



**City of Kingston
Planning Committee
Meeting Number 07-2019
Addendum
Thursday March 7, 2019
6:30 p.m., Council Chamber, City Hall**

Correspondence

- a) Correspondence received from Nicole Addy, dated March 3, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Pages 1 - 2
- b) Correspondence received from Sophie Lecat, dated February 28, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Pages 3 - 6
- c) Correspondence received from Penelope Porter, dated March 5, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Page 7
- d) Correspondence received from Denise Clark, dated March 5, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Page 8
- e) Correspondence received from Kate Smith, dated March 5, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Page 9
- f) Correspondence received from Randy & Sandy Turner, dated March 6, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Pages 10 - 11
- g) Correspondence received from Sylvia Naylor, dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Page 12
- h) Correspondence received from Petra McDowell, dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Page 13
- i) Correspondence received from James Stewart, dated March 3, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 14 - 15

-
- j) Correspondence received from Concord Homes, dated March 5, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 16 - 18
 - k) Correspondence received from Enid Henwood, dated March 5, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 19 - 20
 - l) Correspondence received from Anne O’Riordan & Gary Mullen, dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 21 - 24
 - m) Correspondence received from James Stewart, dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Page 25 - 26
 - n) Correspondence received from LaVerne and Tom Russell, dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 27 - 28
 - o) Correspondence received from Martin Mack, President, Concord Homes dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 29 - 36
 - p) Correspondence received from Joanne Robyn, dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 37 - 40
 - q) Correspondence received from Hub Steenbakkers, dated March 6, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 41 - 42
 - r) Correspondence received from Gary Case, dated March 5, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 43 - 45
 - s) Correspondence received from Susan Chamberlain, dated March 7, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 46 - 47
 - t) Correspondence received from Kyle Nielissen, Kingston Home Builders Associations dated March 7, 2019 regarding Reddendale Neighbourhood Zoning By-Law Amendment.
Schedule Pages 48 – 53
 - u) Correspondence received from John Fisher dated March 7, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Page 54

- v)** Correspondence received from Janet Gibbs dated March 6, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Page 55
- w)** Correspondence received from Roger Healey dated March 7, 2019 regarding 495-513 Frontenac Street.
Schedule Page 56

From: Nicole Addy
Sent: March 3, 2019 9:40 PM
To: Thompson,James
Cc: Osanic,Lisa
Subject: Development Plan for 655 Graceland.

Kindly distribute the following to members of the Planning Committee for the meeting of March 7, 2019.

My name is Nicole Addy Seoane. I reside at 532 Forest Hill Drive East. I respectfully submit the following for consideration in the review of the development plan for 655 Graceland.

While the welfare of wildlife seems to have been given due consideration in the study of the development proposal for 655 Graceland, it appears that human welfare has come to naught, assuming it was ever considered. I am disappointed and appalled to hear that the Planning Committee is prepared to accept the proposal, as submitted. What possible justification is there, in this day and age, for approving the construction of a group of residential units right next to a major railroad. This is 2019, not 1919. While proximity to rail was an essential lifeline for our growing communities in the last century, it certainly is not today. This is the main east-west freight line, with trains routinely pulling 125 cars or more, several times per day. There is considerable loud noise emanating from the friction of the wheels on the rails and bumping couplers every time the freight trains make their way along Bath Road line. This only increases as brakes are applied to slow the train as it approaches the curve close to Collins Bay. The topography of the lot at 655 Graceland is such that the proposed homes along the line would not only be next to the railroad, but sitting above it. A berm with a fence on top would have little beneficial effect in mitigating the noise. The quality of life of the families in those homes would be seriously impacted. I live on the north side of Forest Hill Drive East and have a row of two storey homes across the street as sound barriers. I still hear the rumbling noise of those huge freight trains in my home with all windows closed. What will it be like for those families? Will they even be able to enjoy their homes and yards, open their windows, have a good night's rest?

Besides the noise, vibrations are often felt by residents of Forest Hill Drive, upon the passage of the very long and heavily laden freight cars. This effect would no doubt be amplified considerably in the proposed row of homes right next to the railroad. What structural damage will this cause to the homes subjected to those vibrations on a daily basis? At the first Planning Committee meeting, residents from the western portion of Forest Hill Drive, whose homes are closer to the rail line than those on Forest Hill Drive East, did indeed mention structural problems to some homes potentially related to rail traffic. Since information shared previously and tonight will be in public records, could the City of Kingston be held responsible, if not liable, for those damages for having knowingly approved the development plans ?

As a taxpayer, I have concerns about the transparency of this public consultation. Signs advertising the sale of lots for "dream homes" on the applicant's property have been posted on Bayridge Drive and Bath Road for more than two months. Did the applicant have some privileged information, unbeknownst to the public and city councillors, that encouraged early sales promotions? The real estate agent handling the sales prepared a sketch of the proposed

development for consultation by prospective buyers, indicating one lot already sold and another on hold. Interestingly, while the aforementioned sketch does include Bath Road, it conveniently and conspicuously omits the railroad line, a minor error no doubt...

In closing, I would like to know if the Planning Committee, in conducting their analysis, consulted The Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations, prepared for the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and The Railway Association of Canada.

Thank you.

From: Sophie Lecat
Sent: February 28, 2019 3:44 PM
To: Osanic, Lisa
Cc: Lambert, Lindsay
Subject: TR: 655 Graceland Ave - the current plan

Dear Lisa,

My dear neighbor Nicole forwarded me your email below.

We are the new landlords at 531 Forest Hill dr E. We bought the house in May/June 2018. When we bought the house, we were aware of a building project as the board put on the plot appears on Google maps. Moreover my husband saw it when he visited the house back in March.

From what I understood, this project started to take place in 2012 if my memory is correct. Then the last meeting happened in 2017. To me, the project wouldn't happen because it was initiated several years ago and if it had to happen, it would have happened already. The train track was not really a problem as it is far from our backyard. The train noise was not a no-deal problem when we bought the house because the house and the neighborhood has so many assets that the train noise was a minor problem to us.

We are aware of the meeting next week (March 7) but we are not sure to be able to attend. This is why I am writing you today. I hope my words and this email will be considered.

I am sending 2 pictures enclosed, one taken several days ago and one from this morning from my bedroom. It shows my backyard. As you can see, the backyard is beautiful, with trees and nature. The view is great, no houses, no neighbors. We are in winter so imagine in the summer, with the leaves. It is beautiful, peaceful, quiet. We feel good in this house, in this yard, in this neighborhood. This is the quality of life we chose for our children.

The neighborhood is very nice, as it is a dead end. My neighbors are great, very nice, helpful when you need them. Few cars pass, usually only the residents.

When I learnt that a new meeting was going to take place new week, I was very surprised and very angry that the project was not dead.

Beside the noise of the train that may be more noticeable if they cut trees and put houses instead, the mayor and the authorities have to take into account that this neighborhood does not need more people and more houses. Imagine new families there, where would the children go to school? Would the neighborhood need a new school as well? So you need more teachers, etc. Especially when you listen to the Ford government who wants to suppress the maximum number of children in a classroom. Would the actual local schools be overcrowded then?

More houses there mean more traffic, more risks for our children when they are playing outside.

Moreover, when building new houses right next to my backyard fence, the builders would need to use detonations to carve and make the ground flat, then it would weaken the ground, my ground and my house foundation. If there are creaks in my house, on my walls, who is going to pay for the repairs?

Also, did everybody forget about the tragedy in Chicoutimi, Quebec, several years ago? Building houses so close to a train track is very dangerous. If something bad happens, could the builders sleep well at night? There is safety to take into account here.

And by the way, why building new houses, as there are so many houses to sell on the market already?

I do not understand why these people, who do not live in my neighborhood, has a right to take back my peaceful neighborhood. They do not live there, why are they thinking in my place? They only make assumptions without really knowing if what they say is accurate. They only want to reassure the residents but they are not sure of their claims themselves. If they want to build houses, why not using a bigger and open space lot? There are plenty in the north of the city.

Instead of building more than 40 houses, why not keeping this natural area and build a playground for our children? A pond? A park where we could gather and play ball or frisbee, etc.? Simply keeping nature and its animals. I love having squirrels and birds in my backyard.

Last but not least, the real question everybody must ask themselves is : what is the asset for the neighborhood to build more than 40 houses right there?

Thanks for your time, and please, could you pass my email to the related people so that this project DOES NOT happen. Because us, Forest Hill dr E residents, we DO NOT WANT this housing project to happen.

