



**City of Kingston
Planning Committee
Meeting Number 09-2019
Addendum
Thursday April 4, 2019
6:30 p.m., Council Chamber, City Hall**

Correspondence

- b)** Correspondence received from Michael Shuser, dated April 1, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Page 1
- c)** Correspondence received from Nancy Roberts, dated April 2, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Page 2
- d)** Correspondence received from Frank Dixon, dated March 14, 2019 regarding 655 Graceland Avenue.
Schedule Pages 3 - 4

April 1, 2019

To whom it may concern,

This note is regarding the proposed Graceland Avenue development. My wife and I own 581 Forest Hill Drive West, which is adjacent to the development site. We have several mature trees that would be adversely affected by the proposed construction due to their proximity to the property line. Below is an excerpt from two certified Arborists who outline the details. I request that the developer clarifies whether their plans would cross the distance threshold specified below, which would directly result in damage to the tree root networks.

Regards,

Michael Shuser
581 Forest Hill Drive

The following is an excerpt from Meadow Green Tree Experts:

Location - 581 Forest Hill Drive

This property shares a side boundary with a proposed development of vacant land that involves house construction. The problem I indicate is that close to the east boundary, the client property owner has three trees close to the boundary and any heavy traffic/paving/digging etc on the ground area within 60 feet east of the client east boundary will have a derogatory impact on these trees that could result in damage and decline. This is especially true in the dynamic root biomass area located 20 to 30 feet from the fence boundary.

These trees identified starting from the north through the east property gate are respectively:

- one sugar maple approximately 20 inches DBH
- one Manitoba maple approximately 24 inches DBH
- one White ash approximately 16 inches DBH

Loss of any/all of these trees that are in apparent good health will result in a loss of property value and a reduction in aesthetic value and shade cover, suggesting that this situation needs to be addressed before any work commences in that delineated zone.

Yours in truth,

E. G. Kennedy
Certified ISA Arborist
Certified MET Arborist

E.R. Kennedy
Certified MET Arborist

llambert@cityofkingston.ca

from Nancy Roberts

RE: 655 Graceland Ave. Kingston

The following is part of a submission I tried to make at the last public meeting 7th. March 2019. Since my presentation was extremely truncated at that time I gave copies to all members of the Planning Committee. Since these questions have not been addressed in the latest Planning Dept report I would like them to be answered now.

Excerpt:-

Thirdly - I refer you again to the path which City has just purchased to provide the developer with access to Forest Hill Drive East and hence to Bayridge Drive. -again another example of developers' needs, versus the rights of existing taxpayers. The path in question has not at any time in the past 30 years been a public walkway. It is not a right of way. There is a gate in the acoustic fence at this point. It has been rarely opened. This gate was built to provide access to the land behind the fence. The land was owned at that time by CN Rail who needed this gate access for maintenance purposes. It was not possible to enter the property otherwise. All of the other land on Forest Hill Drive East, from Bayridge to Graceland was privately owned, bounded from one end to the other by an acoustic fence. The gateway was also used by the developer of Forest Hill Drive East to maintain the acoustic fence. This fence is now jointly owned by 11 property owners and the city of Kingston, whose share is miniscule. I would suggest that any decision to alter its characteristics would require consensus of all owners and not be subject to the desires and needs of a potential developer. Since we owners have not sought help regarding the acoustic qualities of the fence I suggest that any comments made by others are irrelevant and, being made by a company in pay of the present developer can hardly be regarded as objective.

I also object to the Hitlerian tactics which have been used to usurp the present residents' rights and I refer Planning Committee to Page 22 of the Report, included here, and the response given to the question regarding the restrictive covenants on our property Purchase Agreements. This is a specious argument and not worthy of the City of Kingston. The Planning Department know quite well that any break in this fence destroys its acoustic qualities and so they are indeed altering the acoustic fencing. Insisting that there are no covenants on title for the path is such a blatant attempt to sidetrack and confuse the issue as to be almost laughable and also not worthy of the City of Kingston.

Thank you, Nancy Roberts

From: frank dixon

Sent: March 14, 2019 12:27 AM

To: pagnew@cityofkingston.ca; Neill,Jim; losanic@cityofkingston.ca; rhutchison@cityofkingston.ca; rkiley@cityofkingston.ca; schapelle@cityofkingston.ca; whill@cityofkingston.ca; frank dixon

Subject: Planning Comm. members, Planning Director Paige Agnew: Questions on west-end development project

Hello everyone:

I hope you are all doing well.

I am following up on the Planning Committee meeting of March 7, which dealt in the Business portion with a Recommendation from Planning Department staff to proceed with a large, complex subdivision project in the west end, just north of Bath Road, just west of Bayridge Drive, just north of the CN rail line, and not far from the eastern end of Collins Bay.

This was my first time seeing this particular project, as I expect it was for many people at the meeting, including several Committee members.

I spoke in public portion of the Business item, as is now allowed.

Q1: When was the last time this project came to the Planning Committee? Was it in 2013? If that is the case, then it would have gone through an entire term of Council (2014-2018) without coming to Planning Committee.

Q2: Has it ever been presented to City Council? If so, what was the outcome?

The Committee voted to defer a decision on next steps for the project until its April 4th meeting, having heard from concerned citizens, and having absorbed detailed information from, in particular, Councillor Lisa Osanic, who represents that district. Traffic, safety, wildlife habitat, density, and noise were among those paramount in discussion, while a nearby resident stated objections to aggressive realtor conduct.

Dealing with the deferral discussion, at the time, Councillor Jim Neill, Chair, stated that the next meeting of the Committee would take place on March 14, when in fact it will be March 21. That error may have impacted the timeline for staff to consider the input from the meeting and report back to the Committee.

Discussion at the meeting, where I learned from others, and having come up with some of my own ideas, led me to come up with what I believe is a better solution for the development of this section of land. To be sure, I am in favour of its development, but just not with the plans presented.

Notably, Councillor Rob Hutchison mentioned the need for greater density, in Kingston, as an overall theme. He specifically referenced this project as having density too low.

However, if Councillor Osanic's plan for one-side loading is taken up, then this would leave the overall density even lower than it is currently, all other factors being equal.

My big-picture scenario for the property consists of the following major pieces:

- 1) Development on only ONE side, the north side, of the so-called 'Road A' (set to be a new east-west road);
- 2) The south side of 'Road A' to be left as wilderness, and to be bought by the City of Kingston from the owners, at fair market rate, and dedicated as new parkland;
- 3) Remaining land to be developed, as presented, to proceed along the lands shown, BUT with greater density of the new units on that land, into a duplex / town house style of building, to achieve the higher density goal;
- 4) Stormwater zone on the southeast of the property to proceed as shown;
- 5) Small new sector of parkland on the west side of the property to proceed as shown;
- 6) New extension off Graceland, running north-south, into development area, to proceed as shown.

This is quite a complex scenario. As it would involve several City departments apart from Planning, it likely couldn't be considered as a package and voted on by the Planning Committee, but would need to be broken up and analyzed. And it would then need to go to Council. All of this could take quite a lot of time, and the owners are wanting to get going on their project, so a delay could take it to the LPAT.

I won't be able to attend the April 4th meeting, as I will be out of town on business.

I am wondering what is the best way to present my ideas for consideration, so am asking you for some guidance here.

Q3: Would it be all right to simply write up my ideas and place them in an Official Correspondence letter to the Planning Committee and Council? Or, is there a possibly more effective method?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Dixon

Williamsville resident