) The determination of density is stated in the policies -- low not exceeding 37.5 uph, medium in the range of 37.5 to 75 uph, and high at 75 uph or greater. Any existing development or a proposed development in Kingston can be determined to be low, medium, or high density based on these numbers on a site-by-site basis. The revised stable areas policies and guidance offered for intensification will better guide high density development which we know is a concern.</p> <p>z) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>aa) The policies of the Official Plan must be read as a whole (see Section 9.2.8). An increase in density within a low density residential neighbourhood would need to be considered against the policies of the entire Plan.</p> <p>bb) Medium density developments are subject to compatibility considerations and are controlled through underlying zoning constraints.</p> <p>cc) The suggested revisions have been considered in advancing revisions to Section 9.12.4. Additional work is being undertaken by the City to ensure the process of public consultation and notice is supportive of open governance. See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>dd) The City cannot legally preclude one from obtaining a demolition permit to remove a structure in advance of receiving Planning Act approvals unless the subsequent use of the property would contract permissions outlined in the OP and zoning by-law.</p> <p>ee) The policies of Section 10.2 have been revised to provide greater clarity of intent.</p> <p>ff) The standards established in the underlying zoning by-laws will be considered through the creation of a consolidated zoning by-law for the City. This project is currently underway and will draw upon</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>z) Consideration should be given to adding maximum building heights to the policies for Low, Medium and High density residential uses. These should ensure building heights of a 'human scale' suitable to achieve the City's vision for the skyline of the future and the protection of key heritage and architectural views of, and within, the City. (Policies such as S 10E.1.8.b Williamsville Main Street approach this issue but amount to an invitation to exceed the desired 2 to 4 story range that constitutes 'human scale' in this location.)</p> <p>aa) Section 3.3.A.2: This policy coupled with S 10.3 permits increased densities without the need for an official plan amendment. The words 'unless an approved secondary plan establishes alternative provisions.' should be deleted.</p> <p>bb) Section 3.3.B.4: This section should be consistent with Section 3.3.8. As currently stated this policy continues to authorize medium density residential use anywhere within all downtown, and many outlying, neighbourhoods. Careful consideration should be given to options for improvement.</p> <p>cc) Section 9.12.4: request changes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Public participation should be permitted (encouraged) when the comprehensive report and draft zoning by-law are considered by the Planning Committee. ii) The sequence of the planning and development process should be: zoning approval, followed by site plan approval, followed by the approval of permits related to demolition/construction, followed by construction. iii) The rezoning application process should require that no site activity occur until the disposition of the application has been determined and any related permits have been issued. iv) The posting requirements related to properties undergoing development should be ongoing and relate to the current status of the development proposal. v) The development process should ensure that, during demolition/construction site hoarding is presentable and suitable for the project location. Neighbourhood disruption in terms of traffic, noise and dust is kept to a minimum and site activity is limited to normal working hours. <p>dd) Section 9.5.40 should be revised to require zoning, site plan and building permit approval in advance of any private on-site activity related to construction, including demolition and excavation.</p> <p>ee) Sections 10.2 and 10.3: Policies relate to the status of secondary</p>	<p>revisions to the Official Plan and the findings of technical studies completed in advance of the OP update.</p> <p>It is imperative that land use planning considerations take into account changing trends and the experiences of other communities to ensure responsible management of local resources and the maintenance of a high quality of life.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change						
				<p>plans require reconsideration. A plan that is not ‘adopted’ has no status and a secondary plan that does not form part of the official plan should have no status.</p> <p>ff) A common thread running through the processing of zoning applications and the updating of the City’s official plan and zoning provisions is reduced planning standards. Examples include proposed changes to parking requirements, amenity space, setbacks and lot coverage. These standards set the stage for the ‘quality of life’ that has made Kingston such a desirable place to live, work and play. The long-term implications of adopting lower standards from other jurisdictions requires very careful consideration.</p>							
12.	J. Bowie	2015-04-21	Transportation	<p>a) Would like to see requirements for visitor/short-term bicycle parking for new residential developments.</p>	<p>a) Policy revisions have been made to section 4.6.52 to support options for lessening the off-street vehicle parking requirements. The City is currently working on the first draft of the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law, which is expected to be released following the completion of the Five Year Official Plan Update. The new Comprehensive Zoning By-law will establish new standards to support the Official Plan’s transportation policies, including new bicycle parking standards. Please email opzb_update@cityofkingston.ca for additional information on the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Project.</p>						
13.	J. Shefrin Email May 6, 2015	2015-05-06	Wellington Extension	<p>a) Please stop the Wellington Street Extension. Please look for a less radical and less invasive solution to the transportation issues. Keep the waterfront habitat intact.</p>	<p>a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p>						
14.	C. Bell	2015-05-21	Special Residential	<p>a) Hospices as a permitted use in planning documents.</p>	<p>a) A hospice has been added to the OP in the definitions section and in 3.3.D.4.</p>						
15.	K. Dantzer, Caraco	2015-05-22	Density Affordable Housing	<p>a) Interested in the policies around minimum density requirements in greenfield.</p> <p>b) Traditionally the word affordable has been a confusing topic locally, as it gets used in several applications. The OP refers to Affordable with a definition, and then several other documents refer to it in a different context. I have attempted to refer to some varieties in the wording as follows to ease my discussions:</p> <table><tr><td>Market</td><td>Above CMHC AMR</td></tr><tr><td>Affordable</td><td>CHMC AMR</td></tr><tr><td>Below Affordable</td><td>80%-100% CMHC AMR</td></tr></table>	Market	Above CMHC AMR	Affordable	CHMC AMR	Below Affordable	80%-100% CMHC AMR	<p>a) The minimum density requirement established in the Official Plan Update for greenfield areas is 37.5 residential units per net hectare (see Section 2.4.4).</p> <p>b) The definition of “Affordable” provided in the Official Plan is the same as that provided in the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, being:</p> <p>a) in the case of ownership housing, the least expensive of:</p> <p>1. housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for <i>low and moderate income households</i>; or</p> <p>2. housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 percent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the <i>regional market</i></p>
Market	Above CMHC AMR										
Affordable	CHMC AMR										
Below Affordable	80%-100% CMHC AMR										

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment		Response / Change
				<div> <div>Social/Subsidized</div> <div>0-80% CMHC AMR</div> </div> <p>I am not asking you to follow this, just that anything you can do to consolidate nomenclature would be greatly appreciated. There are many council discussions that speak to the confusion/misunderstanding of councillors, and in some cases staff, about the differences in definition of affordable between the OP vs Affordable Housing Land Acquisition and Disposition Program as they are not interchangeable. If there is any change proposed to the affordable portion in the OP, I wish to be involved.</p>		<p>area;</p> <p>b) in the case of rental housing, the least expensive of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for <i>low and moderate income households</i>; or 2. a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the <i>regional market area</i>.
16.	L. Murray & A. Loughheed	2015-05-21 2015-06-08	Transportation Wellington Extension	<p>a) KTMP: Re-focusing regarding transportation should take place as part of the OP update, so that subsequent TMPs are not referring back to the last OP update.</p> <p>b) Wellington Street Extension: Recognition in the OP that the WSE is under active discussion and reconsideration, and that its status remains to be determined via the secondary plan.</p>		<p>a) Any future iteration of a Kingston Transportation Master Plan will consider the findings of the North King's Town Secondary Plan and related technical studies.</p> <p>b) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>
17.	J. Gower	2015-06-15	Transportation Stable/Intensification	<p>a) Intensification should occur near transit stops so that the downtown skyline won't be ruined by overly tall buildings. If taller buildings were to be spread out along the transit system, the downtown skyline would not be destroyed so easily.</p>		<p>a) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>
18.	M. Farrar	2015-06-15	Open Space	<p>a) Why is there no inclusion of the Inner Harbour Heritage Trail that Council and staff committed to building from the La Salle Causeway to John Counter Blvd within the upcoming 5 years, as well as the further extension of this trail up to Kingston Mills on the west side of the Great Cataraqui River and back to Kingston on the east side of the river?</p>		<p>a) New policies have been added to the OP that identify and reinforce waterfront priorities and reference the more detailed Waterfront Master Plan. Schedule 5 – Pathways - of the Official Plan has been revised to include delineation of a broader network of proposed waterfront pathways as are laid out in the Waterfront Master Plan.</p>
19.	J. Uliana, IBI Group	2015-06-22	Site Specific Employment Lands	<p>a) 469 to 541 Montreal Street – request designation change from General Industrial to Institutional</p>		<p>a) The City is not including site specific re-designations as part of the OP Update unless such is recommended as part of a completed policy study, approved by Council. The Employment Lands Strategy Review identified several areas to be re-designated on the basis of City-wide considerations. This study did not include recommendations for 469-541 Montreal Street. A site-specific OP amendment would be needed to support the change in designation. These sites are also included in the proposed North King's Town Secondary Plan area and any proposed changes to the land use designation should be considered as part of the overall secondary planning process.</p>
20.	McIntosh Perry on	2015-06-26	Site Specific Employment Lands	<p>a) Seek to re-designate the approximately 75 hectares of land located at the northeast corner of Perth Road and Highway 401 from Rural Area to Rural Industrial. The Employment Land Strategy Review</p>		<p>a) The City is not including site specific re-designations as part of the OP Update unless such is recommended as part of a completed policy study, approved by Council. The Employment Land Strategy Review</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
	behalf of Gilchak Holdings Inc.			recommends concentrating rural industrial development to the McAdoo's Lane area, where the existing developed rural industrial lands are largely concentrated. To accomplish this, it is recommended that additional rural lands along the south side of McAdoo's Lane (directly north of Highway 401 near Montreal Street) be designated Rural Industrial, subject to an area-specific study of opportunities and constraints. The subject property is located within this area and consideration for the appropriateness of the land use change ought to be considered through the City's on-going review of its Official Plan.	does not explicitly recommend that the identified lands be re-designated; only that it be considered following an area-specific study. An area-specific study has not yet been conducted. As such, a site-specific OP amendment would be needed to support the change in designation at this time.
21.	M. Keene, FOTENN for Quay Developments (Kingston) Limited	2015-07-14	Site Specific (19 Brock Street)	<p>a) Language used in Sections 3.18.14 and 10A.5.3 (now 10A.5.2) is overly prescriptive and could be revised to more appropriately guide the redevelopment of the site as compatible infill. Revisions could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revising the introductory language of the policy from "proposals will be strongly encouraged to" to "proposals will be encouraged to" Revising criteria a.to "build up to the street edges or align with the facade of existing character defining buildings" Revising criteria b. to "consider views to City Hall as identified on Schedule DH-4 and the use of corner setbacks at the corner of Brock and Ontario Streets to maintain views to City Hall along Ontario Street;" Revising criteria d.to "consider the use of mid-block walkways and courtyards as illustrated on Schedule DH-3." 	<p>a) Site specific changes are not being contemplated as part of the comprehensive Official Plan update. The requested revisions would need to proceed by way of an owner-initiated Official Plan Amendment to accommodate a full and transparent <i>Planning Act</i> process. Comments on the requested revisions are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language is site-specific and is intentionally directive (no change); 10A.5.2.a) is intended to support the character defining elements outlined in the 2007 Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines, as such, the proposed revision is not appropriate (no change); The proposed revision to 10A.5.2.b) would compromise the intent of the policy which is to maintain a view to the City Hall cupola as identified from a view point along Ontario Street (illustrated in Schedule DH-4) (no change); The policy language in 10A.5.2.d) (i.e., "explore the potential") is enabling in intent (no change).
22.	T. Dawes	2015-07-31	Renewable Energy	a) The presence of the solar farm uses on land leased by corporations is not indicated on any of the maps. However, they are going to have a huge impact on the rural area. The City has to be able to show quickly that impact to others. Suggests a separate file and overlays available to top over existing maps.	a) The City does not have the ability to regulate through Official Plan policy the siting of solar farms as such is a Provincial matter. Identifying solar farms within the City's Official Plan schedules is accordingly discouraged. That said, the City monitors the siting of solar projects, particularly as municipalities must be consulted when a green energy project is proposed.
23.	J. McFarlane, Weston Consulting	2015-08-06	Site Specific	<p><i>Comments regarding 2685 Creekford Road.</i></p> <p>a) Concerns regarding the inclusion of employment area policies that prescribe floor space thresholds and phasing, specifically tied to complementary uses. Provide that given the variability of market conditions, land ownership, parcel sizes, transportation accessibility and connectivity and the desire to achieve complete and mixed use communities, the prescriptive nature of proposed OP policies (stemming from 2015 Employment Land Strategy Review) could</p>	a) Staff have included additional policy direction to implement the findings of the Employment Land Strategy Review and to also offer some flexibility for the inclusion, location and timing of complementary uses, especially on larger land holdings. Please refer to Sections 3.6.12 through 3.6.14 of the third draft of the Official Plan update.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				become problematic. OP policies should provide appropriate policy direction to protect employment lands but also provide the appropriate degree of flexibility in order to maintain their diversity and viability.	
24.	F. Dixon	2015-08-06 2015-09-15 2016-02-23	Transportation Wellington Extension UNESCO	<p>a) Proposed the “Dixon Plan” to create a comprehensive solution to improved traffic flow and efficiency in the sectors immediately north of downtown Kingston, particularly for north-and-south flowing traffic.</p> <p>b) What exactly is the southern boundary of the Rideau Corridor UNESCO World Heritage site? Does it cover the Kingston Inner Harbour, for example?</p> <p>c) Third Crossing: When the construction for this bridge gets going, there is the possibility of discovering unknown archeological resources -- both underwater and along the banks of the river. Has the City thought about this situation in any depth as of yet, and if so, what has been decided?</p> <p>d) Proposed the “Dixon Plan” as an alternative to the Wellington Street Extension</p>	<p>a) Thank you for the submission. However, these proposed changes are outside of the scope of this Official Plan update and would have to be assessed through a comprehensive transportation engineering review.</p> <p>b) The southern limit of the Rideau Canal World Heritage designation is the north side of the LaSalle Causeway; therefore, it includes the Kingston Inner Harbour.</p> <p>c) Thank you for the question. However, this issue is outside the scope of the Official Plan update and should be directed to the Engineering department for their review as part of the Third Crossing project.</p> <p>d) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p>
25.	Kingston Home Builders Association	2015-08-12	Density Stable/Intensification Affordable Housing Student Housing Public Space Estate Residential	<p>a) How will the City implement the 40 percent intensification target for new residential development?</p> <p>b) It is likely that residential intensification will exceed the greenfield (ground-oriented) residential trend for the foreseeable future, particularly considering some of the high density, infill projects proposed in the Williamsville District. How will the City monitor the percentage attributed to “intensification” and what does the City plan to do in the event that greater than 40 percent of new residential development occurs through such growth? Will this be measured on the basis of dwelling units (counts)?</p> <p>c) How does the City expect to implement the “affordable housing” target noted in section 3.3.10?</p> <p>d) What is the anticipated timing of the <i>Central Kingston Residential Intensification Study</i>?</p> <p>e) Section 3.8.14.b) note that lands may be “encumbered” by an easement pertaining to below-grade servicing which does not physically impede the use of parkland;</p> <p>f) Is the City planning to incorporate the <i>Rural Estate Lot Development</i> recommendations coming out of Ruth Fergusson Aulhouse’s planning study? If yes, why have these not been incorporated into the draft OP?</p>	<p>a) The city is already achieving more than 40% intensification; please refer to the Growth Management Technical Brief in the Appendix to the Official Plan Background Report for details.</p> <p>b) Intensification (as defined in the PPS) is counted as any additional residential units or non-residential square footage within the existing built-up area of Kingston. The percentage is calculated as the proportion of this to the total residential units or non-residential square footage developed city-wide. If the City continues to achieve more than the 40 percent minimum target, then that issue will be reviewed when the City’s population, housing and employment projections are next updated, prior to the next five-year update of the Official Plan.</p> <p>c) As referenced in Sections 9.12.2.c and 9.12.3.d of the Official Plan, the City requires the applicant to provide a housing affordability analysis.</p> <p>d) A policy has been added to Section 2.3 to recognize the need to evaluate residential intensification, stemming from the findings of the Central Accommodation Review, in the areas near to the campuses of Queen’s University and St. Lawrence College.</p> <p>e) The policy is intentionally flexible and will allow for consideration of parkland dedication despite the existence of below-grade servicing. The City’s Parkland Dedication By-law should also be considered to better-understand the constraints associated with dedicating parkland to the municipality.</p> <p>f) At this point, the only implementation that will come out of the Estate Residential Review into the five-year Official Plan update is an amendment to Schedule 13 (Detailed Planning Areas) to recognize the</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					proposed “Waterfront Area Designation” locations conceptually as a Future Planning Study Area. Now that the Waterfront Master Plan has been completed, the Waterfront Area Designation special policy area study will commence later this year. Any proposed policy changes from the remainder of the Estate Residential Review and the special policy area study for the proposed Waterfront Area Designation would be done through a separate Official Plan Amendment.
26.	King’s Town Development Corporation (Martin Skolnick)	2015-08-24	Urban Boundary Site Specific	a) Requested that his property on Highway 2 East, which is adjacent to the existing Urban Boundary, be given consideration for inclusion in the boundary.	a) Planning work leading into the Official Plan update, summarised in the Five-Year Official Plan Update Background Report prepared by Dillon Consulting (dated May 11, 2015), demonstrates that an expansion to the existing Urban Boundary is not warranted. Information Report PC-15-103 to the Planning Committee further identifies that Council has confirmed that no new expansion areas will be added to the urban boundary.
27.	M. Keene, FOTENN (on behalf of Springer Group of Companies)	2015-09-03 2015-11-05	Employment Lands Site Specific	<p>a) Concern regarding the new policies on complementary uses that are permitted to locate within Employment Areas. It is beneficial to develop complementary land uses in advance of principle land uses as a means to attract anchor tenants. Proposed policy 3.6.14 does not reference entrances/gateways to industrial and business parks. Concern with this policy is that it could impact the ability of parcels that are not within 300 metres to include a complementary use component, which is a factor in attracting anchor tenants. We contend that the existing policies which limit commercial uses to 25% of a site is sufficient and easily controlled through zoning and site plan control applications. Hotels should be included as a primary use, not as a complementary use – they have a large footprint and the 25% maximum would limit the development of other complementary uses.</p> <p>b) Business Park Permitted Uses: It is requested that the City consider adding warehousing as a permitted use within this designation. Warehousing does not create substantial exterior noise, odour, or other related disturbances that could impact adjacent sensitive uses. Former Pittsburgh Township By-Law 32-74 includes warehousing within the Business Park zone and we suggest this business park is functioning very well by the fact the City wishes to expand it.</p> <p>c) Gardiners Road Dual Designation: The Business Park designation along Gardiners Road currently does not reflect property boundaries; whereby the rear portion of properties may be designated as General Industrial, while the fronting portion is designated as Business Park Industrial. In the case of a corner lot where there is frontage provided to both designations, this is not such an issue. In the case of a non-corner lot, the dual-designation can be challenging to implement. In effect, the dual-designation requires that the rear portion of lots be developed for</p>	<p>a) Staff have included additional policy direction to implement the findings of the Employment Land Strategy Review and to also offer some flexibility for the inclusion, location and timing of complementary uses, especially on larger land holdings. Please refer to Sections 3.6.12 through 3.6.14 of the third draft of the Official Plan update.</p> <p>b) As part of the policy review undertaken by staff following the completion of the Employment Land Strategy Review, warehousing has been added as a light industrial use in the Business Park designation, provided all operations are contained within an enclosed building. Please refer to Section 3.6.A.1 for the specific wording changes.</p> <p>c) The Employment Land Strategy Review noted that there are a limited number of vacant parcels remaining on the Gardiners Road frontage. The designation(s) of parcels along Gardiners Road was not identified as an issue through the Employment Land Strategy Review, and the study made no recommendations for any changes to land use designations for properties in this area. Therefore, no changes have been made to Land Use Schedule 3-A as part of the Official Plan update.</p> <p>d) The City is not including site specific re-designations as part of the OP update unless such is recommended as part of a completed policy study, approved by Council. The designation(s) of parcels along Midland Avenue was not identified as an issue through the Employment Land Strategy Review, and the study made no recommendations for any changes to land use designations for properties in this area. Therefore, no changes have been made to Land Use Schedule 3-A as part of the Official Plan update.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>general industrial purposes while the fronting portion of lots be developed for business park uses. This would require heavier traffic, such as larger trucks, to gain access to industrial areas by crossing through business park areas on the same lot, which could create conflicts and safety concerns. We recommend that the City consider taking a proactive approach by examining where properties contain a dual-designation and determine if it is appropriate. This would save landowners and developers from having to undertake administrative Official Plan Amendments at significant cost.</p> <p>d) Orphan Industrial Designation: Our clients own a large portion of land designated as General Industrial along Midland Avenue. This location has not proven to be attractive for a General Industrial use, and it is requested that the City consider re-designation to Business Park Industrial. We believe this is appropriate when considering the Location Criteria for Business Park Industrial (Policy 3.6.A.4).</p> <p>e) 1370 John Counter Boulevard: The property at 1370 John Counter Boulevard is designated as Business Park Industrial as well as including a small area designated as Residential along the southern edge of the property boundary. It is requested that the residentially designated portion be redesignated as Business Park Industrial to reflect the rest of the site. This property has recently undergone an application for zoning by-law amendment to rezone the entire property for business park use.</p> <p>f) 655 Dalton Avenue: This property is designated as Business Park Industrial. This location presents itself as an opportunity for a gateway development into the City of Kingston. The gateways at Gardiners Road and Division Street allow for a variety of commercial and hospitality services. The properties at Sir John A. Macdonald and the 401 should have further development permissions similar to these other gateways. We are of the opinion that 655 Dalton should be recognized as a prime location for hotel anchored development.</p> <p>g) A recent OPA has revised the Business Park Industrial Designation along Gardiners Road and this should be incorporated into the update.</p>	<p>e) The City is not including site specific re-designations as part of the OP update unless such is recommended as part of a completed policy study, approved by Council. The designation of the parcel of land at 1370 John Counter Boulevard was not identified through the Employment Land Strategy Review, and the study made no recommendations for any changes to land use designations for this property. Also, this property is part of the Alcan District, which has been identified as the location for a future secondary plan. Therefore, no changes have been made to Land Use Schedule 3-A as part of the Official Plan update.</p> <p>f) Site-specific designation changes are not being considered as part of the comprehensive OP update.</p> <p>g) Any recently approved Official Plan Amendments (text and/or mapping changes) have been consolidated into the Official Plan as part of this update.</p>
28.	C. Johanson	2015-09-14	Public Space Site Specific	a) Please do your utmost to remove Polson Park from the area that the City has targeted for intensification.	b) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report (Infill and Intensification).
29.	C. Hargreaves	2015-09-20	Woodland EIA	<p>a) It appears that the term Significant Woodland will have a different meaning in the revised Official Plan than it does in the current Official Plan. Why is this change in meaning not clearly stated in the Definitions?</p> <p>b) Also note that the 50ha figure is not stated in the 2014 Provincial Policy</p>	<p>a) As mentioned in the Five Year Official Plan Update Background Report, the definition of Significant Woodlands has been changed mostly due to the updates in the Provincial Policy Statement (2014).</p> <p>b) The Provincial Policy Statement now requires that, at a minimum, Significant Woodlands “be identified using criteria established by the</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>Statement, which only refers to “criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources”.</p> <p>c) Why, under the revised section 6.1.11/“new” 6.1.19, the “Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment” prepared by the CRCA will no longer be attached as an Appendix to the Official Plan? Although the Guidelines in the current Appendix A are generally similar to the requirements in the current section 6.1.11/“new” 6.1.19, they are also different in potentially significant respects: for example, the Guidelines require that the professional preparing an EIA shall “have an understanding of the natural heritage system of the Cataraqui Region” – the regulations do not require this.</p>	<p>Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources”. These criteria are established in the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (2nd Edition) available here: http://www.ontario.ca/document/natural-heritage-reference-manual. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) recommends a threshold of 50ha. Staff have compared the Significant Woodland criteria from the MNR to the criteria for woodlands developed in the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study (CCRNHS) from 2006. Since the criteria in the CCRNHS were found to be more comprehensive, the reference to the CCRNHS has been retained in the Official Plan in order to preserve as much woodland as possible.</p> <p>c) It is the intent to remove the guidelines from the appendix of the Official Plan and make them available on the City’s website. There are other guidelines referenced in the Official Plan, including urban design guidelines and the guidelines for preparing many studies other than the EIA. As mentioned in the Official Plan Update Background Report, in a modern planning environment, these guidelines may change frequently, so it is not advisable to append them to the Official Plan. It will be more convenient if the guidelines are all available through a single portal on the City website so that the Official Plan is not impacted if new guidelines are written or when guidelines are updated.</p>
30.	E. Rapaport	2015-09-25	Population Projections	<p>a) Was the Sept 2013 City Of Kingston And Kingston CMA Population, Housing and Employment Projections Study used to update the Official Plan consolidated May 2015? How does the Official Plan in section 2.2.3 relate back to the September 2013 projection report?</p>	<p>a) The 2013 City of Kingston and Kingston CMA Population, Housing and Employment Projections Study is currently not reflected in the May 2015 consolidation of the Official Plan (OP). The May 2015 version was an office consolidation containing all of the Official Plan Amendments approved to date (listed at the front of the OP). Results from the study will be incorporated into the Official Plan as part of this five-year Official Plan update.</p>
31.	G. Wright	2015-09-28	Terminology	<p>a) Very interested to see the Definitions enhanced to include definitions for words and terms such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bed and Breakfast (the current Plan is good on this one) • Business • Commercial • Office • Residence • Residential Dwelling Unit • Estate <p>b) There must be one set of Definitions and not a set in the Official Plan and then a 2nd set in the By-laws, otherwise chaos will result as definitions might differ.</p>	<p>a) Many of the definitions included in the Official Plan are quoted directly from the Provincial Policy Statement. When the Official Plan requires a specific definition to clarify the intent of the policies, a definition is provided. Where the meaning of a term is clear, certain and not susceptible to doubt, there is no definition provided because the City relies on the commonly accepted meaning. Furthermore, since land uses are constantly evolving, terms like “business”, “commercial” and “office” are better left to the commonly accepted meaning to ensure the City has the ability to rely on the general intent of the term in the Official Plan as new land uses are established.</p> <p>b) As described in Issue 6 of Section 2.0 of this Report, the purpose of the Official Plan is to provide a broad policy framework for land use decisions in the City, which is meant to be implemented by detailed Zoning By-laws, other municipal by-laws, guidelines and other relevant governing documents adopted by Council. There may be instances</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					where the definitions in the implementing documents provide greater detail than those in the Official Plan. The implementing documents must conform with the Official Plan and not conflict with it, but they are permitted to provide greater detail where it is required and appropriate.