Sophie Lecat

p.s.: my apologies for the grammar mistakes, English is not my native language.





From: Penelope Porter
Sent: March 5, 2019 7:14 AM
To: Thompson,James
Subject: Letter of Support for Graceland

Mr. Thompson:

I am writing in regard to the Graceland Development, I understand that this application is before Council on Thursday. Please accept my email as a letter of support for this development.

Housing availability is at an all time low in the city of Kingston and this is a much needed development. Residents of our city need housing and this infill property is well suited for Residential development. I have every confidence in the professionalism of the municipal staff in that this application meets all of the stringent requirements and policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, the planning act and the Official Plan of Kingston and urge Council to support their planning staff's recommendations.

Although parks and green space is an important aspect to consider, the official plan of Kingston has taken this into consideration and many areas have already been designated as such and there is no need to eliminate this much needed residential development to accomplish this. The development of Graceland will not only assist in alleviating the housing shortage but will also play an important role in our local economy, it is well known that new housing starts has tremendous spin off benefits for jobs, retail/commerce and industrial growth.

Thank you,
Penny Porter

From: denise clark
Sent: March 5, 2019 11:36 AM
To: Thompson,James
Subject: Graceland Development

Good morning Mr. Thompson,

Thank you in advance for allowing the public to comment on the proposed Graceland development.

I would like to comment that we, as Builder's in Kingston, support this development.

From the city comments it is our understanding that the development meets the Official Plan and Provincial guidelines and with that it would be sheer economic waste for city council not to support the recommendation of their own city planners and experts.

Complaints of neighboring residents, such as the "elimination of green space" "more houses being built will add to the train noise" "protection of deer and being subjected to having to look at other homes from their bedroom windows" are both unsubstantiated and would unnecessarily add to the cost of development.

It is no surprise that the City of Kingston lacks affordable housing if they are to side with unhappy homeowner's unwilling to support such a development for the reason's they claim.

This development is very much needed in the city of Kingston!

Again thank you,

Denise and Simon Clark
S Clark Homes Ltd.

From: Kate Smith
Sent: March 5, 2019 6:38 PM
To: Thompson,James
Subject: graceland development

As a local home owner I am thrilled about the proposed new housing development in this area.. it will sure absorb sound from those train tracks!

Optimistic Citizen,

Kate Smith

From: Sandy Turner
Sent: March 6, 2019 7:44 AM
To: Thompson,James; Osanic,Lisa
Subject: Attention - James Thompson City Clerk - Please Distribute to planning committee for March 7th Meeting

511 Forest Hill Drive East,
Kingston,
Ontario K7M8M5

March 6, 2019

City of Kingston – Planning Division
216 Ontario Street,
Kingston, Ontario K7L2Z3
Attention - James Thompson City Clerk - Distribute to planning committee.
jcthompson@cityofkingston.ca
losanic@cityofkingston.ca

655 Graceland Ave - Staff Recommendation at Planning Committee Thursday March 7th

For the Attention of The Planning Division:

The residents of 511 Forest Hill Drive East object to the proposed request for development of 655 Graceland Drive for several reasons.

The proposed walkway would seriously affect our property for several reasons. This walkway would be approx. 280 feet long, most of this area will be dark and hidden from street view. This creates the potential for many erroneous activities including possible crimes against persons or property. Exposed **utilities on the homes will most certainly be vandalized in this area, including; GAS LINE, HYDRO BOX, AIR CONDITIONER, CABLE BOX, FURNACE EXHAUST, all less than 4 feet from the walkway, and were approved by the building inspector when the homes were built.** The area must be maintained at the cities expense, snow removal etc. I'm sure they are not going to come and pick up all the liter that is dropped by pedestrians. These walkways are a thing of the past, Prince Albert Saskatchewan recently began to close these because they are used for vandals to come in to an area, do their vandalism and then to escape. Unfortunately, there are individuals who are disrespectful when using pathways, other cities reported people making noise, litter, paint graffiti on fences/buildings and serious crimes. We DO NOT want to bring this to our quite neighborhood. We submitted an objection to this walkway during the last application process and the developer was ok with removing it as was our Councilor Lisa Osanic. What steps will be taken to protect our home and property?

There have been many serious train derailments in Canada over the past years including the Lac-Megantic rail disaster. Communities should be extending the distance from the rail line to the homes to minimize the death and reduce the destruction of a derailment.

Have any studies been done regarding the amount of blasting that will be required? What steps are being taken regarding blasting stress to occupants and possible damage to nearby homes. This is already a major concern in an ongoing subdivision development in Kingston's west end.

We are also concerned about the noise of passing trains, will the 18-foot sound barrier be high enough to block the noise at the top of the hill, especially in a two-story home. Our City Councillor Lisa Osanic has also expressed concern about this, is the buffer high enough to shield the noise to upstairs windows where people are sleeping.

The proposed land is home to many animals and natural vegetation. We often see deer in the area and recently spotted a large Great Gray Owl in our tree. We have very little green space in our area, losing this diminish the beauty of the landscape.

Randy & Sandy Turner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March 6, 2019 8:27 AM
To: Neill,Jim
Subject: Reddendale zoning bylaw amendment
Importance: High

Dear Planning Committee member,

I am contacting you to ensure that the infill development in Reddendale is context appropriate and compatible with the physical character of the existing built form.

Developers are notorious for trying to persuade councillors to change their restrictions. They do not live in the area. All they care about is maximizing their profits to the detriment not just to the aesthetics of the neighborhood BUT to the flooding problems. This can be seen in the house which is being built at the corner of Crerar. A three story tall house which will obviously have a flat roof to keep within the height code. If permission had been asked to build a duplex at that corner it would have been turned down. This place is larger than many duplexes.

PLEASE can we have it included in the bylaw that THREE STORY BUILDINGS cannot be built as part of the infill in Reddendale. I would like to know why the types of house plans planned by builders in infill areas, are not subject to scrutiny.

Again please do not allow this committee to be persuaded BY DEVELOPERS to change their restrictions.

Sincerely,
Sylvia Naylor

Crescent drive.

From: Petra Kopka McDowell

Sent: March 6, 2019 9:11 PM

To: waynehillkingston@gmail.com; Chapelle,Simon; Osanic,Lisa; Kiley,Robert; Neill,Jim; Hutchison,Rob; Thompson,James

Subject: Reddendale Report D14-003-2019

Dear Planning Committee;

I have had the opportunity to review the Report to the Planning Committee regarding the zoning by-law amendments in Reddendale (D14-003-2019). Unfortunately, I am not able to attend the meeting on 7 March 2019 in person. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the Report's recommendations in writing.

I feel that the recommendations represent a fair compromise between preserving the character of the neighbourhood, while allowing for new homes to be built in Reddendale. As you are aware, developers have been buying properties in this neighbourhood, subdividing them into 2, 3, or even 4 lots, and then building oversized homes on each of these lots. This type of insensitive infill has resulted in the mass destruction of mature trees, changes in grading, shadowing of gardens, loss of privacy, and general disruption of the street scape. The increase in built-up area has also directly affected the drainage in the neighbourhood, contributing to significant flooding issues. With the proposed zoning by-law changes, some of this will be mitigated by ensuring that the sizes of new homes are more proportionate to the sizes of the lots on which they are built. There is also less motivation for the developers to alter the grading.

I would also like to note that smaller homes are more affordable for local families; the builders are currently building grand homes that sell for \$850,000 and \$1,600,000 – most families in Kingston cannot afford this. (Affordable housing was a key campaign promise in the recent elections.) Smaller homes are also more energy efficient and use less natural resources to build. Moreover, smaller homes leave more green space for replacing the large trees that are being decimated by the builders. This is in line with the Sustainable Kingston plan, and is also in line with the recent City-declared Climate Emergency.

Although I understand that there must be some compromises, there are two points I wish could be better addressed in the report:

1. The Floor Space Index (FSI) needs to explicitly state that it includes the garage. The FSI should also include enclosed porches, as these can be considered a 3-season living space.
2. The Rear Yard Depth should be increased, as 25 feet is not nearly enough to allow for the re-growth of mature trees. These trees are critical to our neighbourhood to help control water flow. Also, 25 foot depth is much shallower than the backyards that currently exist in this neighbourhood.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Petra McDowell, Reddendale Resident

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Agarwal,Sukriti
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2019 11:39 AM
To: 'James Stewart'
Subject: RE: [BULKCK] report PC-19-021 problems with Exhibit K

Good morning James,

Thank you for the email. We are unable to share the raw data because of our agreement with MPAC. We appreciate your feedback.

