



**City of Kingston
Planning Committee
Meeting Number 23-2017
Addendum
Thursday November 16, 2017
6:30 p.m., City Hall, Council Chamber**

Correspondence

- a) Correspondence received from Lorie Nadon, dated November 11, 2017, regarding 102 & 104 Park Street.

Schedule Pages 1 – 2

- b) Correspondence received from Irwin Altrows, dated November 10, 2017, regarding 268 Victoria Street.

Schedule Page 3

- c) Correspondence received from Frank Dixon, dated November 15, 2017, regarding 411 Wellington Street, former J E Horton school property.

Schedule Pages 4 – 6

Hello Derek;

Please accept Laurie's letter below if it hasn't yet been official correspondence.

Also please redact her email address.

TY
Jim

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 11, 2017, at 12:05 PM, laurie nadon [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks Jim. Please have my email redacted. It is at the bottom of my letter.

I'm not sure how I get official standing but please forward as correspondence.

Laurie

On Nov 11, 2017 10:14 AM, "Neill,Jim" <jneill@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

That was definitely an oversight. Emails I believe are typically redacted. I'll forward to the Clerk with your permission.

Any issues you may have with blocked driveways please email me & I'll be happy to get enforcement.

FYI; property values seldom go down with new construction. In fact when a higher valuation is determined on nearby properties, valuations more often go up. Unfortunate consequences.

Information regarding appealing to the OMB can be forwarded to you by Planning. If you don't already have official standing I can forward this letter as Correspondence & you can be listed.

TY
Jim

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 11, 2017, at 9:06 AM, laurie nadon [REDACTED] wrote:

Jim

I have read the city's recommendation for the above property (online at <https://www.cityofkingston.ca/city-hall/committees-boards/planning-committee>) and I must say, I am very disappointed that they are recommending the approval of the requested bylaw changes as applied for.

I am also very disappointed to see that my letter was enclosed in the documentation but my email address was not blacked out. Other correspondence had the email addresses blacked out - why is mine now out in the public domain?

For the city to assume that because there are bus routes in the neighbourhood, that the residents of these units will not have more than 1 vehicle per unit, is absurd. As mentioned at the meeting, the house beside me has 5 Queens students and they all have a vehicle. The previous owners also rented to Queens students and in my 11 years on Park Street, there has only been 1 year that there was only a single vehicle for the students.

The houses and driveways on Park Street are on an angle to the road. Because of this, I constantly have people parking in front of my house and hanging over my driveway. I imagine this will only increase once these units are built. I will no longer put up with this and will be contacting the city whenever this occurs in the future.

What are the options with regards to appealing the decision, assuming the Planning Committee accepts the city's recommendation to approve the requested changes?

In looking at the other items on the Planning Committee meeting agenda, I see that there are multiple requests for building of student housing in my neighbourhood. There is one on Victoria Street and another on Mack Street. Is our neighbourhood becoming the next Queens ghetto?

I guess the only good thing that is going to be coming out of this development is that my taxes will be going down as the property value will certainly decrease in value.

Laurie Nadon
99 Park Street
Kingston, Ont

[<https://www.cityofkingston.ca/documents/10180/16982642/SesquiLogo.jpg>]

<<https://www.cityofkingston.ca/explore/sesquicentennial>>

This E-mail contains confidential information intended only for the individual or entity named in the message. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If this communication was received in error, or if you wish to stop receiving communications from the City of Kingston, please notify us by reply E-mail and delete the original message.

From: Irwin Altrows [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 10, 2017 5:09 PM
To: Sands,Jason; Stroud,Peter
Subject: Proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment re 268 Victoria Street

Please register my opposition. I am concerned that before long this section of Kingston may become unlivable for full-time residents.

Irwin Altrows
419 Earl Street

From: frank dixon [REDACTED] >
Date: November 15, 2017 at 5:23:39 PM EST
To: frank dixon [REDACTED], "jbolognone@cityofkingston.ca" <jbolognone@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Clerk: Official Correspondence: 411 Wellington Street, Barriefield (former J.E. Horton School property)

Wednesday, November 15, 2017.

To: John Bolognone, Clerk, City of Kingston
From: Frank Dixon, Williamsville resident
Ref: Official Correspondence: 411 Wellington Street, Barriefield (former J.E. Horton School property)

Hello John,

I hope you are doing well.

This letter is Official Correspondence for the above file, to the Mayor and Council, to the Heritage Kingston Committee, and to the Planning Committee. Please confirm as soon as possible.

Earlier today at Heritage Kingston, the Committee, staff, and interested citizens (including myself) received a presentation on a project proposal for this site in Barriefield.

I spoke only briefly during the public portion, focusing on heritage-related themes, as the Chair, Councillor Peter Stroud, had directed. I stated I would put all of my points into a letter, which I am doing now.

Certainly, this proposal is a vast improvement over the previous attempt on this site by a different developer.

1) My major attempt to improve the design was stated at HK, but I will repeat it here. Several speakers, both Committee members and citizens, had concerns over the loss of sight lines for St. Mark's Church, dating to 1843, should the new project be built as presented, since Barriefield Village is a Heritage Conservation District, dating back over 200 years. I strongly agree. So, my solution has four major points:

- a) shift the building location to the east, to the boundary's edge, opening up these sight lines into the village core;
- b) break up the massing, into three or four segments, each separated by a couple of metres of open space for the second and third floors, but keeping connectivity on the ground floor, for ease of mobility;
- c) use underground parking for most of the requirements, to save surface space, to generate yet more parkland;

d) a capital 'E' shape seems optimal, with the east side hosting the long side, and parking access under the southern horizontal segment, off Wellington Street.

A very similar concept was used successfully, several years ago, in a Kingston project, by architect Alexander Wilson, located on Johnson Street near Toronto Street, north side. This is a rectangular shape, much longer than it is deep, using virtually all of the lot's footprint, with three segments, separated EXCEPT in their shared, buried parking. I think this format will work well here.

2) I asked about the proposed 161 units of the project, and how this number compares to the number of residents currently in Barriefield, so this information needs to be provided.

3) This is a retirement home, so elevators would seem to be necessary, and these will add height, above the stated three storeys. The elevators can be run right from the basement parking, upwards.

4) Some surface parking would still be needed, for delivery vehicles and emergency access, , and this should be optimized in design location and functionality.

5) Are we going to have a variety of unit sizes? Can the townhouses be designed with some variety, instead of a monolithic mass? I am fine with the proposed townhouse concept.

6) I like the 'Village Green' concept, with community access and paths to St. Mark's, very much. That is an A+ idea. Could we get a small soccer field in one corner of this sector? The former school property had playing space, so this has been lost for the moment; it could be partially restored.

7) I would like to see high-quality building materials used, with emphasis on traditional Barriefield themes -- limestone, brick -- but with some latitude for variety, so as to honour the BVHCD revised plan, recently approved by Council.

8) Several speakers focused on the project's entrance / exit locations and the resulting traffic impact. I agree this is a major concern, since the traffic will increase significantly in what is now a very quiet village setting. More detailed traffic analysis studies are required.

9) The heritage of the former J.E. Horton School needs to be memorialized, through a well-researched plaque, prominently displayed, which can also include some general BVHCD information.

10) The latest in green energy technology needs to be part of the design picture here, since Kingston is aiming to be Canada's Most Sustainable City.

I am looking forward to the regeneration and re-utilization of this important space, respecting the heritage character of the village.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank Dixon
Williamsville resident