32.	Anne	2015-09-28	Wellington Extension	a) In the second draft of the OP update, will there be any changes to the wording around the Wellington Street Extension in this draft, to indicate that one of council's strategic priorities is to look for alternatives to the road, and that some doubt exists as to whether the Wellington Street Extension will/should be completed.	a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.
33.	K. Dantzer, CaraCo Development Corporation	2015-10-06	Affordable Housing Terminology	<p>a) Affordable Housing should be defined separately from social housing, subsidized housing, and other "Below Affordable" housing.</p> <p>b) Please provide a sample calculation of 3.3.10.</p>	<p>a) The definition of affordability has been updated to be consistent with that in the Provincial Policy Statement. As well, a new definition of "Core Housing Need" has been added to the Official Plan using the definitions of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and in accordance with the City's 10-Year Municipal Housing and Homelessness Plan. The definition is as follows: "A household that falls below at least one of the adequacy, affordability, or suitability standards and that would have to spend more than 30 percent of its gross income to pay the accommodation costs for alternative local housing that is acceptable, i.e., meets all three of the following housing standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adequate housing does not require any major repairs, as reported by residents; b. Affordable housing costs less than 30 percent of gross household income for low and moderate income households; and c. Suitable housing has enough bedrooms for the size and make-up of resident households, according to National Occupancy Standard requirements. <p>b) An example for the calculation of affordable ownership housing is as follows:</p> <p>Option 1: Purchase price is 10% below the average purchase price in the regional market area.</p> <p>Average price for 2015 was \$292,977¹ therefore a unit priced at or below \$263,679 would be considered affordable.</p> <p>Option 2: Accommodation costs at 30% of gross annual income for low and moderate income households.</p> <p>An affordable unit would be approximately \$291,500 including</p>

¹ As of November, 2015 (<http://creastats.crea.ca/king/>)

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					<p>GST/HST, based on the following assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Income level for Kingston households in the 6th decile is approximately \$82,000²;- \$350/month for property taxes;- \$300/month for utilities, including heat, hydro, water;- Therefore, the monthly mortgage payments can be approximately: \$1,400³;- 5% mortgage rate amortized over 25 years; and,- 10% down payment. <p>This was calculated using the following online tools: http://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/en/co/buho/buho_005.cfm, and, http://www.canadamortgage.com/calculators/affordability.cgi.</p> <p>For example, if the applicant was planning a 20 unit development, they would show that at least 5 of the 20 units are designed to be priced at or below \$291,500 including GST/HST.</p> <p>Note that this is intended as an example only, and that many of the inputs (such as income levels and mortgage lending rates) change over time.</p>
34.	B. Carr Email Oct. 13, 2015	2015-10-13	Barriefield Highway 15 UNESCO Stable/Intensification Planning Process	<p>a) Add Hwy 15 and Hwy 2 near Barriefield Village to the list of streets in 3.3.C.2. to protect the heritage district and the UNESCO site. At present these vacant lands are owned by the DND or the City (the rock garden park), but they (especially the DND lands) might pass into private hands in the future.</p> <p>b) Make it more difficult for City Council to grant Official Plan Amendments to better protect Stable Neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>a) We will review the list of roads and revise if necessary. Barriefield is protected under the Ontario Heritage Act through its designation as a Heritage Conservation District.</p> <p>b) The City is exploring intensification issues further. There may be some additional clarification to the intensification, stable areas, and/or areas in transition policies. A policy that discourages development that is arbitrary or out-of-scale with the existing area in terms of height, bulk, massing, or architectural character will be added. Additionally, a policy addressing height as appropriate subject matter to be studied and regulated in a secondary plan will be added to Section 9.7.2.</p>
35.	J. Bowie	2015-10-14	Williamsville Student Housing	<p>a) A recent publication from Queen’s University (the Comprehensive Housing Review) indicates that there is no shortage of student housing. Hundreds of student housing units along Princess Street are not needed and will undermine the goals of the Williamsville Main Street</p>	<p>a) By strengthening the Official Plan policies around what is and what is not appropriate intensification (see Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report) the City hopes to better control development along Princess Street. Development is intended to proceed according to the</p>

² Based on Statistics Canada tables: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/famil107a-eng.htm>, and <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/famil107a-eng.htm>, and assuming that the income distribution pattern in Kingston matches the pattern of the Province of Ontario.

³ “Affordable” Monthly mortgage payment: $82000/12 \times 0.3 - (300 + 350) = 1400$



No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				Study.	Williamsville Main Street Study. It is not within the City's control to dictate the demographic that a developer chooses to market their product to; instead the City must focus on the use and form of development. It should also be noted that Section 3.3.D.12 specifies that housing must be designed and built to be viable for a wider rental market.
36.	M. Rowghani	2015-10-18 2015-10-26 2016-02-19 2016-04-24	Transportation Green Building Sustainability Renewable Energy	<p>a) 30% of GHG emissions in the city are from transportation. The city has not initiated leadership by example by promoting the use of hybrid vehicles in order to reduce fuel consumption in the transportation sector. Instead, the Official Plan is planning to make about 16 major road expansions which means that planners have predicted the need of more roads for accommodating more cars in the near future and as a result "business as usual". Provides suggestions on ways to address GHG emissions. One of the goals of the OP is to reduce "reliance on automobile", but it promotes car dependency by widening roads and adding more on-road parking.</p> <p>b) The official plan cannot ask more than what the building code requires for new buildings when it comes to the use of renewable energy technologies. It can promote or subsidise renewable energies which will help to make buildings "carbon neutral" by 2020.</p> <p>c) The Official Plan does a good job of attempting to avoid sprawl and make the city more compact and efficient.</p> <p>d) When it comes to dealing with climate change, one can expect that City Council would put more effort and resources towards achieving the GHG emissions reduction target by 2020. The City should aggressively promote renewable energy.</p> <p>e) Provided examples of ways to reduce GHG emissions from various websites.</p> <p>f) Even though, the term "sustainable" has been used 56 times in the second draft (like the first one), the document falls short of doing enough to fight effectively against climate change which is one of the most challenging issues that the humanity is facing in this century. It's goal is to make Kingston the foremost sustainable city in the continent and intends to do its part to fight against the climate change, but does not promote aggressively use of renewable energy, which is one of the best ways to reduce fossil fuel dependency.</p> <p>g) One of the official plan goals is to make new residential buildings carbon neutral by 2020. This plan does not explain in detail how this goal will be achieved. There is no doubt that energy efficiency can play a big role in GHG emission reduction in new residential units. However, new houses won't be carbon neutral if they don't produce in somehow</p>	<p>a) The OP addresses climate change mitigation and adaptation as well as sustainability. See Section 2.1 – Sustainable Development, 2.10 - Resiliency, and 4 – Infrastructure and Transportation. More roads are anticipated, but change from 'business as usual' is also being encouraged. In Section 2.5 – Phasing of Municipal Infrastructure and Transportation, the stated goal is to provide all areas within the Urban Boundary a full range of municipal infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycling routes, public transportation and roads over the long term, through orderly extension or expansion. Widening to the municipal road allowance is being pursued as a means of accommodating alternative modes of transit (e.g., sidewalks for walking and bicycle lanes for cycling).</p> <p>b) The Official Plan and the Ontario Building Code are independent documents. However, multiple policies in the OP to promote sustainability and renewable energy technologies. For examples, see Section 6.2 – Energy Conservation and Production for general support and 9.5.25 for policies authorizing an increase in height or density for buildings with conservation initiatives beyond the OBC.</p> <p>c) Comment received with thanks.</p> <p>d) The OP contains numerous policies to encourage sustainability and renewable energy. For example, please see 2.1 – Sustainable Development and 6.2 – Energy Conservation and Production – for a range of policies addressing sustainability.</p> <p>e) Thank you for the information. Please also see 2.1 – Sustainable Development and 6.2 – Energy Conservation and Production to review some of the relevant OP policies.</p> <p>f) Staff believe that the OP establishes a robust framework as it relates to supporting sustainability. The Plan works in concert with a number of other local initiatives including the City's Climate Action Plan and Active Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>g) The Official Plan is a high-level document, comprised of goals, objectives and policies that are intended to direct physical change and growth. Reaching carbon neutrality requires the coordination of numerous actors and goes beyond the reach of the Official Plan alone. For example, the Ontario Building Code will have to be modified and funding programs delivered by multiple levels of government and through energy agencies to have movement in this arena. For its part,</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>the energy that they use for lighting, heating and cooling.</p> <p>h) Official plan encourages installation of roof top solar panels for generating electricity or thermal energy (heat). But does not specify the kind of encouragement offered by the plan to make it attractive enough to developers. Since solar panel installation on roof tops is not mandated by Ontario building code and If the official plan intends to make renewable energy use a reality, there is an immediate need to provide strong incentives such as tax incentives for "climate stewardship" as it is offered for the "land stewardship" in this plan. The only way to convince the developers to include renewable energy in their design is to give them strong incentives such as tax incentives as it is offered for the "Land Stewardship" in the OP. Fighting against the climate change requires also widespread use of renewable energy and reduction of fossil fuel consumption. The OP should take aggressive measures to promote solar panel installation on new rooftops.</p> <p>i) Official plan has predicted that the city will need 9,110 new residential units until 2036. Assuming that all these units will be carbon neutral by 2036, what will happen to the GHG emissions from existing dwelling units that counted for 73,889 in CMA in 2011 and generated 270,890 tonnes of CO2 in the same year? If this plan does not address GHG emission generated by existing residential buildings, there won't be that much difference in the course of "business as usual".</p> <p>j) On one hand, the OP plans to make the city more compact, but on the other hand it promotes urban sprawl. The OP does a good job by promoting intensification and making the city more compact. However, it is also encouraging urban sprawl by dedicating majority of housing district areas to low residential density in the east and west of the city (see schedule CW1 and RC1). Instead of choosing the European type of intensification, it is adapting the controversial North American model of urbanization. In Europe, wide spread of mix medium density of land use allowed the cities to use more efficiently infrastructures, increase active transportation, support small businesses and safeguard their cultural heritage. Instead, North American High-rise and skyscraper model of urbanization has increased infrastructure cost, car dependency and heat islands. In addition, possible development of the "future development areas" can also encourages urban sprawl. Another source of urban sprawl could be development in rural area within the Municipal Boundary where the single dwelling units are permitted with some conditions. Above development polices definitely encourage car dependency and seem not be aligned with the energy and resource conservation policy of the city.</p> <p>k) By allowing 20 story residential buildings in downtown Kingston, the official plan will fail to conserve effectively Kingston downtown cultural</p>	<p>the Corporation of the City of Kingston has committed to lead by example in its building projects, with new buildings targeted for LEED certification.</p> <p>h) As noted above, the Plan must be implemented through specific government and agency initiatives that support the broad objectives of this over-arching policy document.</p> <p>i) The Official Plan contains enabling policies that support opportunities for energy efficient building design (e.g., 2.1.7, 3.4.17, 6.2). These policies are reviewed against applications for development which such applications are subjected to a Planning Act process (e.g., minor variance, zoning by-law amendment, etc.). The Plan cannot be used to necessitate change when a Planning Act application is not made (e.g., building permit only); however, it is a document that defines the expectations of a community and accordingly the desire to achieve improved energy efficiencies.</p> <p>j) The Official Plan encourages a mix of housing densities and land use types in an effort to establish 'complete communities'. See for example Sections 2.3 (Intensification), (Secondary Planning Areas), 3.3 (Neighbourhood Commercial), 3.3 (Green Building Design Features). Secondary plans such as the Williamsville Main Street Study, provide direction regarding built form, which is comprised of a mix of uses and densities. Future Development Areas have been removed from the Plan in light of direction provided by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.</p> <p>k) See Section 2.0 – Issue 1 – Intensification. Applications for 20-storey buildings are considered against the policies of the Official Plan. The inclusion of affordable housing is sought as a target but is not required within the policy framework due to legislative constraints. "Inclusionary zoning" is a matter currently under review by the Province. This may enable municipalities to require the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>l) The Official Plan is a document used to guide land use decisions. It works in tandem with other policy documents formulated by the City and Utilities Kingston. For further insights into infrastructure and transportation policies, please see the Kingston Transportation Master Plan (2015) and the Sewage Infrastructure Master Plan (2010)</p> <p>m) The OP considers the Third Crossing as a potential future linkage, the feasibility of which is being considered through an environmental assessment process.</p> <p>n) Information is appreciated and will be considered in light of other municipal initiatives that will help inform future OP policies.</p> <p>o) As noted above, road widening are intended to accommodate a variety of users and options for active transportation.</p> <p>p) Opportunities to support alternative modes of travel will be considered</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>heritage, will not help creating an affordable housing and it won't decrease car dependency because of dominant low paid jobs in downtown service sector and unaffordable housing in this area. Affordable housing in Kingston down town and princess corridor could discourage car dependency because they would be affordable to people who work in that area. I would set a limit to the height of new buildings in down town area to conserve Kingston architectural and cultural heritage. Many tourists come to Kingston to visit beauty of our down town not North American high rises.</p> <p>l) While one of the ambitious goals of the plan is to make Kingston one of the "foremost sustainable cities on the continent", the official plan priorities don't reflect that goal. For example, the City still dumps overflow wastewater/ sewer water into the lake on occasion but there is nothing in the plan to address the problem. There are many unsustainable infrastructure projects including street widening/extensions or the third crossing which didn't have an environmental assessment with regard to climate change, but the plan has included entire projects in the plan.</p> <p>m) Defends "fiscally prudent manners" in infrastructure including road investments, but recognizes the third crossing as a "strategic new transportation facility" which benefits a minority of people but will be a tax burden for all kingstonians.</p> <p>n) Several studies have confirmed that conventional congestion reduction policies such as road widening/extensions, bridge constructions etc. are not effective in a medium and long term planning. Instead, they increase car trips and encourage car dependency. In fact, every lane of new road allows about 1000 more cars/km to get to the widened/extended roads. Car dependency also will be intensified by parking availability. Both policies provide a more comfortable condition to people to chose driving modal rather than using transit or active transportation. Road construction is carbon intensive. Every additional lane/km adds 103 to 3234 tonnes of co2 into the atmosphere. Each urban road (single lane) generates in average 80.2 t. co2 annually.</p> <p>o) One of the documents used by the OP is Kingston Transportation Master Plan 2015 (KTMP) which is a road-centric plan that asks for \$500 million to be spent on roads including the proposed Third Crossing. Unfortunately, the OP is adopting the obsolete policies of KTMP and asking for at least 52 road widening/extension and a minimum allowance of 20 meters for new roads to provide among other things on-road parking. This policy is not sustainable and fails to reduce energy consumption and to cut GHG emissions.</p> <p>p) The car-centric policy of OP has ignored the use of new technologies such as electric cars and specially driverless cars in transportation</p>	<p>as part of a forthcoming Active Transportation Master Plan. The recommendations coming out of the Plan will be considered in making further amendments to the Plan, separate from the comprehensive five-year update.</p> <p>q) Increased connectivity across the Rideau Canal has the potential to enhance transit coverage in an area for which there is only one means of connecting east to west (i.e., LaSalle Causeway). Property values are not considered a land use planning matter; however, with increased access comes the potential to support an intensified use of land and the optimal delivery of public services. The lands connected to the third crossing have the potential to be more intensively used than those currently underserved by public transit and a mix of uses, more prevalent west of the Canal.</p> <p>r) The Official Plan is a high level policy document that is not intended to get into the specifics of infrastructure design. Plans for the third crossing have been contemplated through the City's Development Charges Background Study. The Environmental Assessment for the project has been completed and, as directed by Council, detailed design is underway to ensure the project is "shovel-ready" should funding for the project be made available.</p> <p>s) Thank you for the comments. Enhancements to pedestrian connections and active modes of transportation are considered within the Official Plan.</p> <p>t) It is the City's practice to evaluate costs when advancing capital projects. Revisions have; however, been made to Section 9.11.2 to clarify the intent of this policy.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>which cut GHG emissions dramatically or they do not need wider roads.</p> <p>q) The third crossing was part of the former City of Kingston's official plan in the last century looking for new lands to develop. At that time climate change was not a real concern and as a result urban intensification did not gain the popularity that enjoys today. The OP is still supporting the obsolete project which is not aligned with the direction of the plan. One of the OP policies is the "reduction of automobile trips". The third crossing does the opposite – car trips between two parts of the City will increase by 22% when the bridge is in place. Major road network developments increase property values. With this understanding new roads or bridges will facilitate accessibility to properties outside of the city core leading to their increase in property value, which will incentivize developers to build in those areas. In other words, the bridge will encourage housing development on the east side of the bridge in low density sites rather than investments in central area with more intensified land use. Investment in a mega project like the third crossing will benefit primarily developers on the east side and drivers who cross the river. Instead, insufficient investment in transit, will encourage car dependency. This situation is unfair to those who cannot afford to buy a vehicle and the only choice that they have is to use an inefficient transit. Public involvement should be made possible by using direct democracy approaches before the council makes the final decision on the construction of this project.</p> <p>r) AECOM consultant reported in 2011 that the only scenario which will satisfy the OP level of service (LOS D) is to build 4 lane third crossing plus the widening of "Counter Boulevard and a new access road connection between CFB Kingston and Gore Road". Instead, City officials are planning to build 2 lane third crossing which, according to the same report, will not solve the congestion at Causeway and as a result 401 will be used as usual. Unfortunately, the OP is silent about this contradiction!</p> <p>s) In order to encourage transit ridership, it is necessary to provide crosswalk with lighting on the top on arterial roads which also calm the traffic. For example on Bath Road between Sir John A and Portsmouth Ave. and on the Princess street between Bath road and Gardiners road.</p> <p>t) Fiscal prudent policy requires that a cost benefit analysis be prepared for development and capital projects of the City to help the council to make right decisions. I would remove the amendment to the 9.11.2. I believe project's carbon price should be also included in the cost benefit analysis for all projects inside or outside of the city boundary.</p>	
37.	D. Imator	2015-10-19	Right-of-Way	<p>a) Section 4, Table 1 indicates that the ROW width for Princess Street is 20 to 25 metres throughout the City limits. Is this wording from the</p>	<p>a) The planned road allowance width for Princess Street, from Lake Ontario to the westerly limit of the City (i.e., post-amalgamation</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>original City OP where the westerly limit was the CN tracks/ Counter Street? There are existing 4-lane portions of Princess St.</p> <p>b) For the 4-lane portions of Princess, 25 metres is quite narrow and may be hard to fit in all of the desired infrastructure and amenities. Consideration for increasing recommended ROW widths on Princess (even west of Bath Road) should be considered to allow future upgrades for bike lanes, sidewalks, boulevard, etc.</p>	<p>boundary of the municipality), is 20 to 25 metres. There are existing portions of Princess Street which exceed this requirement – this policy will only be applied to the portions of Princess that are less than the planned road allowance.</p> <p>b) The City's Engineering Department has confirmed that 20 to 25 metres is the current desired road allowance width for Princess Street. If future studies determine that an increase is required to accommodate future upgrades, then amendments to the Official Plan may be considered at that time. The City is pursuing the completion of an Active Transportation Plan that will explore opportunities to accommodate multiple modes of travel.</p>
38.	N. Roberts	2015-10-19	Site Specific	<p>a) Redesignate 655 Graceland Ave (at Bath Road & Bayridge Drive) from Residential to Open Space to provide green space to residents of the area.</p>	<p>a) The Planning Division is processing applications for ZBLA (D14-041-2013) and Draft Plan of Subdivision (D12-010-2013) at the noted property. The lands are currently designated Residential. The proposed development includes a block for parkland dedication, which would be zoned as open space and made available to the public.</p>
39.	M. Rogalsky	2015-10-19	Wellington Extension	<p>a) The Doug Fluhrer Park should be maintained as it is and public access to the waterfront should be protected.</p> <p>b) The Wellington Street Extension is not needed to alleviate traffic congestion.</p>	<p>a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p> <p>b) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p>
40.	Susan Millar, Parks Canada	2015-10-19 2015-11-19	UNESCO Transportation Terminology	<p>a) The southern limit of the Rideau Canal World Heritage Site is the north side of the LaSalle Causeway.</p> <p>b) Schedule 4 – Transportation indicates that the EA for the Third Crossing Bridge over the Cataraqui Bridge is complete, there are still several matters outstanding.</p> <p>c) Schedule 9- Heritage - Add a text label to Fort Henry. Indicate that the Martello Towers are part of the UNESCO World Heritage Site.</p> <p>d) Retitle Section 3.10.A. & 7.3.A to Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site.</p> <p>e) Remove the term “living museum” from the description of the site in 3.10.A. and clarify that not all shorelines are included in the site.</p> <p>f) Clarify the Parks Canada Jurisdiction in Section 3.10.A. and 7.3.A.1. It does not extend to the high water mark, however there is a 30m buffer zone surrounding the site.</p> <p>g) Under “Goal” change the word “designation” to “site.”</p> <p>h) Request to consider adding locations for heritage tourism or nature</p>	<p>a) Thank you. This is reflected in the OP Mapping and Text.</p> <p>b) The EA is complete and this is reflected in the policy.</p> <p>c) Thank you, changes made.</p> <p>d) Thank you, change made.</p> <p>e) Thank you, changes made.</p> <p>f) Thank you, changes made.</p> <p>g) Thank you, change made.</p> <p>h) We have reviewed the map. It is useful to inform future work and will be retained for this purpose instead of incorporating it into the Official Plan mapping.</p> <p>i) Thank you, changes made.</p> <p>j) Thank you, change made.</p> <p>k) Thank you. We have incorporated Parks Canada's Development, Site Alteration & Shoreline Management policies.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>themes to OP Schedule 3 based on a map provided with the correspondence.</p> <p>i) Suggests minor wording change to 3.10.A.4 to improve clarity and editorial change to 3.10.A.5.</p> <p>j) Noted that the Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy was not only the work of Parks Canada but that many other partners were involved.</p> <p>k) Attached sample policies which can be used in Official Plans.</p>	
41.	Councillor J. McLaren	2015-10-22	Cost Benefit Analysis	a) Change 9.11.2 from the City “may” to the City “will” require. The City should not approve developments that will cost the City more to maintain than can be recovered through property taxes.	a) The intent of this policy is to ensure that development proceeds in a phased and orderly fashion in accordance with the phasing strategy for an area. The City has the authority to request a Cost Benefit Analysis if a proposal is not in accordance with the phasing strategy and will require new or upgraded infrastructure and/or maintenance programs. A cost benefit analysis is not required from proposals in areas where they City has identified them as appropriate for intensification, since they are already well served by infrastructure and maintenance programs.
42.	H. Mabee	2015-10-24	Site Specific	a) Does the City have a plan to re-zone the property of the St. Joseph and St. Mary Catholic School that are now closed?	a) The property at 671 Brock Street is designated as Residential in the Official Plan. No changes to the designation are proposed in the Five Year Update to the Official Plan. Publically funded schools are typically designated as Residential, and are also permitted in Rural and Hamlet designations. Please contact the Algonquin Lakeshore Catholic School Board if you have additional questions about the future use of this property.
43.	S.Dick, Rideau Acres Campground	2015-10-27	Site Specific	a) Requesting to ensure permission to operate as a campground although designated “Rural Commercial, Rural, Open Space and Environmental Protection” in the Official Plan.	a) As long as the campground remains operational, it is allowed to continue as a legal non-conforming use.