Regards,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division
Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard
216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3217
sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca



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

From: James Stewart [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 03, 2019 3:10 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Cc: James Stewart
Subject: [BULKCK] report PC-19-021 problems with Exhibit K
Importance: Low

Hi Sukriti -

Thanks for the information. I think that you and Dillon have done a great job on this. I'll later pass on some very minor comments, to do with as you please.

But I have a more urgent request:

Exhibit K uses big diamonds to represent houses. These diamonds overlap and hide the large number of houses in the centre portion of the scatterplot.

Without seeing the large number of houses in that portion, the graph seems to show that there are relatively many houses about the

proposed 0.35 FSI, which undermines the argument of using 0.35.

This could be used as an argument in a formal appeal against the by-law.

If, instead, you use small circles that do not overlap, the number of houses in the centre will be more apparant and the graph will better support the proposed 0.35. Ideally, you would present this as a 2D histogram to completely eliminate the loss of information from overlapping points.

I can do this for you if you give me the raw data as two sets of (x,y) points (one set including basement and one excluding basement). I think that the raw data, with no connection to individual addresses, would be permitted to be distributed. If necessary, I could agree to not further distribute the data.

Please let me know if that's possible (and if it's possible before the March 7 meeting).

Thanks very much,
James

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Agarwal,Sukriti
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2019 12:46 PM
To: 'CONCORD HOMES'
Subject: RE: City of Kingston - Notice of a Public Meeting (Reddendale Neighbourhood)

Good afternoon,

The meeting held in January 2019 was requested by a group of residents to discuss the written comments they had jointly submitted on the draft zoning and urban design recommendations that were presented at the October 2018 open house. As such it was not an open community meeting. The joint comments are included in Exhibit N of the Public Meeting Report.

Thanks,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division
Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard
216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3217
sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca



From: CONCORD HOMES [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2019 11:07 AM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: Re: City of Kingston - Notice of a Public Meeting (Reddendale Neighbourhood)

Hello Sukriti,

I read in the report posted on March 1st that there was a community meeting in January 2019. I was not aware of this meeting. What was this meeting and who was it open to?

Thank you,
jw for: Martin



**Certified R-2000 Builder
Tarion Registered**

**Concord Homes is the proud recipient of
Canadian Contractor's Outstanding Renovator and
Custom Homebuilder of the Year Award!**

Phone: (613) 384-0033

Visit our website: www.concordhomes.ca

On Tue, Feb 12, 2019 at 9:49 AM Agarwal,Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

Good morning,

Please find attached a notice of a Public Meeting regarding a proposed zoning by-law amendment to update the residential zoning standards within the Reddendale neighbourhood. The meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 7, 2019 in Council Chambers, City Hall, 216 Ontario St.

A notice has also been published in today's edition of The Kingston Whig-Standard.

Please feel free to forward this email to anyone who you think might be interested.

Thank you,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division

Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston

Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard



216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 extension 3217

sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca

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.

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Agarwal,Sukriti
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 1:33 PM
To: 'Enid Henwood'
Subject: RE: Public Meeting Report - Reddendale Neighbourhood ZBA

Good afternoon Enid,

Thank you for your email. I've consulted with the Building Division in regards to your questions below.

A Building Permit has not been issued for the property located at 38 Crerar Blvd. Building Permit activity can be found on this map:

<https://cityofkingston.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=343a968a042a4a3ba52cd398795c58e5>

Building Permit applications must comply with the applicable law (which includes the zoning by-law) that is in place at the time of the permit issuance.

Thanks,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division
Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard
216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3217
sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca



From: Enid Henwood [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2019 1:17 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: RE: Public Meeting Report - Reddendale Neighbourhood ZBA

Good afternoon Sukriti.

Thank you for the email and link for the upcoming Planning Committee meeting agenda.

Could I please impose upon you to answer a few questions?

1. Is there presently an application by the developer to build on the property located at 38 Crerar Blvd? If so, what is the date and status of this application?

2. Given that there is limited time before the new guidelines are presented to council, the developers that presently own property in Reddendale are no doubt in a hurry to submit their applications to build prior to council's approval. Is there a time frame deadline on which a developer must act on this application? Is there at some point a time or situation when the application would no longer be governed by the old guidelines?

Thank you for your time.

Enid Henwood
34 Crerar Blvd.
Kingston, Ont.

From: Agarwal,Sukriti [<mailto:sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>]
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 4:03 PM
To: Undisclosed recipients:
Subject: Public Meeting Report - Reddendale Neighbourhood ZBA

Good afternoon,

As requested by you at the meeting held on January 14, 2019 with respect to the zoning framework and urban design guidelines for the Reddendale neighbourhood, please find below a link to the March 7 Planning Committee meeting agenda and the Public Meeting report for the proposed zoning by-law amendment for the Reddendale neighbourhood:

https://www.cityofkingston.ca/residents/city-calendar-events?p_p_id=8&_8_struts_action=/calendar/view_event&_8_eventId=31296678

Thanks,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division
Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard
216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3217
sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca



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.

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Gregory,Katharine
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 9:08 AM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: FW: Citizen Input re: Zoning Bylaw Amendment PC-19-021 - for March 7th Meeting
Attachments: Zoning Bylaw Proposed Amendments_Citizen Letter_March 2019.docx; ATT00001.txt

Hi Sukriti,

I received a letter regarding the Report going to Planning Committee PC-19-021 Reddendale Neighbourhood

Kathy

Kathy Gregory
Clerk/Secretary
Planning Building and Licensing

City of Kingston
1211 John Counter Blvd.,
216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3184
kgregory@cityofkingston.ca

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

From: Gary Mullen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 8:59 AM
To: Gregory,Katharine
Cc: Chapelle,Simon; Hill,Wayne; Hutchison,Rob; Kiley,Robert; Neill,Jim; Osanic,Lisa; [REDACTED] Anne O'Riordan
Subject: Citizen Input re: Zoning Bylaw Amendment PC-19-021 - for March 7th Meeting

Dear Ms. Gregory,
Attached please find a letter related to the Zoning Bylaw Amendment being discussed at the March 7th meeting at City Hall. As we are unable to attend this meeting, we submit this letter to indicate our support of the proposed amendments and to provide further feedback comments. We respectfully ask that you acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Anne O’Riordan & Gary Mullen
2 Lakeshore Blvd.
Kingston, ON K7M 4J6

Planning Committee Clerk/Secretary Kathy Gregory kgregory@cityofkingston.ca
City Hall, Kingston Ontario
6 March 2019

RE: PC-19-021 - Zoning Bylaw Amendment - Reddendale Neighbourhood

Dear Ms. Gregory,

My husband and I are owners of the property at 2 Lakeshore Boulevard in the Reddendale neighbourhood of Kingston. We have lived at this address for the past 20 years and previously lived on Park Crescent. As this is a neighbourhood we treasure, we wish to preserve its beauty and character for ourselves and future generations. It is for these reasons that we support the most recent recommendations of the City of Kingston Planning Committee as laid out in the *PC-19-021 Zoning Bylaw Amendment*. The result of two years of work by local citizens of our neighbourhood and the City of Kingston Planning Department, separately and collaboratively, we see this as a reasonable compromise to ensure both the character of the neighbourhood and its unique beauty while respecting the need for infill and increasing the tax base of the city.

Specifically, we support the following items:

- The adoption of 'design guidelines' which will provide the Planning Department with the basis to promote context sensitive development.
- The 30% requirement for open space on individual lots will no longer include pools, patios, access driveway, ramp, parking area, loading spaces, buffer strip, or surfaced walkway.
- The allowable finished maximum height of homes will now be measured from a grade established prior to construction, as opposed to post-construction elevations.
- A maximum floor space index (ratio of the gross floor space to lot area) of 0.35 proposed for the purposes of regulating the bulk and mass of residential buildings.
- Maximum lot coverage of 30% to ensure that the size of the development on a lot is proportional to the lot size.

Additional points that we recognize as recommended by the planning department including the following items which represent improvements to the existing zoning bylaw:

- Interior side yard minimum widths have been increased from 4 feet to 6 feet, though this is substantially lower than what actually exists between most homes in the area. The average existing side yard setback is slightly over 9 feet.
- Rear yard depth minimum remains at 25 feet despite the fact that homes built in the last 10 years have a rear yard depth average of 61 feet and for all homes the average is 65.6 feet. However, when the rear wall of a home is taller than 25 feet the rear yard must equal the height of the rear wall. This at least will help to prevent tall houses with short backyards overlooking neighbouring properties.

