



**City of Kingston
Planning Committee
Meeting Number 22-2017
Addendum**

Thursday November 2, 2017

6:30 p.m., Portsmouth Olympic Harbour, Press Lounge

Correspondence

- a) Correspondence received from Arnold Gaudet, dated October 29, 2017, regarding 48A Point St. Mark Drive.

Schedule Pages 1 – 2

- b) Correspondence received from Heidi Collette, dated October 29, 2017, regarding 48A Point St. Mark Drive.

Schedule Page 3

- c) Correspondence received from Tom and Joan Goodall, dated October 31, 2017, regarding 48A Point St. Mark Drive.

Schedule Page 4

- d) Correspondence received from Jackie Druery and Bruce Young, dated November 1, 2017, regarding 48A Point St. Mark Drive.

Schedule Page 5

- e) Correspondence received from Councillor Neill, dated November 2, 2017, regarding Special Events in City-Owned Facilities.

Schedule Page 6

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

From: Arnold Gaudet [REDACTED]

Sent: October-29-17 1:31 AM

To: Ochej, Derek; Lambert, Lindsay; Turner, Laura; Venditti, Marnie; Mayor of Kingston; Boehme, Ryan N.

Subject: I would encourage council and staff to read this CBC news report regarding developers.

<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/david-chernushenko-developers-architects-lying-bunkhouse-1.4374975>

To City council and planning staff,

I would encourage council and staff and OMB officials to read this CBC news report. It addresses the issues that confirm that Kingston and the OMB are not alone in their struggle to make good decisions based on developers plans that create more questions as apposed to providing clear intent and answers. At the last council meeting a proposal was set forth to establish a committee to help rationalizing the intent of developers and their submissions to the planning department for referral to council. It was debated as to the make up of the committee. The suggestion from 2 of the council members to build the committee around people that bring specific skill sets as apposed to their affiliation to an institution should be the focus. Their suggestion was paramount in meeting the objectives of an effective committee to deal with complex issues of this nature.

As a tax payers we need to start focusing on the city plan that included building the K-Rock in a location where apartment and condo buildings would be built to support the down town core. Every year tax payers are required to assist in financing the short fall in revenue required to operate the K-Rock, and the problem will only get worse as the building ages. The city should start imposing penalty taxes on developers that sit on property waiting for the city to cave into their demands. Developers are moving into the out skirts of town to force the city into accepting their terms. They are starving the main city core that infrastructure was updated for by the tax payer while over whelming and compromising the sewage services and safety of communities that were designed for a designated number of single family homes. If a developer wants to delay their construction projects, they do thing like send well intended people in to dig with spoons. Perhaps they believe that will justify why they haven't started paying the proper taxes and not helping the city implement their plan to bring people to live where cars and gas fumes are reduced or minimized. The official plan was to stimulate the businesses and life in the down town core and stop urban sprawl and needless devastation of trees and waterfront. Developers need to take responsibility for their actions. If you have the time, look at the Face Book account for Citizens against development on 48 Point St. Mark Drive where a well known real estate sales person recently said you can't beat this developer and it would be best to negotiate with him. He references an OMB process carried out many years ago that I sat in on where several lawyers for the developers beat the lone environmentalist. As a certified negotiator for 20 years, I would like to inform people that negotiation require both side to demonstrate rational thought, plans, and behaviour. It is up to the negotiator to lead or influence to achieve this for the

decision makers. What happened in Ottawa should never happen. Winning is not the objective.

I don't have the contact emails for many of the city council members and would appreciate someone forwarding this message to the others.

Thank you for allowing me to participate.

Arnold Gaude

From: Heidi Collette [REDACTED]
Sent: October-29-17 7:10 PM
To: Mayor of Kingston; Schell,Elizabeth; Neill,Jim; McLaren,Jeff; Holland,Mary Rita; Lambert,Lindsay; Ochej,Derek
Subject: Re: 48A Point St Mark

To Whom this may concern

As a resident of the Point St Mark subdivision I'd like to voice my concern for the proposal of the Homestead multi story 95 unit building.

Point St Mark is a lovely quiet area. Full of seniors, new young families, and a pile of dog walkers/owners. We on a whole enjoy the quiet and the limited traffic.

That being said. Adding a 95 unit building to the back portion of our small subdivision is going to add an abundance of traffic and strain to our roadways and add noise to our peaceful tucked away area.

I myself am not a city planner but I have grown up in the city of Kingston and love to see it grow. I would much rather see a smaller shorter more exclusive condo on that lot be built. Somewhere in a range of 15- 20 units instead. The lot is directly on the water and if the building is shorter it won't hinder the property values and views of the attached lots and won't deeply impact the increase volume of traffic.