44.	T. Kelly and M. Dror FOTENN for Infrastructure Ontario/Hydro One Networks Inc. Oct. 28, 2015	2015-10-28	Terminology Energy Generation	<p>a) Please define the terms “utility”, “utilities” and “energy generation systems”</p> <p>b) Please review how the use of terms related to energy generation systems and transmission and distribution systems to ensure consistency.</p> <p>c) Please change policy 6.2.10 (re. energy generation systems, refers to the zoning by-law and option to request Site Plan Control) to provide an exemption for Provincial energy generation systems and transmission and distribution systems.</p>	<p>a) Energy generation systems is a defined term. Where terms are not defined, the plain language or common use of the term applies. The plain language use of utility/utilities adequately conveys the intent of the policies in this case.</p> <p>b) Policies have been reviewed and modified in some cases; if there is a specific section where interpretation is unclear please advise.</p> <p>c) It is in the public interest that provincial energy generation systems and transmission and distribution systems follow the procedures of zoning by law and site plan control in situations where this applies. The policy acknowledges that approval powers may not apply and is</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					enabling in intent.
45.	K. Dantzer, CaraCo Development Corporation	2015-10-28	Site Specific Mineral Resources	<p>a) The land surrounding Elginburg Quarry (Schedule 3-B) shows as Rural and EPA. Does the current application for a quarry expansion include an OPA to change this?</p> <p>b) Can you please clarify what the “Q” symbol means on the Elginburg Quarry?</p> <p>c) Policy is vague around inactive quarry expiry. Add more specific wording requiring “timely” rehabilitation.</p>	<p>a) An application for Official Plan amendment (File number: D09-025-2014) was made concurrent with an application for a Zoning By-law amendment (File number D14-104-2014) to permit the expansion of the Elginburg Quarry.</p> <p>b) The “Q” symbol on Schedule 3-B of the Plan stands for Quarry.</p> <p>c) Section 3.17.7 of the draft Official Plan Update has been revised in response to the comment.</p>
46.	M. Keene Oct. 29, 2015	2015-10-29 2015-11-03	Density Stable/Intensification Student Housing	<p>a) Many people remain concerned with the stable neighbourhood policies and where higher intensity projects will be permitted. Clearer direction is needed, particularly regarding the locational criteria tied to high density residential development (Section 3.3.C.2).</p> <p>b) Is land within the downtown – guided by the downtown and harbour by-law intended to be considered a stable neighbourhood?</p> <p>c) When might the City look at the near campus communities to better define locations for medium / high density developments?</p>	<p>a) Policy revisions have been made to provide clearer direction regarding stable areas and those areas to which high density residential development will be directed.</p> <p>b) As above.</p> <p>c) A policy has been added to Section 2.3 to recognize the need to evaluate residential intensification, stemming from the findings of the Central Accommodation Review, in the areas near to the campuses of Queen’s University and St. Lawrence College. The timing of this work has not yet been decided and will dependent on resource availability.</p>
47.	M. Lloyd	2015-10-29	Wellington Extension	a) I vehemently object to the proposed Wellington Street Extension.	a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.
48.	M. Cole-Hamilton	2015-10-29	Ribbon of Life Terminology Waterfront Site Specific Public Space	<p>a) The document is too large and densely written.</p> <p>b) Specific distances have been removed from the Adjacent Lands definition.</p> <p>c) Definition of EIA seems less strong than previously.</p> <p>d) Second half of 2.8.3 undermines the policy [“Ribbon of Life”].</p> <p>e) 3.9.2. change is satisfactory</p> <p>f) Please remove the word “generally” from 3.10.9.</p> <p>g) 3.18.17(b) site design incorporates the Wellington Street Extension.</p> <p>h) Quotes changes to the Parkland Dedication By-law, that undesirable land will not be conveyed as parkland.</p> <p>i) Proposed development of the old Capitol Cinema at 223 Princess Street does not comply with the Official Plan which indicates that new buildings should be compatible with historic sections of the City.</p> <p>j) The proposed development at the corner of Wellington and Queen Streets is also incompatible.</p> <p>k) Check the numbering in Sections 9 and 10, several Section 10 items</p>	<p>a) The document is technical and covers a wide range of subjects. The approach is to make the policies as clear and straightforward as possible.</p> <p>b) The specific adjacent lands distances have been moved from the definitions into the body of the Official Plan Update in Section 6.1.9.</p> <p>c) The new definition of Environmental Impact Assessment requires the demonstration of no “negative impacts” on the natural features or their ecological functions. This is linked to the terminology used in the Provincial Policy Statement. It is not the intent to make the definition less strong than previously.</p> <p>d) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>e) Thank you.</p> <p>f) Thank you, change will be made.</p> <p>g) The referenced section of the Official Plan contains site-specific policies which do not warrant amendment through the City’s comprehensive update. See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report regarding the proposed Wellington Street Extension.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				appear in Section 9.	<p>h) Comment is acknowledged with thanks. Changes to Section 3.8.14 were made with reference to the Parkland Dedication By-law.</p> <p>i) This comment refers to an application made under the Planning Act that is currently under review. Please see Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>j) This comment refers to an application made under the Planning Act that is currently under review. Please see Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>k) All section references and general formatting of the document will be undertaken upon completion of a final revised Plan”.</p>
49.	A. Loughheed	2015-10-30	Population Projections	<p>a) What is meant by "employed by place of work" in the tables of the 2013 Population, Housing and Employment Projections report (exhibit B), and what makes the numbers so different from the "employment" and "total employed residents" numbers?</p>	<p>a) This is addressed under Employment by Place-of-Work by Industry in Appendix C on Page 2. One data set is the consultant's (SPI), and the employment by place of work is a separate data set (NHS).</p>
50.	S. Jaffrer A. Loughheed, L. Murray. WellingtonX	2015-11-21	Ribbon of Life Waterfront Habitat Secondary Plan Wellington Extension UNESCO Planning Process Open Space	<p>a) Proposed change to 2.8.3. (Ribbon of Life) seems to weaken the protection for the waterfront. In particular the word “legally”.</p> <p>b) Why have the habitats of endangered and threatened species and species tracked from the MNRF been removed from Section 3.10.1</p> <p>c) We appreciate the addition of section 4.6.35.1.</p> <p>d) Please change Section 2.3.5.1. to ensure that residents, tenants, and users of the land – not only owners - should be consulted in the secondary planning process.</p> <p>e) The References to the Wellington Street Extension in Section 3.18.17.b (8 Cataraqui St.) should be removed.</p> <p>f) If the Rideau Canal site extends north from the LaSalle Causeway (section 3.10.A) and has UNESCO World Heritage Designation, then why does the Environmental Protection Area (described in section 3.10.A.1) extend north from Belle Island rather than the causeway? Shouldn't the EPA cover the entire canal?</p> <p>g) Why are the roles of the MNRF and CRCA reduced from “approval” to “consultation” in 6.1.21 to 6.1.24?</p> <p>h) Why “adaptive reuse of built heritage resources” been added as a permitted use in Open Space? Does this mean that buildings can be moved to green space?</p>	<p>a) Please see Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) Endangered species and species at risk information has been further expanded and detailed in the new sections 6.1.5 to 6.1.8. The specific proposed change in 3.10.1 was suggested by the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority, which advised that since either the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) or Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) are able to permit development in a species habitat based on certain conditions or criteria, it should not be included in the Environmental Protection Area designation where development is not permitted.</p> <p>c) Thank you.</p> <p>d) A reference to “other stakeholders” has been added to support open governance and opportunities for consultation and engagement through the secondary planning process. See Section 2.3 Secondary Planning Areas.</p> <p>e) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>f) Policy 3.10.A.1 has been clarified and Schedule 3-A has been revised in response to the comment.</p> <p>g) The changes are proposed to clarify that City Council is the approval authority for applications made under the Planning Act, not the CRCA or MNRF. Both agencies are aware of this wording revision.</p> <p>h) The goal of the policy is to enable existing heritage buildings already existing in Open Space to be adapted for uses such as museums, art</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					galleries, business incubators, etc. The policy has been modified to clarify that the intent is to reuse existing buildings not to relocate cultural heritage resources.
51.	C. Sypnowich, Barriefield Village Association, Coalition of Kingston Community	2015-11-02 2015-12-23 2016-02-23	Barriefield Highway 15 Terminology Heritage Stable/Intensification UNESCO Height Limit Institutional Planning Process	<p>a) The Barriefield section of the plan is brief compared to the Sydenham District section. It is inexplicable why many of the items noted in the Sydenham section (e.g. 'a generally high standard of care and maintenance for buildings and landscapes') that are equally applicable to Barriefield are not also in the Barriefield section.</p> <p>b) The Barriefield section should be more explicit about the key features that give Barriefield its heritage character.</p> <p>c) The "landscape buffer" along Hwy 15 should specify a dimension or should be designated as Open Space. The 'landscaped buffer' along Highway 15 is mentioned with no precise dimensions and gives no indication that it would be any different from the required buffer demarcating other residential areas from Highway 15 elsewhere in Kingston East.</p> <p>d) Mention is made of protecting views of St. Mark's Church from outside the village, but not from within the village other than from its frontage on Main Street. Views of St. Mark's Church should be protected from within the village as well.</p> <p>e) Section 10D.32h allows surplus schools to be automatically redeveloped as Medium Density Residential – this should not be automatic instead it should be a public process (specifically the Horton School property). Request redesignation to Institutional or Special Study Area pending the completion of cultural heritage landscape study.</p> <p>f) Section 2.3. Principles of Growth, and 2.4.5 Intensification Targets, should be modified to indicate that intensification in Heritage Conservation Districts such as Barriefield would not be suitable. Potential policy language to consider 'tipping point' being a point at which new development outnumbers "old" development.</p> <p>g) Highway 2 and 15 near Barriefield should be included in the list of streets that are not appropriate for intensification.</p> <p>h) There are typos as follows – 19 century should be 19th century, St. Mark's should be St. Mark's.</p> <p>i) In general, there is a great deal of concern about the openness of the City to listen and involve residents of Kingston in the planning process, with respect to the Official Plan Review as well as to local planning matters and zoning by-law amendments. The City's approach to citizen</p>	<p>a) Barriefield is protected under the Ontario Heritage Act through its designation as a Heritage Conservation District and through the District Plan. The District Plan is currently under review. Updates may be incorporated into the OP once District Plan revisions are complete and approved by Council.</p> <p>b) An Official Plan amendment may be implemented following the update to the Barriefield HCD Plan to ensure area-specific OP policies are incorporated into the Plan.</p> <p>c) More specific details on the "landscape buffer" would be better to include in the District Plan rather than the Official Plan.</p> <p>d) The protected views in the Official Plan are harmonized with the protected views in the District Plan. Once the revised plan is completed, it may inform further updates to the OP.</p> <p>e) Policy 10D.32h applies to the Cataraqui West secondary plan area only. Any proposals for development in the Barriefield Heritage District will be evaluated against the policies of the Official Plan and the District Plan. Specific changes to private properties are not being considered as part of the comprehensive OP update unless justified as a result of a City-led technical analysis such as the Employment Lands Strategy.</p> <p>f) The protections for Heritage Districts are not overruled by other policies. Development within the District is limited by the policies in the HCD Plan, the Official Plan and the underlying zoning. Policy revisions have been made throughout the Plan to recognize the importance of conserving cultural heritage resources. Compatible development, outlined in Section 2.7, further recognizes the need to protect against the potential degradation of a cultural heritage resource.</p> <p>g) These roads have been added to Section 3.3.C.2.</p> <p>h) Thank you for noting these so that we can correct them.</p> <p>i) Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>j) Section 2.2 speaks to directing intensification to "Centres" which are illustrated in Schedule 2. This policy section must be read in conjunction with other sections which provide additional clarity of policy intent (e.g., Section 10E.1 Williamsville Main Street)</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>participation sometimes seems perfunctory and symbolic, rather than a process to which the City is genuinely committed in order to achieve good city planning. We are looking to the Official Plan Review process for clarified policies and a strengthened commitment to matters such as stable neighbourhoods, environmental sustainability, heritage conservation and meaningful citizen engagement. We see this process as a first step in addressing these related growing concerns and restoring due process in a manner consistent with a genuine commitment to open government.</p> <p>j) The Plan's blanket commitment to intensification, and greater heights and densities at s. 2.2.8, does not consider how high-rises can dwarf the cultural heritage landscape of a city.</p> <p>k) The following should be added to Section 2.3: "For example, in the Heritage Conservation District of Barriefield Village, intensification would not be suitable, given the rural, 19th century character of its cultural heritage landscapes, and the risk that new construction would swamp the existing heritage buildings."</p> <p>l) Section 2.4.5 should be qualified as follows: "the redevelopment of vacant, underutilized, or brownfield sites and infill developments except where cultural heritage resources, existing housing stocks or stable neighbourhoods are at risk; e.g. the open spaces of Barriefield Village are integral to its cultural heritage landscapes and are not good candidates for infill development."</p> <p>m) In Section 3.3.C.2, mention should be made of Highways 2 and 15 where they border Barriefield and the UNESCO-designated heritage sites of Fort Henry and the Rideau Canal system.</p> <p>n) We also need tough, enforced, height restrictions for the downtown such as that observed in the Anna Lane condos.</p> <p>o) We need a good Official Plan, but we also need the will and commitment to follow it from Staff and Council.</p>	<p>k) Section 2.3 offers an overview of the principles of growth affecting the entire City. It is not appropriate to give specific reference to one particular neighbourhood, which received additional policy consideration as a Heritage Conservation District (Section 7.3).</p> <p>l) The policies of Section 2 have been revised throughout to provide greater clarity regarding the intended locations of intensification and the need to evaluate land use compatibility.</p> <p>m) The noted roads have been added.</p> <p>n) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>o) Establishing clarity of policy intent will benefit staff and Council in making decisions that reflect the public interest.</p>
52.	C. London	2015-11-02	Ribbon of Life	a) Can the wording of the "Ribbon of Life" policy be made more clear? The waterfront ecology should be protected.	a) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.
53.	B. Bell	2015-11-02	Waterfront	a) Please do not back away from protecting the waterfront.	a) The waterfront will continue to be protected through Sections such as 2.8.3, 3.9.2 and 9.9.5. Please also see Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.
54.	K. Dantzer	2015-11-02	Right-of-Way	a) Section 4.6.22 change from Right-of-way to road allowance	a) Where appropriate, the use of the term "right-of-way" has been

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				contravenes the on-going “complete street” review.	replaced with “road allowance” throughout the updated Plan for consistency and clarity. It is unclear how the terminology contravenes a review of complete streets.
55.	M. McDiarmid	2015-11-03	Wellington Extension Downtown	<p>a) Kingston should commit to a vibrant, pedestrian focused waterfront. Douglas Fluhrer park needs to be enhanced and not turned into a roadway.</p> <p>b) The historic nature of downtown Kingston should be preserved, the Capitol Theatre development would put this at risk.</p>	<p>a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p> <p>b) The Capitol Theatre project is not being considered in the comprehensive update to the Official Plan.</p>
56.	H. Kaufman	2015-11-03	Downtown	a) I agree with the comments submitted by Friends of the Inner Harbour and Wellington X. Maximum height should be 6 storeys in downtown area but if ample set back and appropriate design, may be 8 storeys.	a) See Issue 4 in Section 2.0 of this Report re: Building Height.
57.	D. Dowling, Pen Farm Herd Co-op and Save our Prison Farm Committee	2015-11-03	Institutional	a) The Collins Bay Institution Farmland should not be considered for residential development and should be preserved as farmland to provide a source of local food.	a) Collin’s Bay Institution will be removed from the list of priority areas for secondary planning as per the Nov 17, 2015 motion from City Councillor Jim Neill.
58.	K. Dantzer, CaraCo Development Corporation	2015-11-03	Right-of-Way	a) The 20 m road allowance is not what the complete streets study recommends (4.6.22).	a) The Complete Streets Study has not been completed and preliminary recommendations/findings have yet to be considered by Council. Policy 4.6.22 of the Official Plan has been revised to clarify that the intent is to allow Staff to review requests for a reduced road allowance on a case-by-case basis if the request for a reduction is substantiated by supporting information to the satisfaction of the City.
59.	G. Tilson	2015-11-03	Wellington Extension Ribbon of Life Habitat	<p>a) Vehemently opposed to the proposed Wellington Street Extension. Instead focus on ambitious transit goals and existing roads.</p> <p>b) Proposed changes to 2.8.3 and 3.9.2 (Ribbon of Life) seem to weaken the protection for Kingston’s Waterfront.</p> <p>c) Why has the habitat of threatened and endangered species been removed from the EPA in 3.10.1?</p>	<p>a) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report</p> <p>b) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>c) Endangered species and species at risk information has been further expanded and detailed in the new sections 6.1.5 to 6.1.8. The specific proposed change in 3.10.1 was suggested by the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority, which advised that since either the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) or Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) are able to permit development in a species habitat based on certain conditions or criteria, it should not be included in the Environmental Protection Area designation where development is not</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					permitted.
60.	C. Woods, KFL&A Food Policy Council	2015-11-03	Sustainability Health	<p>a) Add reference to the four pillars of sustainability.</p> <p>b) Recommend support for local food in section 2.1.8, similar to that in 2.1.7.</p> <p>c) Include direction for municipal waste in section 4.7.</p> <p>d) Use section 9.8.3 to increase access and availability of healthy foods.</p>	<p>a) Thank you. Section 2.1 states the following: “One of the tools to address sustainable development in Kingston will be the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (Sustainable Kingston Plan), which is based on the cultural, economic, environmental and social pillars of sustainability.”</p> <p>b) Section 2.1.8. has been revised to include the following: “ j. promoting and encouraging increased access and availability of healthy foods”.</p> <p>c) Municipal initiatives are guided by the Integrated Waste Management Study, which is referenced in section 4.7.2</p> <p>d) Comment received with thanks. The policy as written could be used as you suggest if a Community Improvement Plan were completed.</p>
61.	C. Grossutti	2015-11-03	EIA Waterfront Wellington Extension	<p>a) Why have the CRCA EIA guidelines been removed from the plan?</p> <p>b) It appears that the changes to this plan weaken the protection for the waterfront and wetland areas.</p> <p>c) Opposes the Wellington Street Extension.</p>	<p>a) It is the intent to remove the guidelines from the appendix of the Official Plan and make them available on the City’s website. There are other guidelines referenced in the Official Plan, including urban design guidelines and the guidelines for preparing studies other than the EIA. As mentioned in the Official Plan Update Background Report, in a modern planning environment, these guidelines may change frequently, so it is not advisable to append them to the Official Plan. It will be more convenient if the guidelines are all available through a single portal on the City website so that the Official Plan is not impacted if new guidelines are written or when guidelines are updated.</p> <p>b) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>c) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>
62.	S. Evans	2015-11-04	Wellington Extension	<p>a) Shame on the City for even considering an unnecessary road through a public waterfront property.</p>	<p>a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p>
63.	T. Dawes	2015-11-04	Site Specific Employment Lands	<p>a) What is the proposed future use for the land around Clogg’s Road north of Creekford Road? Would prefer to see a residential area rather than a business park.</p> <p>b) Support for the policy to have small restaurants etc. within walking distance of industrial parks. Additional convenience stores should also be considered if done carefully and nicely.</p>	<p>a) This area is currently designated as a “deferred area”, and will be subject to the creation of a secondary plan to determine future land uses. It is identified as a business district on Schedule 2: City Structure, and the Employment Land Strategy Review (2015) recommends the area for future business park uses.</p> <p>b) Staff have included additional policy direction to implement the findings of the Employment Land Strategy Review and to also offer some flexibility for the inclusion, location and timing of complementary uses, especially on larger land holdings. Please refer to Sections</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					3.6.12 through 3.6.14 of the third draft of the Official Plan update.
64.	R. Kiley	2015-11-04	Cost Benefit Analysis	a) 9.11.2 should read that the City <i>will</i> require a cost-benefit analysis.	a) The intent of this policy is to ensure that development proceeds in a phased and orderly fashion in accordance with the phasing strategy for an area. The City has the authority to request a Cost Benefit Analysis if a proposal is not in accordance with the phasing strategy and will require new or upgraded infrastructure and/or maintenance programs. A cost benefit analysis is not required from proposals in areas where they City has identified them as appropriate for intensification, since they are already well served by infrastructure and maintenance programs.
65.	Z. Keepings	2015-11-04	Wellington Extension Waterfront Secondary Plan	a) A road should not be built along the waterfront in what is currently greenspace. b) Nothing should be built within 30m of the waterfront. c) The city should prioritize secondary planning in the North King's Town Area. d) The EPA zone should cover the Rideau Canal north from the Lasalle Causeway (3.10.A and 3.10.A.1).	a) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report. b) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this report. c) The North King's Town Secondary Plan is underway. d) The EPA designation captures lands within 30 metres of the Rideau Canal from the LaSalle Causeway to the northern limit of the City.
66.	C. Brown	2015-11-04	Wellington Extension	a) Please reconsider the proposed Wellington Street Extension.	a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.
67.	E. Grenda and D. Bull, Frontenac Heritage Foundation	2015-11-04 2016-02-18	Stable/Intensification Student Housing Open Space Terminology Density Height Limit Site Specific	a) Intensification should be balanced with protection of cultural heritage resources. b) Not confident that the changes to the Stable Neighbourhoods Policy (2.6.3) provide adequate protection to Stable Neighbourhoods. c) How will the new policies 2.9.5 (Smart Cities) and 2.10 (Resiliency) be used to evaluate development applications? d) By listing the streets in 2.6.c) it indicates that high density residential projects would be permitted on all other streets. e) 3.5.12 (Campus Master Plan) it is not clear what development is being proposed for the university's extensive land holdings. f) 3.8 adds permission for adaptive re-use of buildings in Open Space – built heritage should be permitted in open space even if it is not adaptively re-used. g) 3.9 “cultural heritage study” should be “heritage impact statement” h) The changes to Section 7 are acceptable. i) 9.8.8 indicates support for the AMS University District Neighbourhood Improvement Plan, what impact will this have on surrounding heritage resources? Please clarify.	a) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this report. b) See Issue 1 in Section 2.0 of this report. c) 2.9.5 and 2.10 are high level policies intended to support a general direction for development. The policies in 2.10 explain the overarching goals associated with the policies in Section 3, 4, and 5 pertaining to infrastructure and natural hazards in the context of climate change. d) The locational criteria associated with high density residential land uses have been revised to ensure greater clarity. e) Policy is intended to acknowledge the planning work that has been done and that the City expects development of the Campus to proceed according to that plan. Note that the Campus Master Plan is not a Secondary Plan as per 9.7. Please see the Campus Master Plan for details of Queens' intentions. f) Built heritage resources are acceptable in Open Space. The goal of the policy is to enable existing heritage buildings already existing in Open Space to be adapted for uses such as museums, art galleries,

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>j) Re: 51-57 Queen Street and 18 Queen Street/282 Ontario Street: the Planning Rationale, Urban Design Study and Heritage Impact Study do not adequately support approval of the development proposals, and certainly do not justify amending the Official Plan and zoning by-law to permit 21 storeys in height. We strongly advise that any structure should be kept to 25.5 metres as set out in the Official Plan, and be of a style which complements its surroundings.</p> <p>k) Perhaps a new Request for Proposals should go out from City Hall asking for developers to submit plans more in accordance with the guidelines set out in the Official Plan, rather than seeking permission to abandon it.</p>	<p>business incubators, etc. The policy will be modified to clarify that the intent is to reuse existing buildings not to relocate cultural heritage resources.</p> <p>g) Thank you, change will be made.</p> <p>h) Thank you.</p> <p>i) The policy referenced has been removed. Planning activities undertaken by a particular stakeholder group need to be considered by Council prior to the incorporation of specific planning policies that stem from such activities.</p> <p>j) Development-specific matters are not being considered within the context of the on-going Official Plan update. That said, recent development applications have stressed the importance of understanding how an Official Plan may be used to direct physical change in a community (see Issue 4 in Section 2.0 regarding building height).</p> <p>k) The City does not have the ability to dictate the content of a private development application. Mandatory pre-application is used by the City to advise the proponents of development of the City's Official Plan and policies that are relevant to a specific application.</p>
68.	C. Oldfield	2015-11-04	Wellington Extension	a) Turning the park into the Wellington Street Extension is short-sighted, please rethink this.	a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.
69.	B. Carr, D. Craig	2015-11-04	Barriefield Highway 15 Planning Process	<p>a) Endorse the comments made by the Barriefield Village Association including adding a detailed list of features, buffering along Hwy 15 and Hwy 2, and that Barriefield is part of the scenic quality of Hwy 15, the future of the Horton School property.</p> <p>b) Would like to see limits to the number of new houses permitted in the village and that apartment buildings, townhouses, and condominiums be specifically prohibited.</p> <p>c) Sidewalks do not need to be added or widened, people use the roads.</p> <p>d) It is too easy for Council to approve Official Plan amendments.</p>	<p>a) The Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan provides policy direction regarding landscaping and the form of development that may take place within the Village. The Plan is currently undergoing revisions. An Official Plan amendment may be undertaken following Council's approval of the updated district plan to ensure adequate conservation of identified heritage attributes.</p> <p>b) Existing section 7.3.C.7 (a) states "land uses must be limited to detached dwelling and limited numbers of semi-detached dwellings (being 10% or less of the total)."</p> <p>c) The Barriefield HCD Plan acknowledges the importance of maintaining the character of historic streetscapes. The Plan notes that new sidewalks and the replacement of existing sidewalks should be pursued in a manner which minimizes adverse effects on the cultural heritage value of the District.</p> <p>d) Section 9.3 of the Official Plan outlines the process for amending the Official Plan. An Official Plan amendment must conform with the general intent and philosophy of the Plan and be compatible with the</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					adjacent and planned uses including cultural heritage resources and natural heritage features and areas. The process of an OP amendment is legislated within the Planning Act. See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 regarding planning process.