We wish to reiterate former concerns raised by our citizens' working group that are related to development but have not been deemed to be within the purview of current recommended changes:

- While current average lot frontage in this neighbourhood is 70+ feet, and we would prefer this to be the recommended lot frontage in future, the minimum lot frontage remains at 55 feet. Our understanding is that this is due to the provincial policy of intensification. This is indeed a disappointment as it is a major contributing factor to the neighbourhood's character and appeal. A compromise between the proposed 55' and existing average of 70+ feet remains our hope and recommendation.
- This report does not address the serious concerns, raised by our citizens' group, about storm water management. Although it was determined that storm water management is not part of the scope of the current discussions, it is clear to us that much more work needs to be done in this area. As our property is directly on Lake Ontario, at the end of Crerar Boulevard, all of the properties currently located on Crerar and being built on this boulevard, have the potential to contribute to the water flow that drains through and around our property. We have noted that our laneway and part of our front yard have been partially submerged under water in recent years, since intensification of this area experienced a sudden surge. However, it is our understanding that water management issues are to be studied separately from the current zoning bylaw amendment and we look forward to providing input in future, perhaps for a drainage by-law which does not currently exist. We ask that the appropriate department officials include us in any future correspondence related to this issue.
- The preservation of mature trees on private property was not included in this study. We were disappointed to learn that, while Kingston has a Tree Bylaw, it does not address trees (rare species or maturity) on private property. Considering the concerns expressed by many residents of Reddendale, and the removal of many mature trees during recent development in the area, this is an issue which we hope and expect will be addressed by the City in future. Indeed, we have spent considerable effort and finances to enhance our own property's natural beauty and enhance its capacity to absorb and manage water drainage over the past 20 years, resulting in the existence of numerous mature trees and landscaping.

Finally, I note that 3 storey dwellings are now emerging in our neighbourhood and I expect this may set a precedent for future homes. While such buildings, if topped with a flat roof, may conform to proposed height restrictions, they are clearly not in character with the surrounding neighbourhood. I suspect they will, as noted in some Toronto references, create light, view and privacy issues.

We regret that we are unable to attend the City Hall meeting at which this bylaw will be discussed on Thursday, March 7, 2019 and submit this letter to indicate our support of the proposed changes.

Sincerely,

Anne O'Riordan & Gary Mullen,
2 Lakeshore Blvd., Kingston, ON K7M 4J6

Email: [REDACTED]

cc. Councillor Chapelle schapelle@cityofkingston.ca; Councillor Hill whill@cityofkingston.ca;
Councillor Hutchison rhutchison@cityofkingston.ca; Councillor Kiley rkiley@cityofkingston.ca;
Councillor Neill jneill@cityofkingston.ca; Councillor Osanic losanic@cityofkingston.ca

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: James Stewart [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 1:02 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Cc: James Stewart; Barbara Parrott
Subject: Re: report PC-19-021 - definition of "enclosed porch"?

> A definition for an enclosed porch has not been included in the
> report.
>
> Generally speaking, an enclosed porch would mean a structure attached
> to the main wall of a building that has a roof and where the front and
> sides of the structure have been enclosed by walls or windows.

Thank you.

I'm afraid that definition permits a dwelling house to be expanded to include extra habitable areas that would NOT be covered by the restrictions of the proposed by-laws.

Some developers will use this loophole to build outside the intentions of the proposed by-law.

Perhaps the exceptions for "enclosed porch" could be removed?

If not, perhaps a definition could be added stating that the enclosed porch is not a habitable area?

Thanks,
James

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Agarwal,Sukriti
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 12:54 PM
To: 'James Stewart'
Subject: RE: report PC-19-021 - definition of "enclosed porch"?

Hello James,

A definition for an enclosed porch has not been included in the report.

Generally speaking, an enclosed porch would mean a structure attached to the main wall of a building that has a roof and where the front and sides of the structure have been enclosed by walls or windows.

Thanks,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division
Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard
216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3217
sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca



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

From: James Stewart [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2019 9:31 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Cc: 'James Stewart'
Subject: report PC-19-021 - definition of "enclosed porch"?

Hi Sukriti -

I didn't see a definition for an "enclosed porch" in the PC-19-021 report. Would you be able to point me to a definition for this?

Thanks very much,
James

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Gregory,Katharine
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 2:02 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: FW: Reddendale Infill Development and Tomorrow's Meeting

Hi Sukriti,

More comments regarding Reddendale.

Kathy



Kathy Gregory

Clerk/Secretary
Planning Building and Licensing

City of Kingston
1211 John Counter Blvd.,
216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3184

kgregory@cityofkingston.ca



From: LaVerne Russell [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 2:01 PM
To: Gregory,Katharine
Cc: Chapelle,Simon; Hill,Wayne; Hutchison,Rob; Kiley,Robert; Osanic,Lisa
Subject: Reddendale Infill Development and Tomorrow's Meeting

Dear Planning Committee Clerk and Councillors,

We are residents of the Reddendale neighbourhood but are unable to attend the Planning Committee meeting on Thursday, March 7, at 6:30 p.m. We are writing to ask you as members of the Planning Committee to **approve** the new design guidelines as proposed by Planning Department. As residents of the neighbourhood we have been and continue to be very concerned by the pace and scale of infill and redevelopment that is occurring. It is not that some of the housing should not be replaced; we are more concerned by the scale of many of

the houses that are being built in comparison to lot sizes and the scale of most existing homes.

As you must be aware, our neighbourhood has also suffered with many issues of flooding and tree removal. We feel that the amended design guidelines will help with our concerns dealing with the scale and size of allowable housing in comparison to lot sizes and we understand that the flooding issues are outside of these amended rules. However, and despite that, we do feel that stricter rules determining how much of a lot can be covered by house, deck, driveway and other structures will help with some issues of flooding by retaining the ability of open areas to handle intense rainfall.

The amended guidelines also deal with height restrictions and setbacks that have recently become a serious issue for many residents. We are pleased that tighter restrictions will apply with these proposed changes.

As a neighbourhood we remain concerned with the pace of tree removal but realize that this issue falls outside the scope of the changes being considered.

We strongly urge you to **vote in favour** of the amended planning document for the Reddendale neighbourhood. It is very important to *ensure that infill development in Reddendale is context appropriate and compatible with the physical character of the existing built form.*

Sincerely,
LaVerne and Tom Russell
52 Montgomery Blvd.

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: CONCORD HOMES [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 4:28 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: Reddendale Comments
Attachments: Reddendale Planning Comments 2019.docx

Sukriti,

Attached please find our comments regarding the proposed zoning changes for Reddendale. I hope these will form part of the agenda / report for tomorrow's meeting.

Yours truly,
Martin

Martin Mack
President



Certified R-2000 Builder
Tarion Registered

**Concord Homes is the proud recipient of
Canadian Contractor's Outstanding Renovator and
Custom Homebuilder of the Year Award!**

Phone: (613) 384-0033

Visit our website: www.concordhomes.ca



1382614 Ontario Ltd.
Box 26016 Gardiners
Kingston, ON K7M 8W4

Office: 613-384-0033
concord@cogeco.ca
www.concordhomes.ca

March 6, 2019

City of Kingston
Sent via Email

Attention: Sukriti Agarwal

Dear Ms. Agarwal

We have read the proposed zoning changes posted on the website with regard to the Reddendale area. We have several objections to the report and its proposed changes.

From my perspective there appears to have been a biased approach to the process. After reviewing the consultants' presentation, I noticed pictures of the consultants walking the neighbourhood with the residents who (from my understanding) wish to restrict development. The same opportunity should have been afforded to those residents and contractors who want the opportunity to develop and improve their properties and in effect, the neighbourhood. The process is clearly not impartial when those opposing development and wishing to impose greater zoning restrictions have the ear of the consultants. I further noted that when the report references the process, it speaks to a community meeting in January 2019. We followed up to inquire why we were not aware of nor invited to attend this meeting. We were advised that it was a meeting requested by a group of residents to further discuss their joint submission. Their joint submission is included in the report however the details and content of the discussions in the January 2019 meeting are not. Page 9 of 19 of the Report to Planning Committee states:

*A public open house was held on October 9, 2018 to seek feedback on initial zoning and urban design recommendations, followed by a meeting with a group of residents on January 14, 2019. **Based on the feedback received, refinements have been made** to the recommendations where staff felt that the changes represented good planning.*

If this has been a fair and transparent process, how is it that a select group of individuals is given special consideration and their concerns are given more weight than others? Further, as per the report, their joint submission was submitted outside of the timelines given to the public at large. Everyone at that meeting who chose to submit comments would have benefited from extra time to prepare and submit comments. And if a closed door meeting was permitted for

one individual or group, then it should have been an option to anyone who attended the public meeting.....**IF** this was truly meant to be a fair and transparent process for all.