Thank you for taking the time to read my voice.

Heidi Collette
45 Limeridge dr.

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

From: Tom Goodall [REDACTED]

Sent: October-31-17 10:28 AM

To: mayor@cityofkingston.ca; dochej@cityofkingston.ca; llambert@cityofkingston.ca

Cc: mrholland@cityofkingston.ca; jmclaren@cityofkingston.ca; jneill@cityofkingston.ca;

losanic@cityofkingston.ca; lschell@cityofkingston.ca; lkturner@cityofkingston.ca

Subject: Fw: Proposal, 48A Point St. Mark Drive

Subject: Proposal, 48A Point St. Mark Drive

In 2013 we, and many others, submitted comments /photos to the planning committee, detailing our opposition to the proposed development on the Rideau Canal , at 48A Point St.Mark Drive.

Those comments are still valid today. However , as many knowledgeable speakers at the 22 October 2017 meeting pointed out, there have been many changes since then...new housing, high density buildings, shopping plaza on Hwy 15. All of this adds to the earlier comments that, high density development at 48A Point St. Mark, continues to be the last thing that Kingston and it's citizens need.

Hopefully, common sense and good judgement, in long term planning for all of Kingston, will prevail in a decision to deny the proposed development.

Tom & Joan Goodall
64 Point St. Mark Drive
Kingston, On, K7K 6L8

From: Jackie Druery [REDACTED]
Sent: November-01-17 4:02 PM
To: Mayor of Kingston; Holland, Mary Rita; McLaren, Jeff; Neill, Jim; Osanic, Lisa; Schell, Elizabeth; Turner, Laura; Lambert, Lindsay
Cc: Ochej, Derek
Subject: Rideau Marina Ref #617001 JH

Good afternoon Mayor Paterson, City Councillors and Lindsay:

We are writing to express our opposition to the development which is currently under consideration at 48A Point St. Mark Drive, Kingston (Rideau Marina). Thank you for holding a second public meeting on this project which I attended. There were several speakers there who clearly outlined why the proposed development is not in compliance with the Official Plan so I will only say that I agree with them but will not reiterate them here.

We have already made two previous written submissions in opposition to this proposal that are part of the public record. I did point out in the latest one that there seem to be lots of photographs of how the building will look from the Canal and I do understand why this is necessary. But why are there no photographs of how it will look from the backyards and kitchen windows of the residents who live in the neighbourhood? As I pointed out we do have views regardless of the fact that the developer continues to perpetuate the myth that we do not. And photographs were provided to the Planning Department in 2013 that showed those views. Is one to think the City is more concerned about people who will pass by in their boats for 10 minutes than they are about the residents who live in the neighbourhood?

I was also surprised to learn that not only will the parking lot, which will be behind my back fence, be used by residents and their visitors, but also by those who wish to use the public docks, ie. kayakers, canoeists and small boats which will presumably have trailers. Surprised because I did not see this point stated in the Addendum documents although the developer did say that there would be a public dock. Why was this not included in the Addendum?

I also wonder what this development will contribute to the liveability of the neighbourhood? The Point St Mark neighbourhood is already very liveable and must surely be one of the most liveable neighbourhoods in the entire city. It is hard for me to imagine how increased traffic, increased light pollution, increased noise and loss of privacy for residents closest to the development will increase the liveability factor. It is also hard for me to imagine that our elected city officials would set out to make a liveable neighbourhood less so – since liveability is one of the pillars by which the city operates.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and once again express our opposition to this development. Please make this email part of the public record.

Jackie Druery
Bruce Young
62 Point St. Mark Drive
Kingston, ON K7K 6L8

From: Neill,Jim
Sent: November-02-17 12:22 PM
To: Ochej,Derek; Schell,Elizabeth; Holland,Mary Rita; Osanic,Lisa
Cc: Agnew,Paige; Hurdle,Lanie
Subject: Tonight's Planning

Given the light Agenda I will send my regrets. I'm driving to Toronto for an anPHA Public Health Conference.

I will forward a written response to the Community Benefit Report. Please share as Public Submission.

Please read (Mary Rita or Lisa?)

I've had one call regarding the broadening of uses at the Memorial Centre. She was curious about the scope of change but was comfortable with the proposal. I shared the proposal with others in the immediate neighbourhood. Frankly some were surprised that Trade Shows were a prohibited use since pre-amalgamation there were Boat and Car Shows. Therefore I have no issues with the proposal.

Could someone read out the above Statement regarding the Public Mtg regarding Trade Shows and Public Arenas?

TY
Jim

Sent from my iPhone