70.	M. Keene, FOTENN for King's Town Development Corporation	2015-11-04	Stable/Intensification Downtown Density	a) Policies pertaining to stable areas (2.6.2) and areas in transition (2.6.3) need to be clarified. It is unclear whether a neighbourhood (i.e., Downtown and Harbour Area) can categorically be defined as either stable or in transition. Concerned about limitations on high density developments on the streets listed in 3.3.C.2.	a) Policy revisions have been made to clarify where intensification, and more specifically high density residential development, is to be directed. The policy framework should now be clear with respect to the level of development that may be pursued within the Downtown and Harbour Area.
71.	P. Rose, D. Rose, I. Kerford, M.A. Kerford	2015-11-04	Second Residential Units	a) Second Residential Unit policies do not adequately protect neighbourhoods and homeowners. In Westbrook Meadows we have seen duplex style buildings which are not the intended outcome. b) Provides two examples of second unit policies in other jurisdictions: Innisfil, which requires owner-occupied units, and London, which has a residential licensing system.	a) Municipalities are required by the <i>Planning Act</i> to have policies in their Official Plan authorizing second units. Section 3.3.9 (conversions) and Section 3.3.11 (second residential units) provide guidance on second units, including requiring that alterations to the exterior building must be consistent with the existing design, that adequate parking and amenity space be provided, and that the privacy of adjoining residential properties be assured. The existing policies are adequate and revisions are not required at this time. b) Innisfil: requires owner occupancy of one of the units where second residential units are permitted. While their by-law may not have been challenged yet, municipalities cannot control the occupancy of residential dwellings, as this is contrary to the Ontario Human Rights Code. London: Is applying their residential rental licensing program to second residential units. At this point, Kingston does not have a residential licensing system, and significant resources would be required to set up and operate one. The City has looked at the issue regarding licensing of rental accommodations in the past, especially in the areas around the post-secondary institutions, but had decided not to pursue this option, and instead has been focusing on the enforcement of existing by-laws (i.e. property standards, noise, etc.). The application of a licensing by-law for second residential units is an issue that would require additional research, which is outside the scope of this Official Plan update.
72.	J.Allen	2015-11-04	Wellington Extension	a) Preserve waterfront access; do not run a road through Doug Fluhrer Park. Applaud creative transportation solutions that will protect natural public space and wildlife zone proximate to the City's downtown.	a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
73.	K. Bowers	2015-11-04	Wellington Extension	a) The Wellington St. Extension is a bad idea. Too much of our waterfront is already developed and this road is not necessary.	a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.
74.	KFL&A Public Health	2015-11-04	Health Sustainability Agriculture Transportation Planning Process Home Occupations	<p>a) Pleased with health related improvements re. access to healthy food, active transportation, and shade. Also pleased to see the inclusion of a Health Impact Assessment in 9.12.3.</p> <p>b) Recommendations around healthy food policies:</p> <p>c) adding examples around what is meant by healthy food in 2.1.7,</p> <p>d) specifying that food stores should be healthy, Allows small healthy food retailers to locate within walking distance of residences</p> <p>e) prioritizing active transit with references to cycling.</p> <p>f) prioritizing access to healthy food retail, and limiting the number and locations for retailers that sell foods of low nutritional value</p> <p>g) Provide incentives for healthy food retailers in underserved communities</p> <p>h) Plan transit routes to provide access to healthy food retail</p> <p>i) Increase protections of local farmland, watersheds and wildlife habitat, policies to support the production of healthy, sustainable food including through urban agriculture, and implement policies to reduce food waste.</p> <p>j) Acknowledge that transportation plans for new areas should be co-ordinated with strategic level planning in the goal for Section 2.5.</p> <p>k) Include cycling in statements that reference transit and pedestrian activity.</p> <p>l) Allow cash-in-lieu of parking throughout the city.</p> <p>m) Refer to AODA in 3.4.G.6.</p> <p>n) Replace “the private automobile” with “single occupancy vehicles” in 3.6.</p> <p>o) Modify 4.6.15 to acknowledge pedestrian volumes.</p> <p>p) Specify that bicycle parking should be secure in 4.6.52.</p> <p>q) Specify that public engagement should be “equitable” in 9.12.4.</p> <p>r) Incorporate a comprehensive definition of “shade” and improve integration of trees and other types of shade into design considerations to maximize UV protection.</p> <p>s) Indicate that home occupations involving food services and personal services must be licenced by KFL&A Public Health.</p>	<p>a) Thank you.</p> <p>b) The Official Plan promotes small retailers in residential areas and compact, walkable communities. This would enable the types of retailers you mention. The Official Plan is focused on land use policy: on the use and form of development. Definitions of what constitutes healthy food and specifying what types of products are sold by vendors would be better addressed using other tools.</p> <p>c) ‘Healthy food’ is not specifically defined; however, support for local food production and urban agriculture, which are generally associated with healthy food, is very strong in the Official Plan. For example, please see 2.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5.f, 2.1.6, 2.9.2, 3.2.8, 3.8.2. , and 3.12.</p> <p>d) The Official Plan does give general support for healthy and sustainable living; however, it is beyond the scope of the document to specify that all food stores should be healthy.</p> <p>e) Thank you, change will be made to 2.1.2.(b), and 3.4.1., and 3.4.12. The other changes recommended are to policies that specifically target pedestrian use or transit use, so no change is necessary.</p> <p>f) The Official Plan provides broader land use planning direction, and does not have a mandate to limit or penalize food retailers based on the nutritional value of the food offered.</p> <p>g) The Official Plan provides broader land use planning direction, and does not have a mandate to incentivize food retailers based on the nutritional value of the food offered.</p> <p>h) Specific transit planning lies outside of the scope of the Official Plan. Kingston Transit has a mandate for route planning and would be a more appropriate subject for this request.</p> <p>i) As mentioned above, support for local food production and urban agriculture is very strong in the Official Plan. For example, please see 2.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5.f, 2.1.6, 2.9.2, 3.2.8, 3.8.2. , and 3.12.</p> <p>j) The current goal for 2.5 states that all areas within the urban boundary will be provided with a full range of municipal infrastructure “through orderly extension or expansion” which infers strategic level planning.</p> <p>k) In addition to 2.1.2.(b), and 3.4.1., and 3.4.12, multiple additional changes have added reference to cycling and cyclists where there is reference to pedestrians and transit.</p> <p>l) Cash-in-lieu is targeted to areas where the existing density makes it</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					<p>difficult to provide parking at the required levels. The city is currently studying cash-in-lieu with an aim to increasing both the geographic area to which it applies and the required payment per space.</p> <p>m) 3.4.G.6. references accessibility as a requirement.</p> <p>n) Thank you, change will be made.</p> <p>o) Thank you, change will be made.</p> <p>p) Thank you, change will be made.</p> <p>q) Specifying that public consultation should be equitable will be added to the introduction of Section 9.</p> <p>r) Changes will be made to 2.1.1 (add “i. preservation of mature trees for shade”). Other policies referenced already refer to trees or shelter and are deemed sufficient.</p> <p>s) Other food service, personal service premises, and businesses are referenced in this plan without specifying the licences that are necessary. The City will continue to coordinate with KFL&A Public Health on licensing.</p>
75.	P.J. Butler & Family	2015-11-04	Wellington Extension	a) The City should honour Douglas Fluhrer Park. Reconsider the Wellington Street Extension and work on ways to improve the park.	a) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.
76.	A. Clifford		Ribbon of Life Transportation	<p>a) Concerned that the changes to 2.8.3 and 3.9.2 (Ribbon of life) remove waterfront protection from development. The proposed changes should be removed.</p> <p>b) Policies around bicycle and transit routes are not strong enough. Include language that widening roads will only happen for the purposes of bicycles and bus lanes, with an intention to reduce automotive traffic. Consider a 10% per year target for reducing automobile trips.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) The designated width of road allowances, identified in Table 1 of the Plan (Section 4.6.17.1), are intended to accommodate all modes of transportation (i.e., “complete streets”). Transportation Demand Management includes a set of strategies that result in more efficient use of the transportation system. The Kingston Transportation Master Plan (KTMP) set out goals for promoting alternative modes of transportation.</p>
77.	Kingston Homebuilder's Association		Right-of-Way	a) 4.6.22 indicates that a 20m road allowance will be the standard for new roads. 18m road allowances are common in Kingston and they can accommodate emergency vehicles, snow storage, parking, walking, etc. Narrower road allowances are more affordable and efficient. Specific references to fixed numbers limit innovation and flexibility in site design.	a) In general, the City continues to support the standard 20 metre road allowance. The language in section 4.6.22 has been revised to clarify that the intent of the provision is to allow Staff to review requests for a reduced road allowance on a case-by-case basis if the request for a reduction is substantiated by supporting information to the satisfaction of the City.
78.	C. Grossutti	2015-11-05	Ribbon of Life Habitat	a) Remains concerned that the clauses in 2.8.3 and 3.9.2 undermine the integrity of the “ribbon of life” setback.	<p>a) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) Endangered species and species at risk information has been further</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
			Waterfront	<p>b) Remains concerned that removing the habitat of species from 3.10.1 (EPA) weakens protection for these species.</p> <p>c) Remains concerned that the EPA should encompass the entire Rideau Canal within the City Limits.</p>	<p>expanded and detailed in the new sections 6.1.5 to 6.1.8. The specific proposed change in 3.10.1 was suggested by the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority, which advised that since either the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) or Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) are able to permit development in a species habitat based on certain conditions or criteria, it should not be included in the Environmental Protection Area designation where development is not permitted.</p> <p>c) Policy 3.10.A.1 has been clarified and Schedule 3-A has been revised in response to the comment.</p>
79.	G.Pharand	2015-11-05 2015-11-12 2015-12-01	Downtown Height Limit Architectural Design	<p>a) “What is your vision for Downtown Kingston”. Online petition was signed by 222 people. Petition emphasizes the architectural character and human scale of downtown Kingston. The petition called for a 4-6 storey maximum in general for downtown development and the potential for up to 8 to 10 storeys if a proper 3D model were completed to show convincingly how the development fit into the existing downtown.</p> <p>b) Anything exceeding the 1:1 ratio of building height to adjacent street width is problematic, hence the popularity of the term “human scale”.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 4 in Section 2.0 of this Report (re Building Height)</p> <p>b) Section 10A to the Official Plan establishes area specific policies for the Downtown and Harbour Special Policy Area. These policies were defined on the basis of a series of technical studies including the Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines Study. Section 10A.4.6 to the OP includes policies explicitly pertaining to New Buildings & Height Provisions; these policies prescribe height limits and reference the need for angular plane setbacks. Development in the special policy area, which includes the current proposal by Homestead along Queen Street, must demonstrate conformity with the area specific policies of Section 10A.</p>
80.	Councillor L. Osanic	2015-11-05	Cost Benefit Analysis	<p>a) 9.11.2 “may” should be replaced with “will” re. cost-benefit analysis.</p>	<p>a) The intent of this policy is to ensure that development proceeds in a phased and orderly fashion in accordance with the phasing strategy for an area. The City has the authority to request a Cost Benefit Analysis if a proposal is not in accordance with the phasing strategy and will require new or upgraded infrastructure and/or maintenance programs. A cost benefit analysis is not required from proposals in areas where they City has identified them as appropriate for intensification, since they are already well served by infrastructure and maintenance programs.</p>
81.	Councillor L. Osanic	2015-11-05	Green Building	<p>a) City should encourage developers to use solar-ready roof panels for new builds. Example from Burlington with an incentive based approach included in the Official Plan.</p>	<p>a) “Green Building” approaches are encouraged through height and density bonusing (9.5.25 (k)) and as a guiding principle (Sustainability – 2.1.7). They are also referenced in the Residential Design Guidelines, which are now referenced in the OP in Section 8.2 and 8.3.</p>
82.	M. Keene,	2015-11-05	Student Housing	<p>a) Commend City for taking initiative with near campus neighbourhood</p>	<p>a) Please see Issue 1 – Infill and Intensification</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
	FOTENN for Student Village Housing Inc.		Stable/Intensification Density	<p>studies, however the changes made to the high density policies which now prohibit high density use on a number of collector roads is premature and may jeopardize appropriate planning of these areas.</p> <p>b) Section 2.6 Stable Areas and Areas in Transition. It is unclear whether all proposals are assessed against one or the other type of area. It is also unclear whether the university district and the downtown areas are considered Stable or in Transition. They are unique and we do not believe they meet either criteria.</p> <p>c) We are encouraged that the City intends to complete an intensification study for the neighbourhoods near Queen's and St. Lawrence College. However, clarification is required in the meantime to confirm whether proposals for intensification in the downtown and university district should consider the stable area policies.</p> <p>d) Concerned with the list of streets precluded from high density development which may directly conflict with the findings of a future intensification study. This does define Stable Areas – but on a street basis rather than neighbourhood basis. By default, streets not listed should be considered suitable for high density development. These policies may directly conflict with the findings of the future intensification study. What data was used to determine which streets would be included or excluded? If these policies are uninformed they could be subject to great challenge. Further, we believe that many of the streets identified would benefit from high density development.</p>	<p>b) Please see Issue 1 – Infill and Intensification.</p> <p>c) Comment is received with thanks.</p> <p>d) We will review the list of roads and revise if necessary. Please also see Issue 1 – Infill and Intensification.</p>
83.	M. Farrar	2015-11-05	Sustainability Transportation	<p>a) The OP should reflect the Focus Kingston vision to make Kingston Canada's most sustainable city. The Official Plan states that pedestrians, cyclists, and transit are higher priorities than cars. This should be reinforced in every statement of the OP. Budgets and strategic plans should also reflect the sustainable values.</p>	<p>a) Comment is received with thanks. Sustainability is a core direction of the Official Plan. For example, please see 2.3.9, 2.5.11, and 4.6.</p>
84.	M. Keene, FOTENN for 1213439 Ontario Inc.	2015-11-05	Site Specific Employment Lands	<p>a) 670 Montreal Street – For several years have not been able to attract development. Highest and Best use study in 2013 recommended Commercial and Medium Density Residential Uses as most suitable given the neighbourhood context and the planned Wellington Street Extension. Old industrial lands in the downtown should not be considered "Employment Areas". This property was considered for conversion in the Employment Lands Study but we disagree with the conclusions.</p>	<p>a) The City is not including site specific re-designations as part of the OP Update unless such is recommended as part of a completed policy study, approved by Council. The Employment Lands Strategy Review reviewed 670 Montreal Street and recommended that it be re-designated to Business Park Industrial, which has been included with this Official Plan update. A site-specific OP amendment would be needed to support any other change in designation. This site is also included in the proposed North King's Town Secondary Plan area and any other proposed changes to the land use designation should be considered as part of the overall secondary planning process.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
85.	R. Guetter, Weston Consulting for Kingston Creekford Holdings Inc.	2015-11-05	Site Specific	<p>a) 2685 Creekford Road. There are active applications on the site including an OPA, ZBLA, and Site Plan Application (see report PC-15-126).</p> <p>b) We support the increased flexibility around complementary uses as they appear in the Second Draft.</p>	<p>a) There are a few technical items to resolve. Once resolved, Staff may be advancing a recommendation to Planning Committee on the OPA (D09-029-2015) and ZBA (D14-117-2015). A decision has yet to be rendered.</p> <p>b) Comment is received with thanks.</p>
86.	P. Smith Bousfields for King's Town Development Corporation	2015-11-05	Site Specific Urban Boundary	<p>a) Owner of 790 Highway No. 2, believes the site should be included in the urban boundary. The site is immediately adjacent to the existing boundary and the inclusion would result in rounding out of boundary to logical limit. The site is small and well served by urban infrastructure. Development for urban purposes will complete an existing community.</p> <p>b) Inclusion of the site within the boundary would allow its development for a proposed "Age in Place" development.</p> <p>c) Dillon's land needs analysis was almost exclusively a mathematical exercise and has not appropriately taken into account more fundamental strategic and qualitative considerations. From a land supply perspective, it is unrealistic to conclude that all lands within the existing boundary are theoretically able to be developed for residential purposes will actually become available for development within the 20-year period of the Official Plan. Vacant lands may include additional constraints that may reduce the amount of net developable lands and the study includes lands that have been assumed will be available for residential, but they might not become available.</p> <p>d) The review of the requested urban boundary expansion should be undertaken in a comprehensive manner using fundamental planning principles including the provision for sufficient land to accommodate growth, the completion of existing communities and the establishment of logical boundaries.</p>	<p>a) Planning work leading into the Official Plan update, summarised in the Five-Year Official Plan Update Background Report prepared by Dillon Consulting (dated May 11, 2015), demonstrates that an expansion to the existing Urban Boundary is not warranted. Information Report PC-15-103 to the Planning Committee further identifies that Council has confirmed that no new expansion areas will be added to the urban boundary.</p> <p>b) The City has no control over who may ultimately occupy a development. Housing supply must be considered on the basis of population growth and anticipated demand. General land use planning principles encourage a mix of uses and increased densities as a means of supporting access to services.</p> <p>c) Technical studies (i.e., population growth projections and land use inventory) have identified that there are sufficient lands within the current urban boundary to accommodate a mix of land uses over a 20 year period, and likely beyond. A review of the "pending" supply of housing (i.e., draft approved subdivisions, final approved and registered subdivisions and approved site plans) provides that there is an immediate supply of lands to accommodate housing over a three year period (PPS Policy 1.4.1.b)). Further, the "committed" supply of housing (i.e., active subdivision and site plan control applications that have yet to receive Planning Act approval, and lands captured as part of a Secondary Plan) demonstrate that the City has maintained its ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 10 years (PPS Policy 1.1.4.a)).</p> <p>d) The Planning Act requires that municipalities update their official plan every five years through a comprehensive review. The need for changes to the urban growth boundary will be re-evaluated at the time of the next five year update to the OP to ensure the "pending" and "committed" supply of housing remains consistent with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement.</p>
87.	K. Cote,	2015-11-05	Transportation	<p>a) Increase transit target to 11% and promote public transit as the ideal</p>	<p>a) City Council has set an aspirational target to achieve 15% of all trips made during the daily peak travel period by 2034 and that, as an</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
	Kingston Coalition for Active Transportation (KCAT)	2015-11-10	Sustainability Secondary Plan	<p>mode of travel for commuters who live greater than 5 km from downtown.</p> <p>b) Work with employers to restrict parking and increase parking rates, and provide a transit priority lane on multi-lane arterial roads at peak travel times.</p> <p>c) Foster multi-modal travel and continue to enhance the convenience, efficiency and affordability of transit.</p> <p>d) The City has been successful in enhancing cycling and walking by installing bike lanes and removing parking. More can be done about parking to increase use of transit, walking, and cycling, and reduce the use of single occupancy vehicles, namely increasing the cost and decreasing the availability of parking.</p> <p>e) Zoning bylaws do not need to include parking for every development. Secure, sheltered bike parking is recommended wherever people may cycle, and particularly at high profile destinations.</p> <p>f) Introduce paid parking systems into municipal parks and Park-and-Ride facilities.</p> <p>g) Install physically separated cycling lanes on arterial roads. Install buffered bike lanes on collector roads. Designate at least one local road in each neighbourhood as a bike boulevard. Install bike boxes at busy intersections to promote safety for cyclists. Incorporate evidence-based pedestrian and cycling facilities on all new and reconstructed roads.</p> <p>h) Discontinue plans for the Wellington Street Extension.</p> <p>i) Reduce minimum road width requirement of 20 metres for new roads and adopt Complete Streets principles.</p> <p>j) Add Active Transportation definition: Any mode of self-propelled travel for the purpose of getting from one place to another. In the context of the Official Plan, it is understood to be primarily walking and cycling.</p> <p>k) Add Complete Street definition: A street that is designed for all road users – pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.</p> <p>l) Add AT pathway definition: A pathway for active transportation including walking and cycling (yield to pedestrians).</p> <p>m) Revise Section 2.1 to read ‘... that limits the need for undue extension of infrastructure, <i>use of single occupancy vehicles</i>, and reliance on the private automobile.’</p> <p>n) Revise Section 2.1.2.b to read ‘land use patterns that foster transit, <i>cycling</i> and pedestrian activity’.</p>	<p>interim step to this target, staff have been directed to develop the next 5 year Transit Plan with the objective of increasing transit ridership from 4.2M annual trips to 5.6M annual trips by 2021. This goal will be considered in the next KTMP update. If revisions to the Official Plan are recommended, they will be considered at that time.</p> <p>b) Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report and Section 2.5.14 of the Official Plan. The Official Plan sets broad objectives and is meant to be implemented by other, more detailed municipal mechanisms.</p> <p>c) Please see revisions in section 2.5.11.</p> <p>d) In general, the Official Plan has been revised to promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure and providing facilities and services to encourage walking, cycling and transit as priority modes of transportation. Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>e) The City is currently working on the first draft of the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law, which is expected to be released following the completion of the Five Year Official Plan Update. The new Comprehensive Zoning By-law will establish standards to support the Official Plan’s transportation policies. Please email opzb_update@cityofkingston.ca for additional information on the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Project.</p> <p>f) Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The Official Plan does not regulate the cost of parking at municipal parks and park-and-ride facilities.</p> <p>g) Please see revisions in 4.6.9. City Council directed staff to develop a Terms of Reference for the preparation of a RFP that seek the development of an Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) that is based on aggressively achieving a target of 20% of all trips made during the daily peak travel period by walking or cycling by 2034. If any revisions are required to the Official Plan as a result of the future ATMP, they will be considered at that time through separate amendment.</p> <p>h) Please see Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>i) The standard road allowance width identified in section 4.6.22 for new local roads is 20 metres. The policy allows Council to consider a reduced road allowance where justified in new subdivisions. City staff have been studying “complete streets” principles and will continue to advance such work following the completion of the ATMP so that the findings of that Plan can inform the preparation of road allowance designs.</p> <p>j) Thank you for your suggested definition – in order to ensure the</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>o) Revise 2.1.2.i to read “parks that are planned to be accessible by urban residents within a ten minute walk and without having to cross an arterial road;”</p> <p>p) Revise 2.1.3 to read: “The City’s sustainability program encourages large-scale developments to establish mixed land use development areas that provide for employment, education, personal service and essential retail land uses to be located in close proximity to residential land uses, subject to compatibility.”</p> <p>q) Revise Section 2.1.6.a to read “encouragement of transit-supportive densities... mix of uses that foster pedestrian activity <i>and cycling</i>”.</p> <p>r) Revise 2.1.6.c. to read “the design and construction of <i>AT pathways</i>”.</p> <p>s) Consider transit shelters in 2.1.7 (e.g. opening with respect to prevailing winds especially in cold, wet conditions).</p> <p>t) Revise 2.1.7 to include “g. Design that limits automobile dependency and constrains automobile use.”</p> <p>u) Add the following to 2.2.5: “Transportation options within Housing Districts and from these Districts to common destinations will include pedestrian facilities and evidence-based cycling facilities (e.g. increased separation with increased speed and volume).”</p> <p>v) Revise 2.2.6 to read: “A mixed land use area is a form of development that is encouraged in order to locate employment, education, personal service land uses and essential retail as close to residential land uses as possible, subject to compatibility.”</p> <p>w) Revise 2.2.9 to read: “Increased public access to the water, pedestrian activity, <i>cycling</i> and tourism will be promoted within this Centre.</p> <p>x) Physically separated cycling facilities are warranted in 2.2.10, 2.3 and 3.4.E.5 along the Princess Street Corridor due to high volumes and speed of automobile traffic. Other evidence-based cycling facilities will support the use of cycling and foster sustainability in other areas.</p> <p>y) Revise 2.3.3 to read: “... thereby providing support for transit, <i>cycling</i>, infrastructure, and increased levels of economic activity in a pedestrian-oriented setting”.</p> <p>z) Revise 2.3.9 to read: “In order to implement the Strategic Direction of the Kingston Transportation Master Plan, the City will promote a complete streets philosophy and place greater priority on creating supportive conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users, than for automobile users. The City will also prioritize accessibility for all residents and visitors.”</p> <p>aa) Revise 2.3.14 to read: “Shorelines... are a valued... environmental</p>	<p>Official Plan is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), the definition of Active Transportation from the PPS has been included in the revised draft.