What is the purpose of such restrictive zoning standards? The city is allowing the objections of those who don't want new development in their backyards to dictate how one can improve or develop their properties and by consequence, the market value of those properties. Reddendale is not a historic neighbourhood with a particular architectural style. It does not have a heritage designation. There should not be extraordinary restrictions imposed on building in Reddendale because some residents oppose new development. What makes Reddendale more special than Bayridge or Henderson Place or any other existing neighbourhood?

As a resident of the neighbourhood and a builder, I have purchased 3 properties in the area to date. I have commenced building on 2 of those properties and am in the process of developing the other property. My company has also built and/or substantially renovated at least 3 others for clients who purchased properties in Reddendale with the sole intention to build or substantially renovate and move their families into the neighbourhood. Our presence in the neighbourhood has also generated leads with other homeowners in the area who are now considering updating/improving their homes. Our company has played a significant role in rejuvenating the streetscape of the Reddendale area which leads to making it an even more desirable area for families to settle in and enjoy the many parks and greenspace.

New development must meet strict engineering guidelines regarding grading and storm water management. This is absolutely fair and reasonable. These guidelines dictate that new development can not adversely impact the neighbouring properties. If anything, new development improves existing site conditions and could help to alleviate the issues on neighbouring lots. Other than the engineering requirements, new development should not be subjected to more restrictive zoning than other neighbourhoods in Kingston. This neighbourhood is prime for rejuvenation and the City should be encouraging growth and development.

Your report addresses each proposed zoning changes in a one-dimensional manner with plenty of pictures (note – only pictures of well maintained properties) and charts. It does not however, take into account the actual application and implications of the proposed zoning changes. For example, of the 2 properties that I am currently building on, both had existing homes that had issues with mold and/or asbestos and required remediation. Both houses were torn down because of the extensive issues with the homes. Neither home was fit to be lived in, yet they were. And there was a market to sell these homes because of the potential for development. For the new builds currently underway, neither of the plans would have been permitted under the new zoning requirements. The styles of the homes are different from the neighbouring properties yet they both suit their lots and the streetscape and they most certainly add charm and elegance. These builds bring younger families into the neighbourhood and encourage growth. All good things. Never mind the benefits of new energy efficient construction and the increased tax revenues for the city. However, neither build meets the proposed FSI requirements and would not have been permitted under the new guidelines.

Example:

13 Montgomery Blvd (Lot = 75 x 150)

Allowable 30% lot coverage = 3,375 sq ft

Actual new construction = 2,408 sq ft - meets requirements

Allowable proposed FSI = 3,975.5 sq ft

Actual FSI according to calculations = 4703 – does not meet requirements (FSI = 0.418)

Front yard setback – does not meet requirements



FRONT ELEVATION



REAR ELEVATION



VIEW FROM REAR WINDOW

Above pictures show the new construction at 13 Montgomery. The house does not tower over neighbouring houses nor is it too big for the lot. It has garage which is bigger than the “suggested design guidelines” that are intended to “complement” the recommended zoning controls. It has a nice sized front yard and curb appeal. The back yard is very large and existing trees remain. **BUT** under the proposed zoning changes this house would **NOT** have been permitted to be built. It would have had to have been shrunk by 765 sq ft and be pushed back farther on the lot. How does preventing the construction of this home somehow salvage the character of the existing neighbourhood?

We have recently commenced construction for a dwelling at 20 Crerar Blvd. It also meets or falls well below the 30% lot coverage requirements but again fails the standards for the proposed FSI.

We are also in the process of completing plans for a third property in Reddendale. The plan is for a 2-storey dwelling adjacent to a school. The plan as currently designed, again, will not meet the proposed FSI requirements.

The “design guidelines” merit extensive discussion. How are design guidelines – colours, building materials, sizes of garages and architectural styles a zoning issue. Your guidelines suggest locating new construction so as not to have to cut down mature trees. How is that an attainable guideline when new construction is strictly dictated by more restrictive zoning requirements and setbacks?

All of our proposed and in-process construction is designed for families. Careful consideration went into the design of each home. Under the new standards, design guidelines would not even be a factor. With the limitations being imposed, function will outweigh design. Reddendale is a neighbourhood with an elementary school and numerous parks. It should welcome such development. New homes that accommodate larger families, often accommodate housing aging parents or caregivers as well with the need for in-law suites. However, under your new guidelines, I would not be able to build any of these houses.

The diagram in exhibit E relating to the character of the neighbourhood defines the existing housing as having “eclectic styles, variety of housing sizes and variety of building materials”. The definition of “eclectic” is *deriving ideas, style, or taste from a broad and diverse range of sources*. Your very report defines the character of Reddendale as “eclectic”. By definition, it should welcome and encourage new development in a wide-ranging array of architectural styles and sizes. The city should not be dictating the colours, sizes, building materials, architectural styles, sizes of garages and driveways of the homes people wish to build and live in. This is not the intended purpose of zoning.

Essentially, there are 5 proposed zoning changes which I object to as they will severely limit building or renovating.

1. Floor Space Index – this needs to be scrapped – none of the projects I am working on would have been permitted based on your proposed guidelines. Factoring in the basements (whether below grade or not) in the floor space index is ridiculous.
2. 30% Lot Coverage - typically lot coverage is 40% to 45% - does not accommodate attached garages etc
3. Front Yard Setbacks – should not be determined by neighbour’s house size and location on the lot – if a property is flanked by small war time houses you will have extremely limited options for what can be done on that property
4. Rear Yard Setbacks – again, should not be determined by the neighbour’s house size and location on the lot
5. Maximum height – should be in keeping with what is standard in the city. Rock is close to the surface and you often can’t dig the basements deep in the ground.

These changes are meant to limit size of proposed new construction and they contradict the intent of the official plan. Building in established neighbourhoods cuts down on urban sprawl. Limiting the size of builds to the extent that the proposed changes do would also restrict the ability to allow for in-law suites to accommodate aging parents. The official plan encourages growth and re-investment in existing properties. The official plan encourages minor infilling and development. The official plan encourages higher density and diversity. The official plan promotes development in areas where change is desired. Change is desired. People want access to homes in Reddendale. They want access to the parks and greenspace and waterfront that is readily available but home to few. And they want the ability to live in homes that have both access to these amenities and are suitable for the needs of their families.

Reddendale is a desirable location to move to because of the amenities and the potential for what you can build or renovate. The city should be at the forefront of not only allowing that growth but promoting it in Reddendale.

There are unintended consequences that come with these new proposed restrictions. Aging, dilapidated homes will be left to further disrepair as they require such substantial repairs it would not be worth the cost. Kingston already has the lowest vacancy rate in the province. Limiting future development will only drive up the cost of housing even further. A market has also been created for homeowners (often elderly) to sell old homes that are in disrepair. That market will not exist if the proposed zoning changes are accepted. If the market for further developing Reddendale dries up or declines it will also impact jobs for tradespeople.

At the end of the day, there exists high demand for housing and low supply. How is it feasible for the city of Kingston to make it even more difficult to build and or renovate in established neighbourhoods. When the hospitals and universities are trying to attract doctors and professors to our great city but we are known for our lack of housing, how does that impact someone's decision to relocate here. When companies look to locate their businesses in a new city, availability of housing is a factor in that decision making. Kingston is a beautiful small city on the water with so much to offer....except for somewhere to live.

Yours truly,
CONCORD HOMES

Martin Mack
President

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Agarwal,Sukriti
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 11:55 AM
To: 'joanne robyn'
Subject: RE: REDDENDALE

Hi Joanne,

Thank you for your email. Without getting into the specifics of any particular property, a maximum building height of 10.7 metres could allow for three storeys on a lot, provided that the development meets all other applicable provisions of the zoning by-law.