</p> <p>k) A definition of “complete streets” will be evaluated following the completion of the ATMP. Recommendations arising out of the Plan may be incorporated into the Official Plan through a separate amendment process.</p> <p>l) Active transportation has been defined. Where appropriate, pathway has been clarified as an “active transportation pathway”, relying on the definition of active transportation.</p> <p>m) The suggested revision has been incorporated.</p> <p>n) Section 2.1.2 has been revised to reference active transportation.</p> <p>o) Thank you for your suggestion. A revision to the noted section has been made to acknowledge the importance of providing safe access to public parks.</p> <p>p) Education has been added to section 2.1.3.</p> <p>q) Section 2.1.6.a. has been revised to reference active transportation.</p> <p>r) Section 2.1.6.d. has been revised to reference active transportation pathways.</p> <p>s) Thank you for your suggestion. The City considers the recommended conditions when designing transit shelters.</p> <p>t) The Official Plan seeks to reduce reliance on the automobile by promoting other modes of transportation.</p> <p>u) Design matters related to cycling facilities will be considered as part of the ATMP with recommendations being incorporated into the Official Plan through separate amendment.</p> <p>v) Mixed land use, including education, is supported in the policies of 2.1.3.</p> <p>w) Section 2.2.7 has been revised to reference active transportation.</p> <p>x) Design matters related to cycling facilities will be considered as part of the Active Transportation Master Plan with recommendations being incorporated into the Official Plan through separate amendment.</p> <p>y) Section 2.2.7, which speaks to Centres and Corridors, has been revised to reference active transportation.</p> <p>z) As noted, complete streets will be reviewed following the completion of the ATMP. Policy changes or additions to guiding documents (e.g., subdivision design guidelines) may be advanced following this review to implement specific recommendations as directed by Council.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>resource to be protected...public open space system for recreation and commuting.”</p> <p>bb) Insert 2.4.1.e: “Reduce reliance on private automobiles”.</p> <p>cc) Revise 2.5.10 to read: “In order to foster sustainability within the City and reduce reliance on the automobile, the City will make efficient use of the existing infrastructure and provide facilities and services that are essential to ensuring that walking, cycling and transit are safe, pleasant, and the preferred modes of travel in Kingston. Priority will be placed on these sustainable modes of travel before providing new road infrastructure. To achieve this, the City will apply complete streets principles to maximize existing road capacity and improve environmental conditions for non-automobile-based travel.”</p> <p>dd) Revise 2.5.11 to read: “The use of transit will be supported and encouraged through the development of mixed-use areas and mixed-use buildings, the development of Corridors and more intense mixed-use Centres, and through the increase of densities within newer areas, compatible uses and infill with complementary uses, appropriate redevelopment of underutilized and brownfield sites, and the designation of transit only travel lanes for express bus routes during peak travel hours along arterial and collectors.”</p> <p>ee) Revise 2.9.3.g. to read: “enhancing gateways into the City and into the Central Business District through visual upgrading of highway interchange areas (subject to Ministry of Transportation review and approval), controlled signage (including wayfinding signs), streetscape improvements, and, through the application of complete streets principles, ensuring these gateways showcase the City’s commitment to all residents and visitors;”</p> <p>ff) Revise 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 to include “Locations are accessed by safe walking and cycling facilities, and are within walking and cycling distances and along transit routes”.</p> <p>gg) Add “for automobiles and bicycles” to 3.3.3, 3.3.B.2, 3.3.C.4, 3.4.12.b., 3.4.C.7, 3.4.D.6, 9.5.2.i., 9.5.17, 9.5.19, 9.5.34.b, 9.5.36, 9.8.7, 9.5.13.e</p> <p>hh) Add “cycling” to 2.4.4.c., 3.4.1, 3.4.12.a., 3.4.A.3., 3.4.B.8, 3.4.C.8, 3.4.C.9.c, 3.4.D.7, 3.4.E.4, 4.6.5</p> <p>ii) Add “bicycle” to 3.4.12.c.</p> <p>jj) Revise 3.4.12.f to read “what transportation options there are to accommodate the proposal”.</p> <p>kk) Add “Physically separated cycling lanes here will connect residents</p>	<p>aa) The referenced policy section is enabling. Its application is substantiated through more detailed sections of the Official Plan, such as those that have been added to implement the recommendations of the Waterfront Master Plan.</p> <p>bb) The suggested revision has been incorporated.</p> <p>cc) Revisions have been made save and except for reference to “complete streets principles”, which as noted will follow more detailed analysis through the ATMP.</p> <p>dd) The actual routing of Kingston Transit is not something covered within the Official Plan as the Plan is intended to be a higher-level policy document. The Plan does direct development to areas along major public transit routes as a means of supporting the local service delivery.</p> <p>ee) Revisions to the noted section have been made.</p> <p>ff) Revisions to sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 have been made.</p> <p>gg) The suggested revisions have been incorporated.</p> <p>hh) Active transportation has been incorporated where appropriate.</p> <p>ii) Section 3.4.12.c has been revised to reference active transportation.</p> <p>jj) A revision has been made to acknowledge the need to evaluate transportation options, which may include road widening or operational improvements.</p> <p>kk) Section 3.4.B.4 has been revised to reference active transportation.</p> <p>ll) The Review was considered in the advancement of streetscape improvements along Princess Street.</p> <p>mm) Revisions have been made to acknowledge the importance of active transportation and the need for secure sheltered bicycle parking.</p> <p>nn) Through secondary planning and the forthcoming Active Transportation Master Plan the City will evaluate opportunities for Transportation Demand Management. Amendments to the Plan following such work will occur outside of the comprehensive update. These amendments will add additional specificity to the policy framework.</p> <p>oo) A policy addition has been made to address comment.</p> <p>pp) A policy revision has been made.</p> <p>qq) Please see revisions in 3.6.17.d and 3.6.17.f.</p> <p>rr) A reference has been made to the opportunity to support a network</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>to major employers and amenities” to 3.4.B.4.</p> <p>ll) Add “Williamsville Main Street Study Review of Cycling Lanes (2013)” to 3.4.C.9.</p> <p>mm) Revise 3.4.D.9.a to read “a plan for the entire site that addresses access, pedestrian <i>cycling and motorized</i> vehicular circulation, underground or structured <i>and secure sheltered bicycle</i> parking, landscaping, and improvements to the streetscape that will enhance pedestrian <i>and cycling</i> activity... sustainability of the site; Include pedestrians, cyclists, transit, taxis and other automobiles in 3.4.D.9.b.</p> <p>nn) Change “may” to “will” in 3.4.E.6.</p> <p>oo) Add 3.5.16.f: “secure, sheltered bike parking will be situated in sufficient numbers and locations at Main Campus, West Campus, the Stella Buck Building, the Donald Gordon Centre, Innovation Park and the former Prison for Women site.”</p> <p>pp) Add “particularly by walking, cycling, and transit” to 3.5.19.d and 3.5.19.e.</p> <p>qq) Add “cyclists” to 3.6.17.e and 3.6.17.g and add “Ample, secure, sheltered bicycle parking will also be provided” to the end of 3.6.17.g.</p> <p>rr) Add “and commuting” after “recreational” in the goal in 3.8.</p> <p>ss) Add “walking and cycling” to 3.8.2.</p> <p>tt) Add “They can also provide safe, convenient, efficient commuter routes” to the end of the first paragraph in 3.8.11.</p> <p>uu) Add “commuting” to 3.8.12.</p> <p>vv) Add “commuting by foot and bicycle” to 3.9.1.</p> <p>ww) Suggested revisions to the SSP policies 3.18.11, 3.18.12, 3.18.17.b, 3.18.18, 3.18.21, 3.18.39 and 3.18.40.</p> <p>xx) In 4.6, replace “The City is committed to promoting transportation alternatives to the automobile that increase efficiency...” with “The City is committed to promoting transportation choices that increase efficiency of travel, reduce energy consumption and pollution, promote health, and enhance sustainability of the City.” Replace “and multi-modal means of transportation are supported” with “and non-motorized travel (i.e. walking and cycling) will be supported.” Replace “Active transportation is encouraged for all residents, young and old” with “Active transportation is prioritized for all residents, young and old”.</p>	<p>of active transportation opportunities.</p> <p>ss) This policy section speaks to broad land uses and not modes of transportation which may occur as part of the use.</p> <p>tt) Active transportation has been incorporated where appropriate.</p> <p>uu) Active transportation has been incorporated where appropriate.</p> <p>vv) Section 3.9.1 has been revised to reference active transportation.</p> <p>ww) Site specific policy changes are not being made as part of a comprehensive OP update; however, the many changes throughout the Plan establish a framework through which active transportation enhancements will be sought.</p> <p>xx) “Promote health” has been added to 4.6.</p> <p>yy) Please see revisions in 4.6.4. The design of new sidewalks on new and reconstructed roads is reviewed on a site specific basis to ensure safety and accessibility.</p> <p>zz) If any revisions are required to the Official Plan as a result of the future Active Transportation Master Plan, they will be considered at that time.</p> <p>aaa) If any revisions are required to the Official Plan as a result of the future Active Transportation Master Plan, they will be considered at that time.</p> <p>bbb) See revised “Goal”.</p> <p>ccc) The suggested revision has been incorporated.</p> <p>ddd) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>eee) The suggested revision has been incorporated.</p> <p>fff) City right-of-way in this context generally refers to a city-owned space that can accommodate and is appropriate for a bicycle route or active transportation pathway.</p> <p>ggg) The suggested revision has been incorporated.</p> <p>hhh) See revised section 5.28.</p> <p>iii) See revised section 9.5.32.f.</p> <p>jjj) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The Maintenance and Occupancy By-law and Property Standards By-law will provide more detailed information where appropriate.</p> <p>kkk) The policy revisions that have been agreed to provide suitable direction for all areas of the City. Major changes to site specific policies and secondary plans are not being considered as part of this review.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>yy) Add “and on local streets near schools, bus stops, and land uses that are major pedestrian trip generators” and “For all newly installed sidewalks, driveway ramps will be placed on the road surface, or if available in the buffer between the sidewalk and road, to maintain an even flat surface for pedestrians and to minimize injury” to 4.6.4.</p> <p>zz) Add “Additional supports for cycling will include installation of cyclist-activated traffic signals along major cycling routes, where applicable” to 4.6.12.</p> <p>aaa) Add 4.6.30.i: “installing physically separated bicycle lanes to keep slower moving bicycles out of travel lanes, and to minimize conflicts between cyclists and motorists.”</p> <p>bbb) In “goal” of Section 4, replace “supportive of public transit alternatives” with “supportive of public transit as a preferred mode of travel”.</p> <p>ccc) Add “pathways between streets” to 4.6.34.</p> <p>ddd) Change 4.6.35.e to a pedestrian and cycling route. Include evidence-based pedestrian and cycling facilities on all bridges (as well as new and reconstructed roads).</p> <p>eee) Change “walkways” to “AT pathways” in 4.6.5.</p> <p>fff) Need to define “right-of-way” in 4.6.9 – are these “pathways” or “AT pathways”?</p> <p>ggg) Add “sheltered” or “protected” to 4.6.12.</p> <p>hhh) Add “Specific measures to reduce Greenhouse Gases will include transportation options that prioritize walking, cycling, and transit use over single occupancy and private vehicle use” to 5.28.</p> <p>iii) Add “including bicycles” to 9.5.32.f.</p> <p>jjj) Add “year round maintenance” to 9.5.36.g.</p> <p>kkk) Suggested revisions to Secondary Plans and Special Policy Areas in Chapter 10.</p>	
88.	C. Booth	2015-11-05	Woodlands	<p>a) Happy that the minimum forest cover target has been retained.</p> <p>b) Concerned that the proposed new definition of Significant Woodlands only refers to the <u>areas</u> established by the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study <u>not the criteria</u>. Would prefer to see the detailed criteria from the study included in the OP definition. Suggests the following definition for Significant Woodlands: “Woodlands, as determined through the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage</p>	<p>a) Thank you.</p> <p>b) The definition provides a reference to a specific technical study and now includes reference to criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.</p> <p>c) The definition of contributory woodlands has been revised as follows: “Woodlands that do not meet the criteria for <i>significant woodlands</i> as established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>Study (2006) or a site specific environmental impact assessment that meets one or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the woodland contains forest patches over 100 years and older (age); b. the patch size of the woodland is 40 hectares or larger (size); c. the woodland has an interior core area of 4 hectares or larger, measured 100 metres from the edge (interior habitat); d. the woodland is within 30 metres of a waterbody (riparian); and, e. the woodland is within 120 metres of other significant features (connectivity) <p>or identified using criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry which is ecologically important in terms of features such as species composition, age of trees and stand history; functionally important due to its contribution to the broader landscape because of its location, size or due to the amount of forest cover in the planning area; or economically important due to site quality, species composition, or past forest management.”</p> <p>c) Suggests the following definition for contributory woodlands: “All woodlands that do not meet the criteria for significant woodlands as established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry and established by the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study in (2006).”</p>	or the Central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study (2006).”
89.	S. Fraser	2015-11-05	Second Residential Units	<p>a) Supports the comments of I. & M.A. Kerford and D. & P. Rose (2015-11-04). We support secondary suites as owner occupied housing but are concerned about the development of duplexes in R1 zoning with absentee landlords.</p>	<p>a) Municipalities are required by the <i>Planning Act</i> to have policies in their Official Plan authorizing second units. Section 3.3.9 (conversions) and Section 3.3.11 (second residential units) provide guidance on second units, including requiring that alterations to the exterior building must be consistent with the existing design, that adequate parking and amenity space be provided, and that the privacy of adjoining residential properties be assured. The existing policies are adequate and revisions are not required at this time. With respect to owner-occupied units, municipalities cannot control the occupancy of residential dwellings, as this is contrary to the Ontario Human Rights Code.</p>
90.	G. Lodge		Wellington Extension Transportation Planning Process	<p>a) Wellington Street Extension is not needed, instead we should focus on increasing transit ridership and active transportation.</p> <p>b) A network of separated bicycle lanes is needed in Kingston as per the Transportation Master Plan.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) Thank you for your comment. City Council directed staff to develop a Terms of Reference for the preparation of a RFP that seek the development of an Active Transportation Master Plan that is based on</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				c) The Official Plan is too flexible overall. The vision is good, but it then embraces projects that contravene the vision.	<p>aggressively achieving a target of 20% of all trips made during the daily peak travel period by walking or cycling by 2034. If any revisions are required to the Official Plan as a result of the future Active Transportation Master Plan, they will be considered at that time.</p> <p>c) Comment is received with thanks. As described in Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report, the goal of the Official Plan is to provide a wide range of land use policies to ensure that growth is co-ordinated. More prescriptive and specific policies are often set out through zoning by-laws or secondary plans. Many of the changes being made to the OP through this update are intended to guide development to better achieve the vision.</p>
91.	S. Jaffer	2015-11-05	Ribbon of Life Wellington Extension Transportation Cost Benefit Analysis	<p>a) Ribbon of Life policy in 2.8.3 needs to be wordsmithed to better reflect the intent of the policy.</p> <p>b) 4.6.35.1 acknowledges that the Wellington Street Extension is under review, it should explain why this is being re-examined. Suggested wording from revised KTMP.</p> <p>c) Specify “secure” bicycle parking in 4.6.52</p> <p>d) 9.11.2 a cost benefit analysis should be conducted for all development projects.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>c) Thank you. Policy revisions have been made (4.6.52) to support options for lessening the off-street vehicle parking requirement, subject to implementing transportation demand management measures which could include supplying additional bicycle parking. The specific requirements for “secure”/long-term bicycle parking are being reviewed as part of the comprehensive zoning by-law project.</p> <p>d) The intent of this policy is to ensure that development proceeds in a phased and orderly fashion in accordance with the phasing strategy for an area. The City has the authority to request a Cost Benefit Analysis if a proposal is not in accordance with the phasing strategy and will require new or upgraded infrastructure and/or maintenance programs. A cost benefit analysis is not required from proposals in areas where they City has identified them as appropriate for intensification, since they are already well served by infrastructure and maintenance programs.</p>
92.	A. Loughheed,	2015-11-05	Wellington Extension	<p>e) Revise site specific policy 3.18.17.b (8 Cataraqui St.) so it would apply to any road configuration instead of specifying the Wellington Street Extension.</p> <p>f) Modify Section 4.6.35.1 “the suitability of the proposed... will be re-examined....”</p>	<p>g) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p> <p>h) Please refer to Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this report.</p>
93.	F. Charles	2015-11-05	Ribbon of Life Wellington Extension	<p>a) Changes significantly weaken the “ribbon of life”.</p> <p>b) Wellington Street extension for automobiles is discouraged in favour of other transportation modes.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report</p> <p>b) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0 of this Report</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
94.	J. Duquette	2015-11-05	Stable/Intensification Density Woodlands Waterfront Stormwater Transportation Heritage Terminology	<p>a) Section 3.3.C.2.a should prohibit high density residential on the shores of the Rideau Canal and other environmental or culturally important areas.</p> <p>b) Additional criteria for siting of high density residential are needed to avoid development causing “transiting through stable areas” (i.e., nuisance traffic infiltration).</p> <p>c) There is a need to clarify what is meant by “in proximity to” within Section 3.3.C.2. If distance prescribed the method of measurement ought to be noted (e.g., by road distance, straight line, etc.).</p> <p>d) Section 2.6.3 should include prohibition against large scale intensification in locations that are solely accessible by transitioning through stable areas.</p> <p>e) Requesting clarification of “mature trees”.</p> <p>f) Requesting protection of views from the Rideau Canal based on boundary of the navigation channel.</p> <p>g) Requesting revision to how the setback from the Rideau Canal is measured – it should be from the natural high water mark level, not the level associated with artificial, manmade modifications.</p> <p>h) OP needs to emphasize that all proposals for development are to include all related documentation and detailed stormwater management plans. Failure to submit all documentation should result in immediate refusal of development proposals.</p> <p>i) Requesting stronger policy regarding traffic issues in Section 2.7.3.e – include a specific measurable metric.</p> <p>j) Requesting protection of the historic landscape for the Rideau Community.</p> <p>k) Questioning permitted land uses between Section 10B.5 and 3.9.13.</p> <p>l) Clarification of “proximity” in Section 10B.7.2.</p> <p>m) Requesting specific metrics as triggers for traffic studies in Section 10B.12.13.</p>	<p>a) Policy revisions have been made to Section 3.3.C.2 to acknowledge the need for compatibility with the surrounding environment.</p> <p>b) The policies guide high density residential to locations that are intended to avoid nuisance traffic infiltration issues, Section 4.6 of the OP also contains new guidance on traffic calming.</p> <p>c) The standard of 400 metres (i.e., 5 minute walk) has been added.</p> <p>d) Section 2.6.3 has been revised and stronger policies on avoiding destabilization are being proposed in 2.6.5.</p> <p>e) The protection of “mature trees” is an over-arching objective of the Plan. Policies that reference “mature trees” are enabling (i.e., supportive of tree protection) and are not directive (i.e., requiring explicit action). The potential removal of trees is limited by Official Plan policies when such trees fall within, or adjacent to, an Environmental Protection Area (EPA) designation. Further, the City has passed a Tree By-law which regulates the removal of trees of a specific diameter at breast height (i.e., 15 centimetres).</p> <p>f) Protection of views is guided by the Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy and Parks Canada involvement in the development review process.</p> <p>g) This setback is determined by Parks Canada, The Rideau Canal falls within Parks Canada jurisdiction.</p> <p>h) The Planning Act and Ontario Regulations that fall under the Act, prescribe a process for amendments to an Official Plan and/or zoning by-law, and set out the information and material that is required in order to deem an application complete. Section 9.12 of the Official Plan reinforces the requirements of the Act. Failure to submit prescribed information would result in an application being considered incomplete thereby enabling a proponent to appeal such a determination to the Ontario Municipal Board. The Planning Act requires that consideration be had for stormwater management.</p> <p>i) Thank you for the suggestion; however, detailed traffic Level of Service metrics (e.g., D, E, or F) are not appropriate in an Official Plan.</p> <p>j) The cultural landscape of the Rideau Canal is protected through the OP. For example, please see, 2.3.8, 3.9.18., 3.10.A., and 7.</p> <p>k) The reference to “filling” in 3.9.13 is regarding placing of fill along the shoreline, not the fuelling of boats.</p> <p>l) This policy should be read in conjunction with Section 6, which specifies the dimensions of adjacent lands.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					m) Thank you for the suggestion; however, detailed traffic Level of Service metrics (e.g., D, E, or F) are not appropriate in an Official Plan.
95.	J. Bolichowski, Armstrong Strategy Group (on behalf of MasonryWorkx)	2015-11-05	Green Building Architectural Design	<p>a) Requesting addition of “high-quality, climate resilient architectural design” to various sections of the plan.</p> <p>b) Requesting additional requirements for climate-resilient materials for site plan approval.</p> <p>c) Requesting references to quality of architectural design and exterior finishes to various sections of the plan. Add enabling language to the Official Plan to allow the City to set Urban Design Guidelines for built form for small residential.</p>	<p>a) This matter is currently addressed in the plan. For example see references to green building design in Sections 2.1, 6.2 and 8.6. and in design guidelines (see Sections 8.2 and 8.3). Also, see Section 9.5.25 for details about how energy or water conservation initiatives can lead to an authorization of increased height or density. Further changes will be considered for Section 2.10 – Resiliency.</p> <p>b) Comment is received with thanks Section 9.5.32 states that the City will use Site Plan Control to i) require sustainable features to the extent that provincial legislation allows.</p> <p>c) Comment is received with thanks. Detailed urban design matters such architectural styles and materials are generally dealt with through urban design guidelines rather than through specific Official Plan policies. The City has recently completed new Urban Design Guidelines and these can be viewed through the City’s website. Their guiding principles have been referenced in sections 8.2 and 8.3 of the Official Plan.</p>
96.	M. & M. Schlosser	2015-11-05	Second Residential Units	a) Request for stronger policy guidance on secondary residential units to be in the forefront of developing strong policies which encourage development but at the same time balance this with the needs of neighbourhoods.	a) Municipalities are required by the <i>Planning Act</i> to have policies in their Official Plan authorizing second units. Section 3.3.9 (conversions) and Section 3.3.11 (second residential units) provide guidance on second units, including requiring that alterations to the exterior building must be consistent with the existing design, that adequate parking and amenity space be provided, and that the privacy of adjoining residential properties be assured. The existing policies are adequate and revisions are not required at this time.
97.	G. Sutherland	2015-11-05	Mineral Resources	a) Concern about expansion of Wollastonite resource area.	a) See Issue 5 in Section 2 of this Report.
98.	M. Keene, FOTENN	2015-11-05	Williamsville Stable/Intensification	<p>a) Requesting wording changes to prescriptive language reintroduced in the policies in the Williamsville Secondary Plan. This type of policy in the OP hinders flexibility and creativity that the City is seeking in the redevelopment of Williamsville – provides a list of proposed amendments to soften the language.</p> <p>b) The policies in Section 2.6 regarding stable neighbourhoods and areas in transition are not conducive to the redevelopment goals for Williamsville.</p> <p>c) In Section 3.3.c, certain collector roads bisecting Williamsville create</p>	<p>a) Revisions have been made to lessen the prescriptive nature of several sections of 10E.</p> <p>b) The statement in Section 2.6.3, “Stable areas will be protected from development that is not intended by this Plan” infers that redevelopment within Williamsville is envisioned because it is guided by a Secondary Plan, which is part of the Official Plan.</p> <p>c) Section 3.3.C.2 (locational criteria) has been revised to recognize the built form expectations outlined in areas for which secondary plans or special policy areas have been completed.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				restrictions for development which are not conducive to the goals for this neighbourhood.	
99.	M. Shaw, Loving Spoonful	2015-11-06	Sustainability Agriculture	a) Request that the concept of non-profit community food centre be considered through the OP Update and add reference to local food, urban gardening.	a) Please see revision to Section 3.2.8 – Urban Agriculture. The OP also contains multiple references to urban agriculture and local food production (including Sections 2.1.2, 2.1.5.f, 2.1.6, 2.9.2, 3.2.8, 3.8.2., and 3.12).
100.	P. Welch	2015-11-06	Cost Benefit Analysis	a) Section 9.11.2 wording should state, “City will require a cost/benefit analysis...”	a) The intent of this policy is to ensure that development proceeds in a phased and orderly fashion in accordance with the phasing strategy for an area. The City has the authority to request a Cost Benefit Analysis if a proposal is not in accordance with the phasing strategy and will require new or upgraded infrastructure and/or maintenance programs. A cost benefit analysis is not required from proposals in areas where they City has identified them as appropriate for intensification, since they are already well served by infrastructure and maintenance programs.
101.	V. Schmolka	2015-11-06	Secondary Plan	a) Requesting phrase “when change of land use for the property is being considered by the owner” be added to Section 2.3.5.1.	a) Reference to Collin’s Bay Institution has been removed from section 2.3.5 (Secondary Plan) at the request of Council, recognizing the interest in supporting potential farming activities.
102.	N. Cornish, IBI Group	2015-11-11	Mineral Resources	a) Request to clarify the small portion of white appearing on Schedule 3C abutting the Wollastonite deposit. b) Request to “round out” the Wollastonite Mineral Resources Area. c) Request to add a 500 metre radius around the Wollastonite reserve and include it in the “Reserve Area” on Schedule 12.	a) This area will be designated ‘Rural’. b) The area shown aligns with the mapping provided; there is no rationale for rounding out. c) The 500 m area of influence is addressed by policy in the Official Plan and it is not customary to include it within the “Reserve Area” designation.
103.	V. Schmolka	2015-11-11 2016-02-23	Terminology Zoning By-law Planning Process Affordable Housing Transportation	a) Typo found – Section 7.1.7. “much” should be “must”. b) Submit that the amalgamation of the zoning by-laws is the priority over an extensive review of the 2010 Official Plan. c) A new technical review round for other government stakeholders is required given the changes made since draft 1 and this second round of public consultations. d) The City has allowed at least one major development application to go forward without an Official Plan amendment (223 Princess Street) even though the application is in contradiction to several Official Plan policies. The Official Plan needs to have a section that clearly specifies when an Official Plan amendment is required for a planning application and that specifies which policies trump others, if that is the city's intention. e) The city is not applying Section 3.3.10(a) to new developments and is not requiring developers to address this in their applications. What is	a) Thank you, the typo has been corrected. b) The <i>Planning Act</i> requires that an Official Plan be updated every five years to ensure that it: conforms with provincial plans, or does not conflict with them; has regard to matters of provincial interest; is consistent with provincial policy statements; and that policies dealing with areas of employment are confirmed or amended. Taking into account the timing of the adoption of the 2010 Official Plan and the introduction of a 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, the City is required to complete the Five Year Update. The Comprehensive Zoning By-law project is underway and the first draft is expected to be released following the completion of the Five Year Official Plan Update. Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report for additional details. c) Government stakeholders will be provided with an opportunity to review and provide their feedback on Draft 3 of the Official Plan Update.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>the city's policy with respect to new developments and Official Plan affordable housing policies? The city must implement the Official Plan's affordable housing policies until they are changed in the Official Plan.</p> <p>f) Kingston should establish a sunset provision in the Official Plan to ensure that developers do not get approval for a project and then not follow through on the development.</p> <p>g) The revised Official Plan has to recognize that a new bridge is not possible within the current planning horizon and the text and schedules should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>h) The city was careful to identify all edits to the existing Official Plan in the drafts showing proposed changes. How is the city going to keep track of changes from the current 2010 Plan to the proposed one? This is essential so that citizens can see what is being proposed and how it differs from the current Plan.</p>	<p>d) The site specific rezoning application for 223 Princess Street is active and has not been approved by the City. The policies of the Official Plan are to be read as a whole and no single policy or group of policies is intended to be given greater weight than any other policy or group of policies, except as it relates to the clarification of secondary plan policies as described in Section 9.2.6.</p> <p>e) The policies outlined in Section 3.3.10 have been strengthened and reviewed for provincial policy conformity. The 25 percent supply of affordable housing is identified as a minimum target (i.e., it is not a requirement). The province is currently reviewing legislation that may make the provision of affordable housing, through “inclusionary zoning”, mandatory. For now, the City will continue to work with the development community, not-for-profit organizations, the City’s Housing Department and others to increase the supply of affordable housing. Section 9.12.2.c proposes an affordability analysis that refers to the considerations made in 3.3.10.</p> <p>f) Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The <i>Planning Act</i> does not give municipalities authority to establish the requested sunset provision.</p> <p>g) The Official Plan is a high level policy document intended to guide the City’s long term plan for growth. An environmental assessment has been initiated to examine the feasibility of the new bridge. This major piece of infrastructure must be considered in the Official Plan.</p> <p>h) Draft 3 of the Official Plan Update will ensure that the proposed edits are carefully shown so that citizens can see what is being proposed and how it differs from the current Plan.</p>
104.	C. Hargreaves, Kingston Field Naturalists’ Conservation Committee	2015-11-18	Ribbon of Life	<p>a) Ensure protection of the “Ribbon of Life” in the OP is effective and protected in Zoning Amendments.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>
105.	Mark Touw, IBI Group for JSM Property	2015-11-25	Employment Lands Site Specific	<p>a) Concerned about the wording of “complementary use”, the location of complementary uses, and amount of complementary use permitted in advance of a primary permitted use.</p> <p>b) Suggested that the permitted uses in the Business Park Industrial designation should be broadened.</p> <p>c) Suggested revisions to the site specific OP policies for the JSM site</p>	<p>a) Staff have included additional policy direction to implement the findings of the Employment Land Strategy Review and to also offer some flexibility for the inclusion, location and timing of complementary uses, especially on larger land holdings. Please refer to Sections 3.6.12 through 3.6.14 of the third draft of the Official Plan update.</p> <p>b) As part of the policy review undertaken by staff following the completion of the Employment Land Strategy Review, some additional</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				(Section 3.18.12) to reflect suggestions for the Business Park Industrial designation and the existing zoning on the site.	<p>light industrial uses have been added to the Business Park designation, with the requirement that all operations are contained within an enclosed building. Some additional complementary uses have also been added, including hotels, conference centres, drive-through facilities, medical and paramedical uses, and daycare facilities and places of worship, subject to locational criteria for sensitive uses. Please refer to Sections 3.6.A.1 and 3.6.A.2 for the specific wording changes.</p> <p>c) The City is not including site specific re-designations as part of the OP Update unless such is recommended as part of a completed policy study, approved by Council. The Employment Lands Strategy Review reviewed the JSM site and recommended that it be re-designated to Business Park Industrial, which has been included with this Official Plan update. The above-noted additions to the permitted uses for the Business Park Industrial designation would apply to this site. Changes to Section 3.18.12 have been made to reflect the recommendations of the Employment Land Strategy Review. A site-specific OP amendment would be needed to support any other change in designation or policy for this property.</p>
106.	S. Parks and M. Taggart, Tamarack	2015-11-26 2016-03-14	Right-of-Way	<p>a) Support reducing right-of-way widths in new residential developments.</p> <p>b) Propose the following wording for Section 4.6.22: "Road right-of-way widths detailed in the City's Engineering Standards must be designed to accommodate emergency vehicle access, snow storage, boulevard, parking, walking and cycling."</p> <p>c) The table in Section 4.6.27 should also be updated to state that the Designated Width for Local Streets is 18.0-20.0m.</p> <p>d) Standard road-right-of-ways are detailed in the City's Engineering Standards. An 18 metre right-of-way is shown as an accepted standard for local roads.</p> <p>e) By leaving the statement as is in Section 4.6.22, the Official Plan would be discouraging City staff from working with community builders to find ways to develop more compact, sustainable communities with improved efficiency in the provision of municipal services.</p> <p>f) Would be willing to put forward their project at 700 Gardiners Road as a pilot project for comparing the difference between the effectiveness of snow management on different road widths</p>	<p>a) In general, the City continues to support the standard 20 metre road allowance. The language in section 4.6.22 has been revised to clarify that the intent of the provision is to allow the City to review requests for a reduced road allowance on a case-by-case basis if the request for a reduction is substantiated by supporting information to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>b) There is an increasing interest in multi-modal transportation design, active transportation options as well as enhanced street features. As described in item a) above, the 20 metre road allowance requirement will remain to ensure we can accommodate all required features, unless a reduction is substantiated with supporting information to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>c) A reduction to 18 metres at this time is short sighted and does not protect for future recommendations that may come from the Active Transportation Study, increased transit and pedestrian mode share from the Council resolution on the Kingston Transportation Master Plan update and Cycling Policy changes that may include off road facilities.</p> <p>d) The Subdivision Design Guidelines and Technical Standards provide an example of an 18 metre road allowance; however, for the reasons identified above, the typical minimum should remain at 20 metres with flexibility to reduce it to 18 metres when appropriate.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					<p>e) Staff are prepared to discuss an 18 metre road allowance with supporting design information that addresses 2016 Accessible Design Standards for the public realm, snow storage, emergency service delivery, on street parking, pedestrian requirements, active transportation, landscaping, utility locations etc.</p> <p>f) The nature of a pilot project is that if it does not pan out as hoped or anticipated then you can return to status quo. Constructing a subdivision with an 18 metre road allowance cannot be returned to a 20 metre road allowance should the pilot fail. Staff will require the supporting information to be provided to ensure the success of every project. Requests for an 18 metre road allowance will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
107.	L. Peppard	2015-12-06	Mineral Resources Planning Process UNESCO	<p>a) Object to the proposed revisions to the Mineral - Wollastonite (MW) Designation. Noise, principally from crushing operations has been a continuing issue with nearby residents – hours of operation are 7 am to 7 pm and noise is audible at most residential sites along Seabrooke Rd, Big Hill Rd and Seeley's Bay Rd. It would be beneficial if municipal authorities could act as an "honest broker" in setting up a working relationship between the mine proponents and the local residents to solve, or at least mitigate, outstanding issues to avoid the costs of OMB hearings.</p> <p>b) Some blasts are of a maximum allowable magnitude and so are felt over a wide area, including the Village of Seeley's Bay. Not desirable in an area that relies on tourism for economic growth and values the UNESCO heritage designations of the Rideau Canal and Frontenac Arch Biosphere.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) Removal of a mineral resource is subject to approvals (permits) issued by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. The terms of any approval outline operational constraints that include, but are not limited to, blasting limits. The Official Plan is used to identify where a resource exists and to establish a policy framework for demonstrating land use compatibility. Provincial policy requires that the City identify the resource within its Official Plan.</p>
108.	C. Cunningham	2015-12-06	Mineral Resources UNESCO	<p>a) Object to the proposed enlargement of the MW (Mineral Wollastonite) Designation. Purchased land and built hoping to enjoy quiet, rural nature of the area enhanced by wetlands. Wetlands are sensitive to noise and dust as well as general habitat destruction that are a consequence of future mining operations.</p> <p>b) UNESCO heritage designations of the Rideau Canal and Frontenac Arch Biosphere are not compatible with the destructive and disruptive aspects of nearby Wollastonite mine.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) The process of extracting a mineral resource is subject to approvals (permits) issued by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. The terms of any approval outline operational constraints that include, but are not limited to, blasting controls. The Official Plan is used to identify where a resource exists and to establish a policy framework for demonstrating land use compatibility. Provincial policy requires that the City identify the resource within its Official Plan.</p>
109.	S. Mallen	2015-12-06	Mineral Resources	<p>a) Object to the proposed changed in the Mineral Wollastonite (MW) designation. Life has been built around close connection with the land and community. Mining operations have adversely affected quality of life, particularly due to excessive noise and ability to use land to its fullest potential. The expansion of the MW area will result in further degradation to quality of life.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
110.	W. Schuster	2015-12-06	Mineral Resources	a) Object to the enlargement of MW designation. Helped to maintain a heritage home for last 18 years, including such fragile features as the original glass and foundation. Vibrations from dynamite blasting are an ongoing threat to the house and the expansion of mining operations will result in stronger and more frequent blasting. Future mining in enlarged MW designated area will adversely affect enjoyment of property through excessive and continuous noise.	a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.
111.	E. Webb	2015-12-07	Mineral Resources UNESCO Habitat	<p>a) Object to the proposed revisions to the Mineral-Wollastonite (MW) Designation. The expansion of the designated area will affect additional landowners in terms of building and development restrictions.</p> <p>b) Increased negative impact on property values near the buffer zone and agricultural/residential development in the area will be less attractive to investors.</p> <p>c) Development of mining operations in expanded area will negatively impact quality of life for residents in terms of noise, air and water pollution. Irreparable damage will be done to the environment in the expanded area and there are significant wetlands identified within the region.</p> <p>d) UNESCO Heritage Site designation of the Rideau Canal will be threatened. Mining activity is not compatible with the development of recreation and tourism in the area.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) The buffer zone is established to ensure compatibility matters are properly evaluated within a specific catchment area of an identified mineral resource, and more specifically an active extraction operation. Provincial policy requires that the City identify the resource within its Official Plan.</p> <p>c) The identification of mineral resources is a matter of provincial interest. The mapping changes have been reviewed by the Ministry and are supported. Any future extraction of a mineral resource will be subject to permitting controlled by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. A public engagement process is required as part of the Ministry's approvals process, which also requires that potential land use impacts be properly evaluated and addressed.</p> <p>d) The process of extracting a mineral resource is subject to approvals (permits) issued by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. The Official Plan is used to identify where a resource exists and to establish a policy framework for demonstrating land use compatibility. Provincial policy requires that the City identify the resource within its Official Plan.</p>
112.	M. Nelson	2015-12-07	Mineral Resources UNESCO Habitat	a) Same content as letter above from E. Webb.	a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.
113.	G. and J. Sutherland	2015-12-07	Mineral Resources UNESCO Habitat	a) Same content as letter above from E. Webb. Owns area where Mineral Wollastonite would expand and does not approve.	a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.
114.	G. and C. Sutherland	2015-12-07	Mineral Resources UNESCO Habitat	<p>a) Same content as letter above from E. Webb. Bought the property with future intention of building on it and, as owners of the property with the expanded Mineral Wollastonite area, do not want the mineral resource area expanding on it.</p> <p>b) Wonder why it would be allowed to expand into the wetlands.</p>	<p>a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p> <p>b) The expansion of the Mineral Resource Area (MW) is in an area that is currently designated Rural in the Official Plan and will not expand into lands designated as Environmental Protection Area. The Mineral Reserve Area only shows the location of the deposit and it does not mean that the mine can expand into any wetlands.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
115.	D. Dafoe	2015-12-07	Mineral Resources UNESCO Habitat	a) Same content as letter above from E. Webb.	a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report.
116.	C. and T. Mallen	2015-12-07	Mineral Resources	a) Object to the proposed expansion of the Mineral-Wollastonite designated area. b) The proposed expansion makes it impossible for daughter to build a home on property which is extremely important to the family.	a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report. b) The expansion of the Mineral Resource Area (MW) is in an area to the north and southwest of the existing Mineral Resource Area. The extent of the Mineral Reserve Area has been accepted by the Province so the City has to show it in the OP.
117.	B. Mallen	2015-12-15	Mineral Resources	a) Thoroughly object to expansion of Wollastonite Mine. Expansion of mine will potentially prevent family from constructing new home on father's land. b) Natural resources should not destroy the potential of bordering properties and pristine rural landscape. Potential for it to harm wetlands and livelihood of community is a grave concern for all residents.	a) See Issue 5 in Section 2.0 of this Report b) The process of extracting a mineral resource is subject to approvals (permits) issued by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. The Official Plan is used to identify where a resource exists and to establish a policy framework for demonstrating land use compatibility. Provincial policy requires that the City identify the resource within its Official Plan. The extent of the Mineral Reserve Area has been accepted by the Province so the City has to show it in the OP.
118.	Councillor R. Allen	2015-12-29 2016-01-07	Agriculture	a) Can we include additional uses in the rural area to allow rural business to diversify income streams or leverage the local food movement establishments? b) I am wondering if there could be a definition of "Rural - Farm," something that doesn't contravene Provincial policies but provides additional protection for existing farm-type uses on what is Rural, but not large enough, or quality enough to be classified as Prime Agriculture in the provincial framework. It would be nice to have a framework that causes us to pause when looking changing the use of a farm even if it isn't Prime Agricultural, it still contributes to local food, and encourages economic activity through agriculture.	a) In Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Areas, the revised policies of the Official Plan allow for on-farm diversified uses that are compatible with and do not hinder surrounding agricultural uses. This additional permission will allow additional uses in Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Areas in a manner that is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. The promotion of the local food movement is already referenced in the Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Areas designations and has been added to the Country Area in sections 2.1.5.f. b) The Rural Area designation reflects areas of the City outside of the Urban Boundary that generally have Class 5 to 7 soils with less suitability to sustain viable agriculture and existing non-farm development that may limit the future of intensive farm activity. There are small areas of high capability farmland and existing livestock operations within the Rural Area designation. A policy has been added to 3.13.4.
119.	Wayne Headrick, Cunningham Swan	2016-01-06	Site Specific Zoning By-law	a) Request that the lands owned by Juniper Lane Development Corporation, 681102 Ontario Limited and 1686713 Ontario Limited, being described as PIN 36083-0132, being Part Lot 16, Concession 2, Part 1, 13R-2700 save and except Part 1 FR663068 and Part 4, 13R-19580, remain unchanged in zoning (i.e., C2-36-H and I) and designation (i.e., Arterial Commercial & Environmental Protection Area).	a) Changes to the EPA designation illustrated in the second draft of the OP reflect the inclusion of the floodplain as mapped by the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority (CRCA). The third draft of the OP separates the floodplain from those natural heritage features that make up the EPA designation. Mapping of the floodplain has been added to Schedule 11. Consultation with the CRCA will be required in advance of any development or site alteration within an identified

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					Natural Hazard Area (i.e., floodplain). A permit may also be required as identified in policy 5.5.
120.	D. Campbell	2016-01-09	Downtown	a) Encourages a “vibrant, exciting downtown that shows off our heritage integrated with new architecture” (note: comment made in the context of the proposed Capital Condo project and Homestead high-rises on Queen Street).	a) Thank you; the City shares this vision for the downtown. On-going work on intensification policies will help better guide development.
121.	G. Pharand	2016-01-12	Architectural Design Transportation	<p>a) Concerned that development needs to fit better in terms of scale and materials.</p> <p>b) Suggestion for low-rise parking structure rather than underground parking beneath high-rise buildings.</p> <p>c) Concerned that over-gentrification may drive up commercial rents and force out small businesses.</p> <p>a) Also concerned about the amount of parking proposed.</p>	<p>a) The Official Plan has a number of sections that give guidance regarding compatibility of scale and materials. For example, see Sections 2.7 – Land use compatibility and Sections 8.2 and 8.3 regarding the residential design guidelines. Work is on-going to determine how we can improve the policies to help better guide development. Please see Issue 1 – Infill and Intensification for additional information.</p> <p>b) There are a variety of factors that determine if a developer will build a parking structure rather than underground parking. At this time, the City is willing to let developers propose how to provide parking, and the City will assess the suitability of the design through the site plan review process.</p> <p>c) Thank you for this comment. The Official Plan encourages businesses to evolve while still recognizing that the Central Business District is at the top of the city’s hierarchy of commercial areas (see Section 3.4.7).</p> <p>d) Thank you for this comment. The City is currently undertaking a parking review as part of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law review. In addition, concern about any oversupply of parking for proposed development can be considered during the site plan review process.</p>
122.	N. Cornish, IBI Group	2016-01-27	Mineral Resources	<p>a) Does the Mineral Resource Area (MRA) – Wollastonite designation match the boundary of the Wollastonite deposit provided to the City as a shapefile (GIS) by IBI Group and does the designation encompass the municipal road allowance bordering the east side of the subject lands? It is our understanding that it does, however, due to the high level nature of the mapping, it is difficult for us to confirm this with the naked eye.</p> <p>b) Given the second paragraph of your email as highlighted below, is additional technical information required to support the known geological extent of the wollastonite deposit provided to the City as a shapefile (refer to question 1)?</p> <p>c) It was our understanding that MNDM confirmed the deposit boundary provided to Staff and that the information provided was sufficient given the integration of the change into the second draft. As per our letter of November 11, we asked to round out the ‘MRA - Wollastonite’</p>	<p>a) The MRA-Wollastonite designation illustrated in the second draft of the Official Plan schedules matches the boundary provided to the City as a shapefile by IBI Group, and supported by the Province. The boundary encompasses the municipal road allowance.</p> <p>b) The original shapefile provided by IBI Group has been supported by the Ministry. Given the designation of mineral resources is a Provincial interest matter, we will support the area represented by the shapefile and will include such in the revised OP without additional technical information.</p> <p>c) While some sections of the Rural-designated lands between the proposed MRA boundary and the EPA-designation boundary are only a few meters wide there are other areas that are as wide as 100 metres (east) and 190 metres wide (west). Without Ministry support for the inclusion of these lands the City will not be including them in the OP as part of its comprehensive five-year review.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>designation so that there isn't a ± 200 metre strip of 'Rural' designation between the 'EPA' lands and the 'MRA-Wollastonite' designation. We recognize that this area is beyond the deposit boundary of the shapefile provided. However, given the very small area between the Wollastonite and EPA designations (at some sections it would be as little as a few meters wide), it's unlikely on the ground you would ever be able to identify that area hence, the request to "round out" the designation. We ask that the City consider the rounding out of the designation based on the high-level nature of the policy document.</p> <p>d) Is additional technical information required to support our request that the 500 metre buffer on Schedule 12 be updated? Schedule 12 reflects a 500 metre buffer around the 'MRA – Wollastonite' designation illustrated on Schedule 3. It is our opinion that given the update to Schedule 3 to reflect the confirmed deposit area (i.e. the area provided in the shapefile), the 500 metre buffer on Schedule 12 should be subsequently updated to reflect the changes to Schedule 3 which were supported by technical evidence.</p>	d) The City's approach in the OP is to address influence areas through policy rather than mapping; we are maintaining this approach.