Thanks,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division
Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard
216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3217
sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca



From: joanne robyn [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 5:37 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: Re: REDDENDALE

Hi Sukriti,

Thank u for your reply.

Please correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the information you provided is effectively telling me that a 3-storey flat-roofed buildings similar, or the same as, the one now being constructed at the corner of Park Crescent & Crerar Blvd. (60? Park Crescent), could meet all of the regulations that have been proposed in the zoning bylaw amendment provided the lot & building met all other requirements such as set-backs, lot coverage, main-wall height etc ?

I have attached a photo of the new construction for your information.



Joanne

On Wed, Mar 6, 2019 at 5:15 PM Agarwal,Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

Hello Joanne,

Thank you for your email.

The proposed zoning by-law amendment limits the maximum height of a dwelling to 10.7 metres; it does not regulate by number of stories. The proposed zoning by-law amendment does not regulate the shape of roofs.

Thanks,

Sukriti



Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Project Manager, Planning Division

Planning, Building & Licensing Services

City of Kingston

Located at: [1211 John Counter Boulevard](#)



[216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3](#)

613-546-4291 extension 3217

sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca

From: joanne robyn [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 11:29 AM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: REDDENDALE

Hi Sukriti,,

First, I want to thank you for your patience and professionalism in this long endeavor. It appears that we might be close to the end, although you will be continuing with all of it for a longer time.

What I would like to ask you is the following:

Will the zoning bylaw amendment for Reddendale as drafted prevent the future construction of 3-storey flat-roofed homes in Reddendale? If so, could you please indicate exactly which changes will prevent this?

Thank you for your reply. I truly hope that this is a simple answer.

Respectfully,

Joanne

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.

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Hub Steenbakkers [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 7:48 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Cc: Hill,Wayne
Subject: Comments

Dear Sukriti:

I'd like to share some thoughts I've had about the proposed Reddendale zoning by-law changes.

A large part of the focus of the planning effort is related to the "bulkiness" of houses in the neighbourhood. This has led to a considerable amount of contention as witnessed by the public comments.

The original FSI was set by the consultants at 0.4 without basement consideration. At the time it was presented in October, it was difficult to get a feeling for what that meant as it was a new concept for most of us. Also, there were no scatter plots (as have since been produced in exhibit K) to give the number context. Nonetheless, there was a considerable public backlash.

In the next iteration, the FSI was changed to 0.35 and included basements. For simplicity sake, a 4000 sq ft one story home with a basement (4000 + 4000 = 8000) which would have been allowed under the first rule would be reduced to a one story home, including basement, with a building footprint of $3500/2 = 1750$ sq ft. This is a reduction of 56% in building footprint! In a case with a basement that is mostly below grade, the volume, or bulk reduction would be similar. This is a significant reduction which prompts two questions: a) How did the professionals get it so wrong the first time, or b) Did they not get it right the second time? It would be easy to believe the reduction was a knee-jerk reaction to the public backlash.

In fact, one could perceive the choice to be arbitrary. Consider this: The exhibit K scatterplot suggests that about 30% of the existing homes would not meet the 0.35 FSI. Do these homes not represent the character of the neighbourhood? Is there an intent to alter the character of the neighbourhood? If so, the public should talk about it. How was an FSI of 0.35 rationalized?

I want to be clear on my position. I am in alignment with the spirit of the proposed zoning by-law changes including increased side yard setbacks, maximum heights, an appropriate form of bulk control, etc. What I am having difficulty with is how the preservation of the character of the neighbourhood is being implemented.

FSI is based on area, yet here it is being used to model bulkiness which is based on volume. I would submit that if you want to model bulkiness that is based on building volume, FSI is the wrong tool to use. FSI was a concept born in the time when a "floor" was almost always 8' high. Things are different now with some residential floors being nearly twice that old norm. I would suggest using a formula based on volume. May I suggest a formula like $\text{VolumeIndex} = \text{floor0area} \times \text{floor0height} \times \text{floor0coefficient} + \text{floor1area} \times \text{floor1height} \times \text{floor1coefficient} + \text{floor2area} \times \text{floor2height} \times \text{floor2coefficient} + \text{floor3area} \times \text{floor3height} \times \text{floor3coefficient}$. Floor0 is the basement, floor3 is the living space contained with a roof (with dormers). The coefficients would allow different weightings of the floors. The formula would have to be back tested to determine the appropriate coefficients and confirm that the formula adequately models the desired outcome.

I would treat the volume of floor0 as being only the portion of the basement that contributes to the visual bulkiness of a building - specifically, only the portion that is above ground. Floor0height would be measured from grade to the first floor.

If there is a need to control basement attributes it should be done with a rule or formula directed specifically to that attribute. This would be more effective than trying to control basements with FSI. The same can be said for using specific rules to address things like the height of main wall and perhaps the elevation of the first floor. Note that the proposed rules would not prevent someone from building a two story home with a flat roof at 35' above grade, creating the uncharacteristic main wall that you seek to avoid. I think there is still some work to do on preventing inordinately large main walls. Placing a height limitation on the main wall, as was originally proposed, appears to be the right approach but the height needs to allow for modern style (>8') ceilings starting at a reasonable first floor elevation above grade. Perhaps the right approach is to have a generous main wall height limit just under what would allow 3 full floors (27' ?) as well as limiting the style of architecture that could accommodate a third story (ie: must be contained by roof lines).

I agree that there should be a maximum footprint that a building can occupy on a lot. Is 30% the right number? It seems reasonable but, I don't know, I haven't seen a scatterplot of how the existing neighbourhood houses relate to that number. It should also be back tested and confirmed.

In summary, while I agree with the spirit of the proposed zoning changes, I believe FSI is the wrong tool to use to manage "bulkiness". I would recommend using something that relates to volume instead. If other attributes need to be controlled, do it with direct rules/formulas that relate only to the attribute in question.

I hope you find these thoughts helpful.

Regards,

Hub Steenbakkens


Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Case [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 7:54 AM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Cc: Hill,Wayne
Subject: Reddendale Neighbourhood
Attachments: City.pdf

Good morning Ms. Agarwal,
Attached is my letter outlining just a few of my concerns regarding the proposed zoning changes for Reddendale.

Regards,
Gary Case

Gary Case
25 Point Crescent
Kingston, ON K7M 3P2

March 5, 2019

City of Kingston
1211 John Counter Boulevard
216 Ontario Street
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

Attn: Sukriti Agarwal, Project Manager, Planning Division

Dear Ms. Agarwal,

Re: Report Number PC-19-021, Reddendale Neighbourhood

I was unable to attend the open house on October 9th regarding the proposed zoning changes and urban development for the Reddendale area. As a resident to the area for 25 years and who rebuilt my house 14 years ago on the existing lot, I find the proposed changes to the existing Zoning –By-Law too restrictive.

What makes Reddendale a fantastic area to live in is its location with parks, waterfront access, big lots and schools. There is no physical characteristic of the existing homes that makes the area desirable. Actually many of the houses built in the 1950's and early 60's are not appealing and some are in disrepair. New development and infill development has created life and positive change to the neighbourhood. The City should be encouraging infill development to the neighbourhood as there are no new infrastructure (sewer, water, roads, parks, schools, transit, etc.) required and they can control storm water management with better lot grading requirements.

Like most home owners my house is a large part of my net worth. We have seen significant increases in house values in the neighbourhood over the last 5 years. A big part of this increase has been the infill development of new homes being built. The new restrictions proposed like 30% lot coverage, floor space index, soft landscaping allocation among others would severely restrict infill development in my neighbourhood. This would cost many homeowners tens of thousands of dollars in lost property value when they go to sell their homes. There is no market for older homes that are in disrepair. Buyers to the area want to update, modernize, make major renovations or build new homes.

I would like to know of all the new homes constructed or renovated in the past 5-years in Reddendale what percentage would have been approved under these new proposed zoning changes? I am also concerned what effect the soft landscaping allocation would have on me adding a pool, deck or shed.

These zoning changes would put Reddendale at a disadvantage over other neighbourhoods, like LaSalle Park, Henderson Place, Welborne, Bayridge and others that will see infill development in the years to come. If the City is concerned with infill development this should be done through a City-wide new Zoning By-Law, not neighbourhood by neighbourhood. Where the City can get input from residences, Home Builders Association, Kingston Construction Association, Kingston and Area Real Estate Association and other professionals who support development, redevelopment and business. This issue is too big to have 100 or so Nimby residence (organized group) of the neighbourhood to lobby the City to spend \$100,000 to restrict development because they are opposed to change. If the consultant's report is good for Reddendale it should be good for the rest of the surrounding neighbourhoods and Kingston. If these proposed zoning changes are passed it will have a negative economic impact both to the homeowners of Reddendale and to the City in lost tax revenue.