123.	A. Candon, Candon and Clancy Real Estate Solutions	2016-02-02	Stable/Intensification Right-of-Way Employment Lands	<p>a) Are we considering the financial components associated with creating an intensified corridor? If you are going to land bank property create a larger piece then it has to make economic sense to do that. If you buy 3 parcels for 3 million dollars and can only build a 6 story building you will be stopping development in its tracks. Is this being considered?</p> <p>b) Are we considering the 20 meter road way change being suggested by Taggart construction to be included in the new OP?</p> <p>c) Are we considering the Northdale Corridor as an example of how to make a vibrant development with economic "spin-off." This development corridor made Waterloo one of the top 10 communities in the world by "The economist." It allowed for hundreds of small businesses to start up and billions of dollars worth of investment into the community. It is now known as the tech triangle, has the head office for google and is competing with silicon valley as a place to do business. This is an incredible example of institutional resources and private capital being used to complement each other. It is not just building a building it is creating a community. How much of this is being considered?</p>	<p>a) The intent of identifying corridors and nodes is not to prevent development in other areas but to identify generally where higher densities would be more appropriate. For example, downtown could be a node but a neighbourhood like Greenwood Park would not be. This means that we would anticipate developments in the downtown to have much higher densities than developments in neighbourhoods like Greenwood park. It will help clarify some of the higher density development requests that the City has been receiving. We understand that development needs to make economic sense or else it will not happen.</p> <p>b) Policy revisions are being considered to enable broader consideration of alternative road allowance widths (i.e., those less than the 20 metre minimum) taking into account the benefits that a lesser road width might offer, subject to meeting specific policy "tests".</p> <p>c) The City's Employment Areas policies have been revised to lessen development constraint by accommodating a broader range of uses subject to compatibility considerations. These revisions were advanced upon review of planning policies established in other municipalities, one of which being the City of Waterloo. The Centres (nodes) and Corridors policies provide a framework for advancing secondary planning activities that could support the creation of an area such as the Northdale Corridor in Waterloo.</p>
124.	P. Brown	2016-02-09 2016-02-23	Noise/Light Pollution	a) One of the statements commonly referred to in the Official Plan is the reference to MOE Guidelines as they relate to noise. The challenge	a) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. Noise is regulated by the Provincial Guidelines and the City of Kingston's Noise By-law.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>with that is that the guidelines are universal in nature. Would we be able to get a modifier such as “or any such further guidelines or policies as implemented by the City in general or on a site specific basis”?</p> <p>b) Quiet is one of those things we only appreciate when it is gone. I would love to see the OP at least acknowledge that we value that and will fight hard before we give it up. I realize that the OP wouldn’t get into this kind of detail but if the OP spoke to the importance of noise management then we could recommend a “Quiet Zone” along our shorelines during the Noise By-Law review. The proposed “Quiet Zone” would prohibit mechanical or electronic noise in excess of 40 decibels that would be heard by users of the “Quiet Zone”. All future development along the “Quiet Zone” including new roads would be subject to a noise impact study to demonstrate that such development would meet or exceed the target decibel level.</p> <p>c) International Dark-Sky Association’s work on light pollution is quite interesting – it is a global movement that Kingston should be a part of, especially considering our sustainability goals.</p>	<p>b) Policy revisions have been made to Section 5.21 to acknowledge the importance of noise management. The Ministry of Environment’s Guidelines establish Province-wide expectations for assessing factors that may result in compatibility issues (e.g., noise, odours, vibrations, etc.). The City’s Noise By-law provides the regulatory framework for controlling noise.</p> <p>c) Light pollution is considered during the site plan review process. The Site Plan Control Guidelines speak to providing enough lighting to promote pedestrian and vehicle safety while minimizing ambient light pollution. Reference to potential “light pollution” has been added as a consideration to be had when evaluating land use compatibility (see Section 2.7).</p>
125.	L. Munday, KFL&A Public Health	2016-02-11	Health	<p>a) KFL&A Public Health provided health stakeholder feedback in the form of compiled recommendations throughout the Official plan Update process. From a health promotion and health protection perspective, we are quite pleased with many of the revisions made to date. We feel that our feedback has been comprehensive and have no plan to make further recommendations for revisions.</p>	<p>a) Thank you for your comments. We are glad that you are pleased with the revisions that have been made.</p>
126.	H. Fleischer, CN Rail	2016-02-16	Transportation	<p>a) We wish to acknowledge the City of Kingston’s proactive effort in addressing the presence of the railway in your community. We note that the Official Plan addresses issues concerning land use compatibility, safety, noise and vibration, and protecting the integrity of industry and the railway corridor in the region.</p>	<p>a) Thank you for your acknowledgment.</p>
127.	S. Warren	2016-02-19	Transportation	<p>a) With respect to the new Official Plan, are the Kingston City Transit Bus Routes ever going to extend north up Sydenham Road, north of Crossfield?</p>	<p>a) Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The actual routing of Kingston Transit is not something covered within the Official Plan as the Plan is intended to be a higher-level policy document. The Plan does direct development to areas along major public transit routes as a means of supporting the local service delivery.</p>
128.	C. Khan	2016-02-23	Waterfront Sustainability Green Building	<p>a) Recommend that the next iteration of the Official Plan include stronger policies regarding waterfront protection, ecosystem services and green infrastructure. Ecosystem services include things like carbon dioxide sequestration, stormwater management, pollination services, and provision of clean water and food among a huge variety of things. Examples of green infrastructure approaches include planting urban trees, utilizing green roofs, and construction with green building</p>	<p>a) The waterfront will continue to be protected through policies such as 2.8.3, 3.9.2 and 9.9.5. Please also see Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The Official Plan also contains new policies related to source water protection with the goal of protecting the quantity and quality of source water over the long term. As well, there is strong support for green industry and building practices in the Official Plan, for example, please see 2.1. Please also see revisions made to policy 2.1.5 with</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>materials.</p> <p>b) Interested to see how natural environment, safeguarding existing natural heritage features and generation of ecosystem services will be interpreted in the Official Plan.</p> <p>c) Now is the time to start planning for green infrastructure projects.</p> <p>d) It is a good time to start thinking about enhancing green space in Kingston.</p> <p>e) Waterfront areas should remain intact for future generations to enjoy.</p>	<p>respect to local food production</p> <p>b) The Official Plan applies an ecosystem approach to protecting the natural heritage system, and protection of the natural heritage system is one of the strategic policy directions of the Official Plan. For example, please see Sections 2.3.13, 2.8, 3.10 and 6.1.</p> <p>c) Comment is received with thanks.</p> <p>d) Comment is received with thanks.</p> <p>e) Comment is received with thanks. The waterfront will continue to be protected through policies such as 2.8.3, 3.9.2 and 9.9.5. Please also see Issue 2 in Section 2.0 of this Report.</p>
129.	K. Ohtake, Sydenham District Association	2016-02-22 2016-02-23	Institutional Student Housing Stable/Intensification Planning Process Community Benefits	<p>a) Request that the Official Plan address redevelopment of institutional properties in the Sydenham District (example St. Mary's of the Lake Hospital, KCVI, St. Helen's and Stone Gables, the Marine Museum deep-water pier) and other similar sites to protect the open (and hopefully green) space that they currently offer the community.</p> <p>b) Recommend that if an institutional, commercial or industrial property is being decommissioned, the default zoning on that property be the same as its adjacent properties and that any deviation from such a policy be subject to consultation with neighbouring property owners.</p> <p>c) The incorporation of student housing into the traditional housing stock has been a challenge. This is exacerbated by redevelopments which fail to respect the built form and social structure of the neighbourhood and frequently seek numerous concessions to existing zoning bylaws to maximize the density of occupants. Suggest two broad approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Encourage higher-density residential accommodation, tailored to the needs of students, in the area north of the University to Princess Street and bounded (broadly) on the east by Barrie St. and on the west by Alfred St. ii) Discourage the ad-hoc re-development of existing housing into student specific accommodation in the rest of Sydenham district. <p>d) The Official Plan must provide clear definition of areas for intensification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Presumption that fewer occupants per household will actually increase need for housing stock. Accuracy of projections is key to the entire policy of intensification. To what degree have projections been vetted. ii) Population growth in the area around Queen's University and St. Lawrence College will be dominated by growth in enrolment. It is not clear if specific projections from institutions were considered 	<p>a) The development or redevelopment of institutional lands within Sydenham District is limited by the policies of the Official Plan and the underlying provisions of the zoning by-law. Any change in land use that is not permitted by the OP and/or zoning would require amendment through a public Planning Act process. The provision of public open space, through parkland dedication, is explicitly prescribed in the Planning Act and reiterated in the OP (see Section 3.8.13).</p> <p>The recommendations of the Waterfront Master Plan, recently adopted by Council, are being proposed through policy revisions to the Official Plan. Revisions acknowledge the need to establish a connected waterfront pathway within the urban boundary of the City and a series of waterfront nodes within rural areas. Policies have also been added to support the strategic acquisition of waterfront lands are part of a Planning Act process and where possible to secure enhanced access to the waterfront itself. These policies revisions will need to be considered in upon review of applications for development of institutional lands abutting the shoreline of Lake Ontario.</p> <p>b) Any land use change that is not permitted by the underlying zoning by-law would be subject to a zoning by-law amendment and a public Planning Act process. There is no legal opportunity to have the zoning of a property "default" to the zoning of adjacent properties.</p> <p>c) Policies pertaining to stable areas have been revised in addition to those pertaining to high density residential development and the locational criteria associated therewith. The revisions proposed will provide greater clarity regarding the intended location of intensification, which is notably lacking in the current Official Plan. The Official Plan cannot distinguish the users of land from the use of land. A residential use is intended to accommodate those who reside within the designated area, regardless of whether or not they are a student.</p> <p>d) Population projections completed in 2013 by Meridian Planning and</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>in population growth for these specific areas.</p> <p>e) The Official Plan must provide a clear definition of a stable area versus an area in transition and provide suitable protection to stable areas against de-stabilizing developments. It is necessary that firm criteria be established for the transition threshold to be met.</p> <p>f) The Official Plan must improve the public consultation component of the planning process regarding requested changes to the official plan and zoning bylaws.</p> <p>g) Defining density as bedrooms per area as compared to living units per area would be much more appropriate in areas of significant student accommodation. Urban Residential Density measured by the number of “residential units per hectare” does not adequately reflect the real effects of human density in an area.</p> <p>h) Ensure requested deviations from it or from the zoning bylaws are justified with tangible and significant benefits to the community, not just the developer.</p>	<p>the Centre for Spatial Economics (C4SE) were based on varying levels of anticipated growth driven by activities in the local job market, fluctuations in student enrolment, changes in the demographic composition of the population, and net migration. The work was completed by a qualified consulting firm and vetted through staff review, public consultation and ultimate adoption by Council.</p> <p>The City completed a Central Accommodation Review to evaluate patterns of intensification occurring within the neighbourhoods around Queen’s University and St. Lawrence College. Stemming from this Review, an intensification study was recommended as a means of defining how changes in the area could be controlled in a manner that protected stable areas. A policy has been added to the Official Plan to recognize the need for additional technical study arising out of the Central Accommodation Review. The timing of undertaking this Study is dependent on the allocation of municipal resources.</p> <p>e) Policy revisions have been proposed to Sections 2.6 to address the need for more explicit direction regarding the protection of stable areas from potentially de-stabilizing developments.</p> <p>f) See Issue 6 in Section 2 regarding planning process.</p> <p>g) This is a matter that will be considered in the advancement of the zoning by-law project.</p> <p>h) Any deviation from a zoning standard must demonstrate conformity with the policies of the City’s Official Plan and consistency with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement. Planning staff at the City advance their review of development applications on the basis of these fundamental planning responsibilities and the need to protect the ‘public interest’.</p>
130.	P. Rose	2016-02-23	Terminology Stable/Intensification Heritage Site Specific Second Residential Units	<p>a) The document lacks long term vision or a strong fundamental skeletal framework to guide Kingston for the next 10, 20, 50 years.</p> <p>b) Examples of lack of clarity or unclear directives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3- Goal mentions Councils strategic priority for “smart growth” yet the concept of what smart growth is or means remains undefined and is therefore nebulous. Section 2.3.2 talks about needed intensification within the urban boundary with “compatible” and “complementary” infill of residential density yet the term compatible fails to mention massing, heritage or sustainability as part of being compatible. There is no clear defining section dedicated to outlining the principle concepts of heritage, preservation or standards for preserving and defining Kingston into the next decades. 	<p>a) The Official Plan is intended to be a high level policy document established to manage and direct physical change and the effects on the social, economic, and natural environment of the City. Revisions proposed throughout this update have further strengthened the Plan and its policy directives.</p> <p>b) See bullets below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisions throughout sections 2 and 3 are intended to provide clarity thereby enhancing interpretation. The Official Plan is believed to have a very robust policy framework as it relates to heritage conservation. Further, the continued advancement of Heritage Conservation District work demonstrates the City’s commitment to conserving heritage over the long term. A property designation project

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 20 storey apartment builds proposed for Queen Street and the Official Plan are in complete opposition. With respect to Section 3.3.D.13, the time is now to put in place a permanent self-sustaining rental licensing program for the purposes of personal safety, code compliance, monitoring and an appropriate fine structure to weed out noncompliant or negligent landlords/owners which will move the city further toward improved, sustainable long term housing stock. In Section 3.3.11. d. and g. regarding second residential units, there is no discussion or requirement of the need for public transportation. c) In contrast, Section 3.3.11.j. discusses secondary suites outside of the “as of right” area, and calls for mandatory public transit in close proximity. There is no consistency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development proposals are reviewed against the policies of the Official Plan and Zoning by-laws with decisions needing to satisfy specific Planning Act tests. The policy enables the implementation of a rental licensing program. c) Areas within which second residential units are permitted “as-of-right” are considered to be well-served by public transit. The inclusion of a policy reference to public transportation in 3.3.11.j has been specifically tied to those instances where a second residential unit is proposed outside of an “as-of-right” area warranting review and consideration on the basis of matters such as proximity to public transportation and servicing.
131.	G. and L. Buzzi, Collins Bay Marina Inc.	2016-02-23	Open Space Ribbon of Life Waterfront Site Specific	<p>a) Concerned with the Environmental Protection Area and Open Space designations of the marina on Schedule 3-A of the current Official Plan. Zoned Marine Commercial (C4) in Zoning By-law Number 76-26. Concerned that the future changes to the zoning to conform to the Official Plan could result in the closing of the marina. Open space designation of the lands owned by the Collins Bay Marina is wrong. Request that an appropriate commercial designation be applied similar to the marinas on the north side of Collins Bay where the Arterial Commercial designation has been applied.</p> <p>b) Request a specific designation as a Harbour Area be applied so that its permitted uses will be protected by Section 3.9.A.2, and any implementing zoning by-law will allow for marine retail, mooring facilities, seasonal docking, dry docks, marine salvage and repair uses.</p> <p>c) The application of ribbon of life for new development will threaten future viability of the marina.</p> <p>d) With respect to Draft 2 of the Schedules, following comments are provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 incorrectly designates Collins Bay Marina (CBM) as Major Open Space/Environmental Schedule 2 incorrectly designates CBM as Environmental Protection Area Schedule 9 incorrectly designates CBM as Riparian Corridors Schedule 12 – the boundary of the unevaluated wetlands should be the eastern boundary of CBM lands <p>e) Schedule 17 illustrates NEF boundaries on the airport property that are incorrect. Will provide further evidence regarding this. The Canadian</p>	<p>a) Site specific changes are not being contemplated as part of the Official Plan update. The requested revisions would need to proceed by way of an owner-initiated Official Plan Amendment to accommodate a full and transparent <i>Planning Act</i> process. It should be noted that the Open Space designation permits marinas.</p> <p>b) Collins Bay is already designated as a Harbour Area on Schedule 3-A of the Official Plan. As indicated in Section 3.9.A.6 of the Official Plan, the City supports the continued marina, dry dock and marine functions of the Harbour Areas on the Cataraqui River, and for the Collins Bay, Rideau, Treasure Island and Trident Marinas.</p> <p>c) As indicated in Section 3.9.3 of the Official Plan, the ribbon of life may be modified or exempted in marina facilities.</p> <p>d) We have updated Schedule 3 to reflect CBM existing land use status.</p> <p>e) This comment is being considered in the context of the City’s evaluation of the potential expansion of the north-south runway. Revisions to NEF mapping will be advanced on the basis of the findings of the City’s evaluation. At this time; however, it is noted that the OP will reflect NEF mapping derived from the 2007 Airport Master Plan and not the work of the on-going expansion project.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				software (NEFCALC) used by Transport Canada was not used. This is a major flaw in your OP as it effects many homes to the east of the airport, to the south of the airport and to the north of the airport. We have commissioned a noise contour study using the correct Canadian software by qualified engineers-Amec Foster Wheeler. Our study will prove the harm that will be inflicted on Kingston residents.	
132.	D. Tran	2016-02-23	Height Limit	a) Recommended a height restriction limiting building heights in the Urban Boundary in the City of Kingston to XX metres, or the width of the right-of-way of the street on which a building fronts, whichever is shorter.	a) See Issue 3 in Section 2.0.
133.	A. Lintner	2016-02-23	Stormwater Green Building Sustainability	<p>a) I'm hoping you can help me understand how the Official Plan update is addressing two aspects of the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement related to stormwater management. If you can point me in the direction of which Official Plan policies are responsive to these aspects of the 2014 PPS, that would be very helpful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Planning authorities should promote green infrastructure to complement infrastructure. (policy 1.6.2) and ii) Planning for stormwater management shall: maximize the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces; and promote stormwater management best practices, including stormwater attenuation and re-use, and low impact development. (policy 1.6.6.7) <p>b) I'm in favour of Kingston seeking to shift from "Grey to Green" (see, for example, guidance developed by the Credit Valley Conservation Authority http://www.creditvalleyca.ca/low-impact-development/low-impact-development-support/stormwater-management-lid-guidance-documents/), as the adoption of "green infrastructure" has benefits in terms of improving stormwater quality/quantity, addressing climate change, providing natural habitats, and potentially food (e.g., community gardens, fruit trees).</p>	<p>a) A reference to green infrastructure has been added to 2.10.1.b. The definition of "green infrastructure" from the Provincial Policy Statement has been added to the draft Official Plan Update. As well, Sections 2.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.8 have been revised to reference green infrastructure. Reduction of stormwater flows is addressed through a number of policies in the Official Plan; for example see Sections 2.1.1, 2.8.6 and 4.3, and revision to Section 2.1.7. As well, several ways of reducing the amount of stormwater released in the City's stormwater management system are listed in the Design Guidelines for Residential Lots and Design Guidelines for New Communities, which are now referenced in the draft Official Plan Update in Sections 8.2 and 8.3.</p> <p>b) Comment is received with thanks. Please see the response above.</p>
134.	Councillor J. McLaren	2016-02-24	Terminology Planning Process Cost Benefit Analysis	<p>a) Define "resilient" and "resiliency" including a social, economic, cultural and environmental aspect and link it to the highest levels of the OP – similar to "sustainable"</p> <p>b) Resist approving development proposals that have not demonstrated the ability to pay into the community in the form of taxes over their full life cycle or the</p> <p>c) Resist approving development proposals that have not demonstrated their need in terms of a full demographic analysis.</p> <p>d) Add to the list of adverse effects: decline in property values as a result of a particular development.</p> <p>e) It must be written into the OP that rationale and justification must be given for the requested amendment (not just rationale and justification</p>	<p>a) While we wait for future direction from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change on how to apply the concepts of resiliency to land use planning, the City recommends that we maintain our strong/established sustainability theme as the overarching framework for our Official Plan and treat resiliency as a lens through which we can approach our response to climate change.</p> <p>b) The intent of the cost benefit analysis policy is to ensure that development proceeds in a phased and orderly fashion in accordance with the phasing strategy for an area. The City has the authority to request a Cost Benefit Analysis if a proposal is not in accordance with the phasing strategy and will require new or upgraded infrastructure and/or maintenance programs. A cost benefit analysis is not required from proposals in areas where they City has identified them as</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>to build). It must be shown that a more important goal cannot be achieved without relief from a less important goal.</p> <p>f) We need to see in the third draft of the OP the actual edits and new text. Please maintain a similar style to the current second draft with the colour coded crossed out deletions and underlined new text.</p>	<p>appropriate for intensification, since they are already well served by infrastructure and maintenance programs.</p> <p>c) The Provincial Policy Statement requires that municipalities plan for growth and development by ensuring sufficient land is made available for a mix of uses. The City has determined that there is an ample supply of lands to accommodate a range of housing types over a period that is consistent with PPS directives (i.e., 10 years). Proposals to expand the Urban Growth Boundary would be considered premature in light of the supply of lands currently suited to accommodating growth.</p> <p>d) Planning decisions in Ontario must be based on land use planning grounds which do not include property value; this is a matter that has been considered by the Ontario Municipal Board. That said, good land use planning results in an arrangement of land uses that are compatible with one another thereby lessening the potential for conflict.</p> <p>e) The policies of the Official Plan must be read as a whole and no single policy or group of policies is intended to be given greater weight than any other policy or group of policies, except as it relates to the clarification of secondary plan policies as described in Section 9.2.6. Section 9.3 outlines requirements and criteria that an application to amend the Official Plan must meet. The proponents of development must satisfy Council that the overall intent and purpose of the policies of the Official Plan, in addition to those policies which explicitly apply to a situation, have been upheld.</p> <p>f) Draft 3 of the Official Plan Update carefully shows the proposed edits with colour coded deletions and underlined new text.</p>
135.	P. Brown	2016-02-26	Site Specific	<p>a) Review of site specific policy for 844-858 Division Street – the policy has changed from its original approval in 1995 to the current wording. Can you confirm that our rights and uses have not been diminished since the original approval?</p>	<p>a) Section 3.18.13 of Draft 3 of the Official Plan has been updated to include reference to incidental and subordinate uses such as catering and a restaurant for consistency with the original site specific policy from 1995.</p>
136.	M. Kussin, Alma Mater Society,	2015-06-15	Student Housing	<p>a) Would like to explore the feasibility of including a set of design guidelines for the University District in the Official Plan Update. The guidelines have been composed by students of the Queen's School of Urban and Regional Planning.</p>	<p>a) This is being considered for future action. Design guidelines for the University District would be a separate process from the current OP update, and the guidelines composed by Queen's planning students could feed into and be validated through a future process. To that end, using a process similar to the Williamsville Main Street policies (10E.1), if the near-campus area were to become a special policy / secondary plan area, design guidelines could be used to articulate a specific vision for the built form of the University District.</p>
137.	Matt Kussin	2016-02-02	Stable/Intensification	Residential-based	<p>a) Section 2.7 of the OP lays out land use compatibility principles and</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
	Alma Mater Society		Student Housing Transportation Stormwater Public Space	<p>a) There should be a focus on promoting smart infill development by taking advantage of the vacant space located at the centre of many residential blocks. Amongst many other conspicuous benefits, achieving greater residential density in homogenous student neighbourhoods is key to protecting neighborhoods at the periphery of the student sprawl area. This also allows Victorian homes in the area to continue to retain the neighbourhood feel of pedestrian scale residential development.</p> <p>b) There should be a larger focus on retail space in the University District. Corner lots should be taken advantage of for their high potential as mixed-use spaces (i.e. Division & Johnson St., which contains three excellent examples of mixed-use buildings). The retail spaces should be oriented as neighborhood commercial amenities (i.e. neighborhood markets, cafes, outdoor dining spaces, etc.).</p> <p>c) Increased (i.e. more frequent) lighting from residential buildings should be heavily prioritized.</p> <p>d) 'Monster home' conversions should be limited. They constitute ongoing property standard liabilities, detract from the appearance of the neighbourhood, lead to an intrusion of privacy into neighboring backyards, and affect the property tax valuation of adjacent homes. These collectively serve as 'push factors' for families to leave the University District and other nearby neighborhoods, distancing the area from its ideal 'mixed' composition.</p> <p>e) The established shift in the preferences of students from 5-7 bedroom homes to smaller units of 2-3 bedrooms should be reflected in future development.</p> <p>f) Appropriate tools for intensification in the University District include townhouses, stacked townhouses, row houses, semi-detached dwellings, lowrise apartments, and mid-rise apartments.</p> <p>Community-based</p> <p>g) Minimum parking requirements set out in Bylaw no. 8499 represent a large cost for private developers where parking is not in high demand. Currently, many properties have an excess of parking spaces and a lack of bike storage options. The required parking space per dwelling unit ratio should be reduced in the area.</p> <p>h) SWM and other utility upgrades needed to properly accommodate intensification in the University District should be undertaken.</p> <p>i) Certain streets in the University District should be considered as prime candidates for 'shared space' designation.</p>	<p>Section 3.3.7 provides direction for infill. The vacant space in the centre of residential blocks does present an opportunity for infill in some instances. This must also be balanced with a number of factors regarding development compatibility in terms of building height, massing and exterior design; minimal adverse effects in terms of privacy, access to sunlight, or shadowing; and the provision of other functional elements such as vehicular and pedestrian access, and amenity areas. The recently implemented Residential Design Guidelines (see Sections 8.2 and 8.3) also provide additional information.</p> <p>b) Section 3.4.3 specifies that small-scale, local commercial uses such as convenience and coffee shops may be permitted within Residential designations in accordance with Sections 3.3.2 and 3.4.F. Section 3.3.2 states that where appropriate and compatible, small-scale convenience commercial uses are allowed by zoning within apartment building or on a site specific basis on low or medium density residential site. 3.4.F (Neighbourhood Commercial) provides detailed policies for neighbourhood commercial uses.</p> <p>c) While street lighting falls within the mandate of Utilities Kingston, increased lighting from residential buildings can be addressed through Section 9.5.32 - Site Plan Control which specifies that the City will use the process of site plan control review to, among other elements, provide a safe, functional and visually attractive environment. According to the Site Plan Control Guidelines, elevation drawings must include the location and design of all exterior lighting, and landscape plans must include the location of all outdoor lighting.</p> <p>d) Section 2.7 describes principles of land use compatibility to be followed by proponents to respect the quality of existing areas, provide for suitable transitions, in order to avoid or mitigate adverse effects. Further, Section 3.3.9 – Conversion – contains the requirements that must be met to the satisfaction of the City when converting a dwelling to two or more residential units. Further to an earlier comment, this type of conversion must be carefully integrated in light of the type of development proposed in comment a). The recently implemented Residential Design Guidelines (see Sections 8.2 and 8.3) also provide additional information.</p> <p>e) Unit mix is generally determined by the developer. However, Section 3.3.D.12 specifies that any new or redeveloped residential uses intended for student accommodation must be designed and built to be viable for a wider rental market, and that the City may therefore restrict the number of bedrooms or habitable rooms per residential unit through the zoning by-law.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>j) Opportunities for the installation or application of public art should be prioritized and utilized whenever possible.</p> <p>k) There is a critical need for bicycle parking and storage throughout the University District. Public and private access to such amenities should be prioritized.</p> <p>l) The University District suffers from a lack of public space and street furniture for its residents to enjoy and access in the neighbourhood. The prevalent yet rarely used backyard spaces in the area could be employed more effectively to create green spaces in the neighbourhood and promote shared community spaces.</p>	<p>f) The Official Plan supports the provision of a broad range of unit types across the City, and including the University District. Given its distinct characteristics, consideration is being given to the creation of a University District Secondary Plan, which could provide a finer level of detail in terms of policy direction for the area.</p> <p>g) Current parking requirements are being examined as part of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law process, and may consequently affect the OP update. Depending on the broader approach to intensification, the context of a project may facilitate a rationale for lowered parking requirements.</p> <p>h) It is recognized that servicing constraints to development in the University District must be addressed to allow for future development. Again, this falls within the mandate of Utilities Kingston. Section 2.5.1 specifies that development within the City will be phased according to the City's ability to provide adequate municipal infrastructure, including water, sewer and stormwater. Further, 2.5.8 states that where intensification is encouraged, increased densities will only be approved when it is determined by the City that servicing capacity exists or that capacity expansions are imminent.</p> <p>i) Further discussions are warranted to fully understand the desired outcomes regarding 'shared space'. The City has recently been investigating integration of Complete Streets philosophies into street design. The project is still ongoing.</p> <p>j) Section 9.5.25 – Height and Density Bonus – states that the city may approve a by-law authorizing an increase in height or density beyond that allowed in the zoning for matters benefiting the public, including providing public art. These Community Benefit policies are currently being reviewed as part of the OP Update. Reference should also be made to the recently-adopted Public Art Master Plan (2014).</p> <p>k) Similar to c), bicycle parking and storage associated with residential development can be addressed through Section 9.5.32 - Site Plan Control for residential development with more than 4 units. It specifies that the City will use the process of site plan control review to, among other elements, provide for safe vehicular access, parking and loading. Consideration is being given to whether Site Plan Control should be expanded for the University District to be able to provide direction to all residential development, which would allow better control if issues such as bicycle parking.</p> <p>l) For details regarding the provision of public space, please refer to Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Regarding provision of shared community spaces, the City has recently undergone an Amenity Area Review Study (2015) which has implications for the provision of</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					recreation space on private property in new development.
138.	J. Brown	2016-02-27	Urban Boundary Site Specific	a) This document has failed to provide water service to Elginburg which under Provincial law that they are required to do. For many residences their only source of water is from runoff. Their wells have long since run dry. Pollution from the asphalt falls into this source of water. If this city can find a million dollars to spend on a walk way across a swamp using our tax dollars, then they can help the residences of Unity Road.	a) The City is not proposing expansions to the urban boundary as part of the current Official Plan update.
139.	H. Finley	2016-02-29	Height Limit	a) Does the City have specific storey or measurement numbers for the following: low rise, medium / mid-rise, high rise, and tower?	a) The Official Plan does not identify specifically what constitutes low, medium and high rise construction. Generally, low rise is considered one to three storeys (e.g., single family detached, semi-detached and townhomes), medium (mid) rise is considered four to six storeys (recent changes to the Ontario Building Code allow mid-rise construction to be wood-framed), and high rise is considered seven storeys and higher. The Official Plan currently identifies height limitations in the North Block. The limit is 25.5 metres.
140.	M. Birmingham and M. Gventer	2016-03-08 2016-04-22	Affordable Housing	<p>a) Housekeeping changes : “Non-profit” is out of favour. The term preferred not is “Not-for-Profit” as per the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act.</p> <p>b) Where you use the term “Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation” it should be Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.</p> <p>c) Section 2.3, Principles of Growth, after paragraph “The City’s Population and Growth Model... needed in the City by 2036”, insert the following paragraph: “The relative demand for <i>affordable</i> housing increase proportional to the current need. It is projected that from 2015 to 2036 the need for additional affordable units will be 4,000 units (based on discussions with housing professors of the School of Urban and Regional Planning of Queen’s University).”</p> <p>d) Re Section 2.2.15 (Future Development Areas), after “...provision of <i>affordable</i>...”, add “housing including a range of Core Housing Need households;”</p> <p>e) Re: Section 2.6.5, add: “f. The extent of which the new development addresses the affordability targets of the City of Kingston 10 year Municipal Housing and Homeless Plan (2013)”.</p> <p>f) Re Section 2.6.8, amend d as follows: “...particularly the stock of affordable...[INSERT] rental and ownership housing that address a range of Core Housing Needs of the Kingston population [INSERT]...and retain...in the population”.</p> <p>g) Re: 3.3.10 a., after “...low and moderate income households...”, add “10% of which address Core Housing Need”.</p> <p>h) Re: Section 3.3.10 i, after “tracking the percentage...new <i>affordable</i> housing units”, add “including detailing the number of units that address</p>	<p>a) Thank you for your comments. The suggested revision has been implemented in the revised Draft 3.</p> <p>b) The suggested revision has been implemented in policy 9.6.25.f.</p> <p>c) The population and growth targets outlined in the Official Plan have been supported by the background reports and studies, prepared by qualified professionals and vetted through a public process. The inclusion of additional housing statistics would need to be pursued through a more detailed process. As such, the suggested numbers have not been included in this iteration of the OP.</p> <p>d) Future Development Areas have been removed from Draft 3 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>e) The intent for new development to include a component of <i>affordable housing</i> is sufficiently outlined in 3.3.10.</p> <p>f) Section 2.6.8 has been removed from Draft 3 of the Official Plan Update.</p> <p>g) Core Housing Need is a situation a household can be in at a point in time based on low income, below occupancy standards, or deterioration of the dwelling unit. It is not a housing format or tenure arrangement. The policies support affordable housing so that less households will be captured in Core Housing Need status.</p> <p>h) Please see response to item g) above.</p> <p>i) Core Housing Need is clearly defined in the Official Plan and does not require a reference to a standard.</p> <p>j) Please see response to item g) above.</p> <p>k) Site specific policy changes are not being made as part of a comprehensive OP update.</p> <p>l) Site specific policy changes are not being made as part of a</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>Core Housing Need”.</p> <p>i) In 1.4 Definitions, Perhaps the definition of Core Housing Need in the Overview should have a lead in phrase referencing its standard meaning : “As defined and reported by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Statistics Canada in census related data,... a household that falls below...”</p> <p>j) Re: Section 3.3.10 i., second bullet: after “track the number of <i>affordable</i> housing units”, add “and number of units that address Core Housing Needs”</p> <p>k) Re: 3.18.8, add paragraph “d. inclusion of units that address Core Housing Needs.”</p> <p>l) Re: 3.18.11, add paragraph “l. additional variances such as density allowances will be considered in exchange for Core Housing Need”.</p> <p>m) Re: 3.18.22, add paragraph “l. additional variances such as density allowances will be considered in exchange for Core Housing Need”.</p> <p>n) In 1.4 Definitions, amend Geothermal Energy, after “...from the heat generated”, insert “or stored”.</p> <p>o) Amend Section 4 Infrastructure and Transportation Goal: after “City for the term of this plan”, add “To promote and develop sustainable energy initiatives starting with conservation of energy with the ambition of attaining near zero energy consuming buildings”.</p> <p>p) Revise Section 6.D.2.1, to read: “Geothermal energy systems may be used for the production of thermal energy (heat), for cooling by transferring heat to the earth or to produce electricity, and where such systems are intended to produce heat for cooling space exclusively, these systems may be treated separately through the policies of this Plan as follows, and the implementing zoning by-law”.</p> <p>q) Upper limit standards (not rigid but rationales for deciding) of density are required for high density development. 3.3.C.1 I note that this is addressed in the Administration Section in that densities are not absolutes, but the lack of an initial upper number for high density developments is notable.</p> <p>r) Development Review (2.1.7): Add two new g and h: g. Provide infrastructure that facilitates waste diversion. h. Include water saving technologies in the building design including roughing in grey water reuse capacity (for flushing toilets).</p> <p>s) Affordable Housing (3.3.10): Add new l: l. Noting the announcement by the Government of Ontario that it plans to introduce inclusionary zoning legislation during this session, the City of Kingston intends to include inclusionary zoning options that are in accord with the legislation in its affordable housing strategies following general consultations with the public.</p> <p>t) Site Plan Control (3.4.18), After l, add new j:</p>	<p>comprehensive OP update.</p> <p>m) Site specific policy changes are not being made as part of a comprehensive OP update.</p> <p>n) The suggested revision has been implemented in the definition of Geothermal Energy.</p> <p>o) The policies of Section 6.2 have been revised to support the Kingston Climate Action Plan by providing that the City is working towards a target of reducing the community’s greenhouse gas emissions from 2011 levels by 20 percent (%) by the year 2020 and by 30 percent (%) by the year 2030.</p> <p>p) Section 6.2.D.1. has been revised in Draft 3.</p> <p>q) Anything above 75 units per net hectare is considered to be high density residential. The maximum density is reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Where appropriate, maximum density is limited in a site specific zoning by-law.</p> <p>r) Policy 2.1.7.a. addresses designs that reduce water consumption and 2.1.7.d. addresses construction and operational practices that minimize waste.</p> <p>s) If the Government of Ontario introduces inclusionary zoning legislation, the City of Kingston will review its Official Plan policies in the context of inclusionary zoning at that time.</p> <p>t) Policy 3.4.18.i. adequately addresses infrastructure matters related to solid waste and recycling storage.</p> <p>u) The suggested revision has been in policy 4.7.4.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>j. Provide adequate infrastructure for occupants of building to move their waste to the central storage facility</p> <p>u) Business Initiatives (4.7.4) Amend as italicized: Businesses and <i>multi-residential operations</i> are encouraged to develop safe, cost-effective and innovative ways to deal with waste materials in order to divert waste matter from landfill.</p>	
141.	R. Pietka	2016-04-06 2016-04-24		<p>a) I am contacting you in regards to additional seating capacity introduced recently to the Saint Lawrence College, main, east sport field (Portsmouth Ave.). In December last year (2015), construction crews installed two concrete pads size of 20' x 40' , that appear to be part of increasing seating capacity on this field from current some 300 seats, to 800 seats on this sport field. As a part of the project there were introduced/ stored additional multi-level seats nearby. I don't know exact details of the project, since I could not see posted construction permit for the above construction. I am concern with the above seat capacity increase, and wonder at what point the west sport field of SLC will become a stadium. I wonder if City of Kingston has any guidelines on the subject of increasing seat capacity, before sport field would become official stadium, with require - I hope changes in zoning, installation of washrooms, fire and life protection etc. I would appreciate your answer.</p>	<p>a) The St. Lawrence College is designated 'Institutional' in the Official Plan and zoned a site-specific Special Education and Medical Uses 'E1.359' Zone in Zoning By-law Number 8499. Recreational/sports fields are considered ancillary to a primary permitted use, being the institution (school).</p>
142.	P. Dunnett	2016-04-12		<p>a) I am most concerned that the OP will not address an important development in the world of transport. Elon Musk, one of the cleverest men on the planet and the founder of Tesla, believes there will be significant numbers of driverless cars as early as 2020. The head of GM thinks it will be 2021. Driverless cars will significantly reduce the road space needed and reduce the carbon footprint. Ergo, the OP should place the emphasis on reducing and improving the road network not increasing it. Driverless cars need far less road space per vehicle, and shared driverless cars far fewer parking spaces. They are also better at avoiding cyclists and pedestrians, making those transport options more attractive.</p>	<p>a) Section 4.6 of the Official Plan confirms that the City is committed to promoting transportation choices that increase efficiency of travel, reduce energy consumption and pollution, promote health and enhance the sustainability of the City. If technology advances as anticipated, the City's policies support improvements to the transportation network that will support active transportation and help to meet the goals noted above.</p>
143.	B. Kaplan	2016-04-13		<p>a) A few points related to "accessibility". The words "promoted" and "promotes" in 2.3.16 and 8.2 are tepid verbs, and suggest a very weak commitment to accessibility. I would like the City of Kingston to make a strong and clear commitment to accessibility. "The City <u>will</u> do this and that" rather than "The city promotes this and that".</p>	<p>a) The policy language in the Official Plan, as it relates to accessibility, is intentionally enabling in structure. Changing the policies in Sections 2.3.16 and 8.2 to <u>require</u> that universal design principles and barrier free access be provided would necessitate amendments to the plan whenever such accessibility matters could not be achieved (e.g., adaptive re-use of a heritage building).</p>
144.	R. Molleson	2016-04-17 2016-04-24		<p>a) There have been many figures expressed about the cost of the 3rd crossing. When was the last estimate made for this project based on other a 2 lane and a 4 lane bridge? Do these estimates take into account the actual time frame that the project will be started therefore the cost will be higher given inflation and the value of the Canadian</p>	<p>a) Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The cost and project schedule for the third crossing are outside of the scope of the OP Update project. Your questions have been forwarded to the City's third crossing project team. Any future questions or comments in this regard</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>dollar for those materials and companies that are not Canadian?</p> <p>Does this cost estimate cover the re-construction of both ends of the crossing up to and including Gore Rd. and Cty Rd. 15 as well as Montreal St. and John Counter Blvd.</p> <p>What are the projected and ongoing maintenance costs for this bridge which should include repairs, cosmetic finishes and hydro electric for lighting?</p> <p>What is the completion time estimate from start to finish of the bridge?</p> <p>Will the 3rd crossing project move forward should there be no cost sharing by either or both the Federal and Provincial governments?</p> <p>Should there be no commitment from both Federal and Provincial governments in sharing the cost please provide me with an average annual cost that would be added to my annual residential tax bill and for what length of time for both the primary construction costs and secondly for the annual maintenance cost?</p>	<p>can be obtained by contacting the third crossing project team (https://www.cityofkingston.ca/city-hall/projects-construction/third-crossing/contact).</p>
145.	Anonymous	2016-04-17		a) What is the definition of “commercial” in the OP?	a) Many of the definitions included in the Official Plan are quoted directly from the Provincial Policy Statement. When the Official Plan requires a specific definition to clarify the intent of the policies, a definition is provided. Where the meaning of a term is clear, certain and not susceptible to doubt, there is no definition provided because the City relies on the commonly accepted meaning. Since land uses are constantly evolving, terms like “commercial” is better left to the commonly accepted meaning to ensure the City has the ability to rely on the general intent of the term in the Official Plan as new land uses are established.
146.	Anonymous	2016-04-17		a) Kingston’s heritage is very important for tourism and a sense of unique character. I hope the OP continues to respect heritage in Kingston and I am encouraged to know the City can refuse a demolition permit.	a) Thank you for your comment. The OP will continue to protect and conserve heritage in Kingston.
147.	S. Hope	2016-04-17		<p>a) Re: Heritage – why are the location, pattern and actual buildings, which are fundamental to understanding how and why the patterns of travel, omitted? They are essential to understanding how a city grows! i.e. old railway lines and buildings.</p> <p>b) What is the status of the natural landscape? We were told it would be considered necessary in Shannon Park.</p>	<p>a) Section 4.6 of the Official Plan recognizes that a strong relationship exists between the transportation system and the various forms of development within the community.</p> <p>b) As defined in the OP, natural heritage features and areas include significant wetlands, significant coastal wetlands, other coastal wetlands, fish habitat, water supporting aquatic species at risk, significant woodlands, significant valleylands, habitat of endangered species and scientific interest, which are important for their environmental and social values as a legacy of the natural landscapes of an area. The policies related to the natural heritage system are</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					provided in section 6.1 of the OP. They speak to the importance of maintenance, restoration and enhancement of the natural heritage system. Natural Heritage “A” and Natural Heritage “B” features are identified schedules 7-A, 7-B, 7-C, 8-A, 8-B and 8-C. Schedule 8-A identifies a small portion of Shannon Park as a contributory woodland, which is included in the OP as a Natural Heritage ‘B’ feature.
148.	Anonymous	2016-04-17		a) To what degree have you (the City) taken into consideration that health and educational value of natural landscape?	a) Section 6.1 has been modified to acknowledge the health and educational value of the natural heritage system.
149.	Anonymous	2016-04-17		a) The waterfront is fenced off near the ferry terminal, behind the Museum of the Great Lakes and the government property near Lake Ontario Park. Why are these properties fenced off? Would like a full trail along the waterfront with continuous access.	a) The recommendations of the Waterfront Master Plan, recently adopted by Council, are being proposed through policy revisions to the Official Plan. New policies have been added to the OP that identify and reinforce waterfront priorities and reference the more detailed Waterfront Master Plan. Schedule 5 – Pathways - of the Official Plan has been revised to include delineation of a broader network of proposed waterfront pathways as are laid out in the Waterfront Master Plan. Revisions acknowledge the need to establish a connected waterfront pathway within the urban boundary of the City and a series of waterfront nodes within rural areas.
150.	D. Ritchie, Downtown Kingston! BIA	2016-04-20		a) We are glad to see this update has set residential intensification and density targets, especially in the downtown core. Our Board of Directors has endorsed both proposed residential projects now before Planning (“The Capitol” at 223 Princess St and Homestead Land Holdings’ proposals on Blocks 3 and 5 of the North Blocks). We are also pleased to see that targets have been set for the number of affordable housing units in the city and strongly believe that the development of both projects mentioned above will allow for the redistribution of some of our current housing stock and increase the amount of affordable housing units overall.	a) Thank you for your comments.
151.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) City Transit – If the City wants to get people out of cars, they <u>must</u> provide an alternative. Kingston does not run public transit on Christmas Day. How do low income people get to church and visit family on Christmas Day? b) Bike Transit – Toronto has great water front trail. Kingston could get some ideas from that project.	a) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. Specific transit planning lies outside of the scope of the Official Plan. Kingston Transit has a mandate for route planning and would be a more appropriate subject for this request. b) The recommendations of the Waterfront Master Plan, recently adopted by Council, are being proposed through policy revisions to the Official Plan. New policies have been added to the OP that identify and reinforce waterfront priorities and reference the more detailed Waterfront Master Plan. Schedule 5 – Pathways - of the Official Plan has been revised to include delineation of a broader network of proposed waterfront pathways as are laid out in the Waterfront Master Plan. Revisions acknowledge the need to establish a connected waterfront pathway within the urban boundary of the City and a series of waterfront nodes within rural areas.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
					Opportunities to support alternative modes of travel will be considered as part of a forthcoming Active Transportation Master Plan. The recommendations coming out of the Plan will be considered in making further amendments to the Plan, separate from the comprehensive five-year update.
152.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) Please ensure that <u>every</u> district has a small strip plaza with milk stores, pharmacy and restaurant available to people living there! Might make the City less dependent on cars.	a) The Official Plan designates a number of “District Commercial” areas that are intended to provide for a convenient commercial focus for surrounding neighbourhoods for a range of frequently used goods and services. As well, neighbourhood commercial uses are permitted within the Residential designation (please refer to Section 3.4.F of the Official Plan).
153.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) Please promote heritage areas in all districts of the City. Can be mentioned in tourism and their magazines as well as on the internet.	a) The City continues to proactively identify and conserve its heritage resources through research, working group review, and resultant Part IV and Part V designations under the Ontario Heritage Act. Promotion of heritage areas in magazines and on the internet is outside the scope of the Official Plan.
154.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) More bike lanes – segregated from other traffic b) Waterfront trail from Belle Isle to Lake Ontario Park c) All in one garbage pick-up – sorting done at KARC d) Clean up brownfields on Montreal Street	a) Opportunities to support alternative modes of travel will be considered as part of a forthcoming Active Transportation Master Plan. b) The recommendations of the Waterfront Master Plan, recently adopted by Council, are being proposed through policy revisions to the Third Draft of the Official Plan. New policies have been added to the OP that identify and reinforce waterfront priorities and reference the more detailed Waterfront Master Plan. Schedule 5 – Pathways - of the Official Plan has been revised to include delineation of a broader network of proposed waterfront pathways as are laid out in the Waterfront Master Plan. Revisions acknowledge the need to establish a connected waterfront pathway within the urban boundary of the City and a series of waterfront nodes within rural areas. c) Garbage operations are outside of the scope of the Official Plan. d) Many of the brownfield sites are within the boundary of the proposed North King's Town Secondary Plan area. Any proposed changes to the land use designation may be considered as part of the overall secondary planning process. For more information, please visit: https://www.cityofkingston.ca/city-hall/projects-construction/north-kings-town .
155.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) Please get rid of all courtesy walk lanes! Make the official walk lanes and subject to laws that force drivers responsible for any injury caused to walkers! b) Establish an official plan dealing with removal of toxic plants such as wild parsley in lieu of chemical sprays not being allowed.	a) The design and location of courtesy walk lanes are outside of the scope of the Official Plan. Opportunities to evaluate such matters will, however, be provided through the advancement of an Active Transportation Master Plan to comment this year. b) Details surrounding the removal of toxic plants are outside of the scope of the Official Plan.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
156.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) I live (presently) in the rural area but know many, many areas well, so I am interested in what is going on everywhere. Perhaps I am most interested in areas that seem to be transitioning (in the City's point of view) and thus am curious about your special policy areas. These areas are shown on a schedule presented today, but there was limited information as to what might be proposed or why an areas was designated as a special policy area – in particular, SP area #3, Cloggs Road. I will endeavour to try to find something about it in the draft – but you don't make it easy.	a) Special Policies and Secondary Plans provide more detailed policies related to a specific area. The Clogg's Road area was identified as a future secondary planning area in accordance with the Urban Growth Strategy completed in 2006. The Urban Growth Strategy study is available at this link: https://www.cityofkingston.ca/city-hall/strategies-studies-plans/urban-growth The Clogg's Road area is currently designated as a "Deferred Area", and will be subject to the creation of a secondary plan to determine future land uses. It is identified as a business district on Schedule 2: City Structure and the Employment Land Strategy Review (2015) recommends the area for future business park uses.
157.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) Look at pedestrian crosswalk (signalized) at Bath between Portsmouth Ave and Sir John A. MacDonald Blvd. b) Opportunity for driverless technologies and electric cars.	a) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The design and location of pedestrian crosswalks are outside of the scope of the Official Plan. b) Section 4.6 of the Official Plan confirms that the City is committed to promoting transportation choices that increase efficiency of travel, reduce energy consumption and pollution, promote health and enhance the sustainability of the City. If technology advances as anticipated, the City's policies support improvements to the transportation network that will support technological advances, active transportation and help to meet the goals noted above.
158.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) Add more bus routes in areas of the City such as Cataraqui Woods district. b) When companies like Bell want to dig up areas and the contractor cut off land lines necessary for emergency help, the contractors should be forced to come out immediately to reconnect the land lines!	a) Specific transit planning lies outside of the scope of the Official Plan as the Plan is intended to be a higher-level policy document. The Plan does direct development to areas along major public transit routes as a means of supporting the local service delivery. b) Concerns related to land lines is outside the scope of the Official Plan.
159.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) I am a new permanent resident to Kingston, recently retired. Lured here by reports that the City is ideal for retiring. Kingston falls short in one area that comes to mind. Build it and they will come. Build wide, unencumbered residential roads and the speeders will come. Build inviting, safe roads and communities will come. Crossfield, Anderson and Augusta are speedways – very unfortunate. Don't propagate streets like these.	a) Thank you for your comment. The Official Plan establishes future road allowance widths but does not provide the detailed design of the road within the allowance. The detailed design is outside of the scope of the Official Plan. The Official Plan supports the use of active transportation and recognizes the increasing interest in in multi-modal transportation design, active transportation options as well as enhanced street features.
160.	Anonymous	2016-04-24		a) Could the City of Kingston have a referendum for a "surcharge" to cover improved snow clearing and removal?	a) See Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. Snow removal operations are outside of the scope of the Official Plan.
161.	J. Brown and A. Allison	2016-03-05 2016-04-24		a) Public safety of water – mandatory. The five year Official Plan does not take into concerns that area residents north of the 401 have a lack of water security and lack of any plan on the part of the City to supply services to this area. Greenhouse effect will dry up rural sources of water i.e. wells, ponds, streams, etc. The lack of action on the part of the City of Kingston is in direct opposition to the PPS, which they love	a) Thank you for your comment. As indicated in Section 4.2.9 of the Official Plan, municipal services are not planned to be extended beyond the Urban Boundary as shown in Schedule 2 within the life of the Official Plan, unless warranted, following completion of the requirements of Sections 2.4.9 through 2.4.11 inclusive of the Plan. The Official Plan Update contains new policies related to source water

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>to bring up.</p> <p>The citizens on Unity Road are drinking water from runoff that goes through fields and ditches and is collected in galvanized culverts because this is their only source of water. This water is subject to pollution from the asphalt plant (Elginburg Quarry), as the fact that it is only 80% efficient, therefore 20% is landing on the water that these people are using.</p> <p>Every citizen in Ontario is entitled, by law, to breathe clean air, and not be exposed to loud noise, vibration, to have access to clean and plentiful water, and to have the enjoyment and normal use of their property without harm and/or material discomfort. These fundamental legal entitlements cannot be ignored, compromised or denied by elected officials, staff and/or representatives of provincial and municipal government bodies, agencies and/or boards.</p> <p>b) Fire protection in rural area</p> <p>c) Quarry operations and permits to take water</p>	<p>protection with the goal of protecting the quantity and quality of source water over the long term (please refer to Section 6.3). The new policies are intended to implement aspects of the Cataraqui Source Protection Plan that was written to fulfil the requirements of the Clean Water Act. The Cataraqui Source Protection Plan came into effect on April 1, 2015 and is available at this link: http://cleanwatercataraqui.ca/studies-and-reports/cataraqui-source-protection-plan-explanatory-document/</p> <p>b) Kingston Fire & Rescue provides a number of services to the public that include fire safety inspections, fire prevention, public fire safety education as well as emergency response to fires within the City.</p> <p>The Official Plan Update includes new policies with respect to wildland fires in Section 5 and also identifies locations of wildland fire hazards within the rural area in Appendix A.</p> <p>c) Several policies related to quarry operations are included in the Official Plan (for example see sections 2.8.8 3.17.19, 3.17.B.4). Permits to take water fall under the purview of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and are outside the scope of the Official Plan.</p>
162.	M. Good	2016-04-26		<p>a) The wording within the Official Plan indicates that Kingston has an interest in reducing the dependency on personal car usage in an effort to promote sustainability, however there is nothing in the Official Plan that indicates that the City actually has any plans to attempt to move towards this ideal. In fact everything within the Official Plan points to increasing the reliance on personal car usage.</p> <p>The Third Crossing is case in point. The major impact the Third Crossing will have is the expansion of low density urban sprawl, which will by it's existence alone dramatically increase the number of households that will be reliant on personal car usage. This effort to increase urban sprawl goes against the official stance of the city which is stated to be densification in an effort to reduce personal car usage.</p> <p>b) The City is the issuing of all day parking permits in residential areas. The residential areas some of these parking permits are targeting are areas that at present time have staggered parking allowed in an effort to prevent all day parking. These areas are in the older parts of the city where many of the homeowners do not have the luxury of driveways or their own parking spots. These areas are not business areas but residential areas.</p> <p>Instead of addressing the transportation and parking problems of</p>	<p>The policies and objectives of the Official Plan support a reduced reliance on the automobile by supporting infrastructure required to support active transportation and transit. The Official Plan also directs intensification into areas that are located along high frequency transit routes and in close proximity of a mix of uses, which will help to reduce the need and reliance on automobiles.</p> <p>Policy revisions have been made to section 4.6.52 to support options for lessening the off-street vehicle parking requirements. The City is currently working on the first draft of the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law, which is expected to be released following the completion of the Five Year Official Plan Update. The new Comprehensive Zoning By-law will establish new standards to support the Official Plan's transportation policies and objectives of reducing reliance on the private automobile. Please email opzb_update@cityofkingston.ca for additional information on the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Project.</p> <p>a) Please see Issue 6 in Section 2.0 of this Report. The provision of on-street parking permits is outside of the scope of the Official Plan. Over the last 5 years, in support of the objectives of the KTMP and the goal of reducing reliance on the private automobile, the City has implemented a wide range of transportation demand management initiatives including significant transit system enhancements, commuter parking and pricing strategies, cash-in-lieu of parking updates, on-street parking changes, a review of the supply and demand for parking</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Category	Comment	Response / Change
				<p>people who do not live downtown but do work downtown with a more modern enlightened approach, this city initiative will just turn residential neighborhoods into giant parking lots, thereby increasing downtown pollution and congestion. There needs to be much more thought and consideration given to these matters of transportation other than just falling back into the position of either building more roads or more parking spots. We need modern innovative ideals and efforts put into public transportation initiatives.</p> <p>In order to believe all the language in the Official Plan around the city being serious about reducing the dependency of personal car usage, there needs to be some very real changes in what actions are taken by our city leaders. It has to be much more than words in a plan, it has to be actions that will move us towards the words in the plan.</p>	<p>within City-owned lots and improvements to infrastructure to support active transportation.</p>