Please keep me informed of all future meetings and public correspondence regarding the Reddendale Neighbourhood.

Regards,



Gary Case

Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Susan Chamberlain [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 11:02 AM
To: Gregory,Katharine; Chapelle,Simon; Hill,Wayne; Hutchison,Rob; Kiley,Robert; Neill,Jim; Osanic,Lisa
Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: Reddendale Recommendations
Attachments: IMG_4458.JPG

Hello Kathy and Planning Committee Members,

I would like to confirm my support for the recommendations put forward by the Planning Department regarding development in Reddendale. I am a long time resident of Reddendale and I am not against development in our neighbourhood. Many examples of appropriate development exist. However I have witnessed the building of houses that are not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood and which have greatly increased the density of housing in our area. In many cases houses have been torn down, all trees on the lot cut down and two and sometimes three much larger houses are built. The attached photo shows one example.

The proposed zoning restrictions and design guidelines were developed with lots of opportunity for community input. As a member of a concerned group of Reddendale residents I met with both our councillor and the relevant city planners following the Open House in October, 2018 and felt our concerns were listened to and considered. This set of recommendations will address many of the issues we have had in terms of protecting the character of the neighbourhood. We urge the Planning Committee to support the Report.

Kingston just declared a climate emergency. We are looking for ways to reduce greenhouse gasses, protect the eco-system, and protect the community from climate change. Smaller houses are more environmentally friendly (from the perspective of building resources as well as heating), and they allow for more green space where trees can be planted to offset greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, the recommendations also require less of a footprint on the environment, allowing for more conservation efforts in this sensitive area.

Thank you,

Susan Chamberlain



Agarwal,Sukriti

From: Kyle Nielissen [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 1:40 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Cc: Agnew,Paige
Subject: Reddendale Neighbourhood Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment
Attachments: KHBA - Proposed Reddendale Zoning By-law Ammdendment-03-07-2019.pdf

Sukriti,

Please refer to the attached letter from the KHBA regarding the public meeting tonight regarding the Reddendale Neighbourhood Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

Regards,

Kyle Nielissen, P.Eng.
Project Manager
Kyle.Nielissen@Forefronteng.ca



1329 Gardiners Road, Suite 210
Kingston, ON, Canada K7P 0L8
T 613 634-9009 Ext. 101
C 613.561.9265
F 888 884-9392



March 7, 2019

Planning Committee and Staff
City of Kingston
216 Ontario Street
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

This letter was prepared on behalf and in consultation with members of the Kingston Home Builders Association (KHBA) and relates to the proposed Reddendale Neighbourhood By-law amendment scheduled for a Public Meeting March 7, 2019.

The proposed by-law will have significant impacts to a number of our small home builder's, contractors and the residents within the Reddendale Neighbourhood.

Residents are currently receiving above market value for large lots in the Reddendale Neighbourhood based on redevelopment potential, the proposed amendment will substantially reduce property values in the area.

As proposed, the by-law would include some of the most onerous zoning provisions in the entire urban area.

Council Strategic priorities include climate change and sustainable development. To accomplish these goals the City of Kingston has promoted and focused on intensification, this requires the utilization of underutilized serviced land in all areas of the City. The proposed amendment does not support these goals and sets a bad precedent that this is a neighbourhood by neighbourhood policy.

This by-law is contrary to the Provincial Policy Statement and City of Kingston Official Plan Update. Refer to the attached letter regarding Zoning By-law amendment Reddendale Neighbourhood by Fotenn, dated March 7, 2019 for the planning specific issues.

The KHBA will continue to be an active member of the community and will support our small home builders.

Sincerely,

Kyle Nielissen, P.Eng.
KHBA
First Vice President

cc: KHBA members
Attach: Zoning By-law Amendment Reddendale Neighbourhood

March 7, 2019

Ms. Paige Agnew

Director of Planning, Building and Licensing Services
1211 John Counter Boulevard
Kingston, ON, K7K 6C7

Via email: pagnew@cityofkingston.ca

**RE: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (D14-003-2019)
Reddendale Neighbourhood**

Dear Ms. Agnew,

Fotenn Planning + Design has been retained by the Kingston Home Builders Association (KHBA) to review the proposed zoning by-law amendment for the Reddendale Neighbourhood and the associated public meeting report, to be presented at the March 7, 2019 Planning Committee meeting.

The public meeting report describes the City's intent to rezone the subject lands, provides a preliminary rationale and policy review, a background review of the consultation that has taken place to-date, proposed urban design guidelines, and details of the proposed zoning by-law amendment. The report was prepared by City staff, with support from Dillon Consulting. The report includes extensive comments provided by members of the public, which demonstrates the heightened level of concern in the area resulting from recent and ongoing development in Reddendale. The comments received also include correspondence from home builders and residents expressing concern with the proposed zoning by-law amendment.

The proposed zoning by-law amendment seeks to apply three new zones to the area of Reddendale which is currently zoned R1-3. The three proposed zones are R1-74, R1-75, and EPA-17. Our review focuses on the R1-74 and R1-75 zones. Our primary concerns with the new zones relate to lot frontage and the proposed built form standards. We are also concerned with the overall approach being taken; of advancing regulatory changes which appear unsupported by policy. Further, section 45(1.3) of the *Planning Act* imposes a two-year moratorium on minor variances following the passing of a zoning by-law amendment, which could have a negative impact for minor infill and/or intensification in the neighbourhood. We encourage Council and staff to consider a measured land use planning approach to managing development in Reddendale.

Provincial Policy Statement

The public meeting report references sections 1.1.1, 1.1.3, 1.4.3, and 1.6.6.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement. Three of these sections deal with efficient development and use of land and municipal infrastructure. The fourth deals with minimum targets for the provision of housing. These are all higher order policies that relate to the proposed lot frontage provision but do not directly relate to the proposed provisions for built form. The proposed zoning by-law amendment would significantly limit the potential for as-of-right intensification in Reddendale, reducing the opportunity for optimizing the use of existing infrastructure and therefore coming into conflict with the PPS. The level of municipal services in Reddendale is high in terms of the level of transit service, and proximity to commercial and open space uses. Further, the City has adopted a minimum net urban residential density of 22 dwelling units per net hectare. The proposed performance standards would not reasonably allow the creation of any new lots, or the intensification of existing lots, which would meet this threshold. As such, the proposed zoning by-law amendment is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

Official Plan

The Official Plan promotes compatible intensification within the Urban Boundary, as stated in Section 2.4. The Reddendale neighbourhood is located within the Urban Boundary and is well-served by municipal infrastructure and therefore has first priority for development of vacant or under-utilized lots, including infill opportunities, as per Section 2.4.6. Section 2.4.5 of the Official Plan states that 40% of new residential development is intended to occur through intensification. Section 2.4.4(a) of the Official Plan also establishes a minimum net residential density of 22 dwelling units per net hectare for new development within the urban boundary, as referenced above. The intent of this minimum residential density policy is to increase the City's net urban residential density and optimize the use of existing infrastructure and services, in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement. The most recent comprehensive update to the Official Plan was Official Plan Amendment 50 (OPA 50), approved by Council in 2017. One of the policy changes in OPA 50 strengthened the minimum density of 22 units per net hectare. Previous language referred to this density as a "target", whereas OPA 50 re-framed this density threshold as a minimum requirement. This policy is highly prescriptive and does not contemplate exceptions, except where a higher density is desired per subsections b), c) and d) which do not apply to the subject area.

In order to achieve a minimum density of 22 units per net hectare, the **maximum** lot area for a single-detached dwelling is 454.5 square metres (1.0 hectare ÷ 22 units per net hectare = 0.04545 hectares). The proposed Reddendale zoning includes a minimum lot frontage of 16.7 metres (55 feet). The **maximum** lot depth must therefore be 27.2 metres so as to achieve the required minimum density, however the majority of lots within the Reddendale Neighbourhood have lot depths which range from 30 to 50 metres. Although we have not performed a calculation, we know Reddendale to have one of the lowest densities in the City and likely not reaching the minimum requirement in the Official Plan. As such, infill lot creation in accordance with the proposed zone provisions would result in a density of **less than 22** units per net hectare.

The report "Reddendale Zoning By-law Recommendations" by Dillon Consulting states in more than one location that the proposed zoning by-law is not seeking to reduce the density in Reddendale. Essentially, the report argues that the existing minimum lot frontage provision cannot be increased because of Official Plan policy related to minimum density requirements. However, the report neglects to address Official Plan policy requiring the minimum density of 22 units per hectare for new development and that passing a zoning by-law amendment that does not support this density would be contrary to the Official Plan.

The current zoning for this area conflicts with the Official Plan but it also pre-dates the Official Plan by 40 years. However, an amendment to the zoning by-law must conform to the Official Plan in effect at the time the application was deemed complete. The proposed amendment would reinforce an outdated zoning by-law provision for minimum lot frontage which conflicts with a policy that was strengthened in the most recent update to the Official Plan in 2017. Therefore this amendment does not conform to the Official Plan.

Proposed Built Form Standards

With the exception of a relatively small number of new developments in recent years, the Reddendale neighbourhood generally reflects the built form standards of the 1950s and 1960s when the land was initially developed. Historically, this neighbourhood was developed as a low-density residential subdivision with large lots on partial services, requiring large lot sizes. Architectural styles and market preferences for housing styles have changed significantly, with the present emphasis on larger homes and smaller lots being influenced by Provincial policy which directs municipalities to more efficiently use land.

The proposed built form standards will have the effect of significantly limiting building potential in Reddendale. The use of an FSI requirement is of particular concern, as this is a tool generally intended to control built form and density in medium to high density environments. In Kingston, FSI is not presently used in the former Kingston or

Pittsburgh Townships. The One-family and Two-family dwelling (A) Zone of the area regulated by zoning by-law 8499 includes an FSI provision of 1.0, notable for being almost three times the proposed limit for Reddendale.

The proposed FSI, lot coverage, landscaped open space, main wall height, and yard setback provisions must be considered together. A dwelling which is constructed to the lot coverage maximum of 30% would not be permitted a full basement or a full second storey. The side yard setbacks requirements of 1.8 metres represent a 50% increase over the current minimum of 1.2 metres, which is a standard side yard requirement throughout Kingston which allows for sufficient access and separation between dwellings in an urban environment. The proposed main wall height would effectively limit dwellings to one-storey with basement or two-storeys with no basement, and would be further constrained by considerations of lot coverage and FSI.

The Front Yard Depth provisions state “if the average of adjacent properties is not feasible, greater of: the average of one neighbouring property on the same side of the street and 6 metres ...”. This provision is vague and potentially difficult to interpret and enforce. Who will decide which is the ‘one neighbouring property’ to use and when will that be determined – at time of building permit, before?

There is also a need to justify the new definition for Landscaped Open Space. This definition is substantially different than found in any other area of the City of Kingston. It does not reflect flexibility, changes in design tastes and standards or maintenance requirements for homeowners. Excluding, in particular, buffer strip, surfaced walk, surface patio, swimming pool or similar area from landscaped open space is overly restrictive and would be a challenge for the City to enforce over time.

We strongly urge staff to reconsider the proposed built form standards. In our opinion the standards will have unintended consequences to the type of dwellings that can be built and the form of landscaped space provided. The provisions also appear to be unclear in how to implement at the building permit stage and difficult to enforce over the short and long term.

Overview

It is our opinion that the proposed zoning by-law amendment will excessively limit development in the Reddendale Neighbourhood beyond what is in the interest of maintaining neighbourhood stability. Within stable neighbourhoods, the Official Plan recognizes that some compatible change and growth will occur over time. The proposed amendment would significantly reduce opportunities for gradual change to occur in the neighbourhood over time. As noted repeatedly in the public meeting report, the eclectic nature of building forms in Reddendale is a defining characteristic of the neighbourhood, which has resulted from incremental changes over time. These changes have occurred within the umbrella of zoning that is more restrictive than current typical standards found throughout other parts of the City (ie larger lot frontages and areas). The proposed zoning as written would discourage continued evolution of the already eclectic character of this neighbourhood.

Further, new development in the Reddendale neighbourhood has occurred in low density built forms, primarily single-detached dwellings. Proposed lot sizes have decreased and dwelling sizes have increased from that existing in the area, however the predominant low density residential land use remains. A more efficient use of the existing municipal infrastructure aligns with Provincial policy as well as the City’s own goals for sustainable and cost-effective development.

Implementation of the proposed zoning by-law amendment is likely to result in a development “freeze” in the neighbourhood because of the flawed nature of the zone provisions and the inability to apply for a minor variance for two years after it is passed. While some may argue this is the desired outcome, zoning is not the means to achieve a freeze. There is also no indication that this is the purpose of the rezoning based on the Public Meeting report.

We encourage Council and Staff to continue exploring other avenues to manage change and development in Reddendale. The proposed zoning by-law amendment does not appear to be well-supported by Provincial or municipal policy. An alternative approach could include the development of neighbourhood-specific Official Plan policies to guide development, followed by appropriate regulatory tools such as a zoning by-law amendment.

Please feel free to contact me at 613-542-5454 with any questions and I ask to be notified of any decisions or future public meetings regarding this zoning by-law amendment application.

Respectfully,

Margo Watson, MCIP RPP
Managing Partner

Cc KHBA Attn Kyle Nielissen

From: JOHN FISHER

Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 10:32 AM

To: Lambert,Lindsay

Subject: Comments re: Proposed Zoning Amendment for 655 Graceland Avenue - March 7, 2019

In preparation for the March 7 Meeting of the Planning Committee, I would like to provide my comments to the proposed change.

In the same week that the City of Kingston declared a Climate Emergency and committed itself to reducing the carbon footprint in the city, there is an opportunity to demonstrate the City's commitment to living up to its plan and not eliminating one of the few remaining undeveloped, natural green spaces in the Bayridge community. If the committee grants the approval to proceed with development, we will not only lose the greenery and forest land that can help reduce our CO2 footprint but also a wildlife habitat and corridor along the rail lines for deer, coyotes, rabbits and birds (numerous pileated woodpecker and occasional eagle sightings).

In summary, as a resident of the area, I do not support this re-zoning and would urge the Planning Committee not to approve the proposal to allow for the building of the 45 unit subdivision.

Sincerely,

John Fisher,
630 Forest Hill Drive

From: Janet Gibbs
Sent: March 6, 2019 6:48 PM
To: Newman, Greg
Subject: RE: Planning Committee - March 06, 2019

Thank you for sending me the link to the Graceland development. I was especially interested in the responses by the community. 4 inquiries had questions, 3 inquiries wanted modifications to the development, especially number of houses, 2 inquiries approved the development and 22 inquiries OPPOSED the development. The loss of the woodlot and its wildlife/birds was mentioned over and over in the letters.

If this development is approved, it will send the message to this community and others that the concerns and issues residents have to developments are of no interest or value to the city's council or mayor and will be ignored. Subsequently there will grow more and more resistance to any development near an established neighbourhood. As 3 months have passed since my letters were received at the mayor's office and with every councillor and either ignored or thrown out, I feel the same way as a neighbourhood that has an opposed development go ahead anyway, of no value and ignored.

Even more galling was the response by the city that the woodlot "was of no value".

Please pass on my concerns to whomever you wish might receive them and actually hear them.
Thank you, Janet

From: Roger Healey [
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 3:24 PM
To: Sands, Jason
Subject: D14-025-2018 495-513 Frontenac St

Dear Mr. Sands,

I am writing on behalf of Kingston Coalition for Active Transportation (KCAT) to comment on the plan for 495-513 Frontenac St (D14-025-2018). Specifically the request to reduce bike parking from 1.0 per unit to 0.5 per unit.

The location of this project on Frontenac near Princess is such that most residents/tenants will be close enough to work, school and amenities that bicycling will be a major mode of travel. To reduce the number of bicycle parking spaces does not make sense, especially as this mode of travel (along with walking and Transit) is part of the City's plan to increase Active Transportation trips and reduce car trips significantly in the next few years.

Reducing the number of car parking spaces is fine, but this must be accompanied by an increase in the number of bicycle parking spots (not a decrease). In terms of space, each car parking spot can accommodate anywhere from 5 to 10 bicycles. In addition to increasing the number of bicycle parking spaces, the spaces must be sheltered and secure because bicycle theft and vandalism is a serious problem.

Sincerely,

Roger Healey
Chair, KCAT
123 Beverley St
Kingston, ON K7L 3Y7