



**City of Kingston  
Planning Committee  
Meeting Number 18-2019  
Addendum  
Thursday September 5, 2019  
6:30 p.m., Council Chamber, City Hall**

---

**Correspondence**

- a) Correspondence received from Cheryl King-VanVlack, dated September 5, 2019 regarding Zoning By-Law Amendment - 11 & 27 Wright Crescent.

Schedule Pages 1 - 2

## **Traffic Study**

“The proposed development will add a modest amount of trips to the area roadways. The site is projected to generate 62 new trips during the AM peak hour and 78 new trips during the PM peak hour.”

*It is difficult to understand these low numbers when there is a total of 184 parking spaces and therefore, 184 cars allocated to the site. How many of these are visitors and handicapped parking?*

*While I understand how the study was conducted, the v/c ratios seem very low. There is a huge amount of traffic associated with the buildings on Wright Crescent and peak hours for child drop-off at daycare and pick-up at daycare create a huge amount of traffic, as do the arrivals and departures from the Crescent School. I find it hard to believe that a potential of 184 cars will have only modest impact on traffic movement at the intersections.*

## **Geotechnical Report**

“The building and UPG foundations systems may be able to be installed directly on the existing bedrock, BUT depending on the final elevation, bedrock may have to be removed in order to accommodate basement level and UPG footings.”

When will it be known if bedrock has to be removed? If so, does this involve blasting? One of the primary concerns of FCC#6 is the effect that blasting may have on the infrastructure of buildings adjoining this property. When is it feasible in the Planning Process to request more specific information about safeguards taken not to disrupt infrastructure of the buildings of FCC#6 (Frontenac Condominium Corporation #6) which are on the north property line of the development? For example, can FCC #6 request that the infrastructures of these buildings be inspected prior to and after any blasting that is done to ensure that no damage is done to the infrastructure (i.e. basement wall cracking, cracking of pool infrastructure).

## **Noise Impact Study**

“It is not anticipated that the proposed rooftop HVAC equipment will generate a noise impact. The study provides three recommendations to meet the City of Kingston and MECP noise guidelines.

- 1) The MECP requires, as a minimum, forced air heating with a provision for central air conditioning. The proposed is planning to include central condition in any case, thus meeting the requirement.
- 2) The sound levels are above the MECPS noise criteria such that a warning clause is required for all Agreements of Purchase and Sale for both proposed buildings. The warning clause must be inserted into the Agreement of Purchase and Sale.
- 3) It is recommended that the HVAC equipment and exhaust fans at both buildings be reviewed once details of these systems are available to ensure compliance with the MECP’s NPC-300 guidelines.”

*The recommendations appear to be contradictory in which the report indicates that the proposed rooftop HVAC equipment will not generate a noise impact, however, recommendations 2 & 3 seem to indicate that there is a concern about the noise impact of the HVAC system. Could you please clarify if*

*there is an anticipated noise impact of the HVAC system and what will be done to minimize the noise pollution?*

## **5.2 City of Kingston Official Plan**

### **Section 2 – Strategic Policy Direction**

Section 2.7.4 – Mitigation measures may be used to achieve development and land use compatibility. Such measures may include one or more of the following:

a) ensuring adequate setbacks and minimum yard requirements;

A minimum setback of 7.5 metres will be maintained from abutting properties for the proposed four-storey apartment building located at 27 Wright Crescent. A minimum setback of 14.5 metres will be maintained from abutting properties for the proposed six-storey apartment building located at 15 Wright Crescent.

and Bath Road.

c) requiring fencing, walls, or berming to create a visual screen;

No fencing, walls, or berming are proposed to create a visual screen. Landscaping is proposed to help soften and screen parking areas.

e) maintaining mature vegetation and/or additional new landscaping requirements;

Three (3) existing trees are proposed to be maintained. New plantings, including 24 trees, 182 shrubs and 134 herbaceous (i.e. perennials and grasses) are proposed.

*While the setbacks will be 25 feet and 48 feet respectively for the 4- and 6-story buildings in relation to the 115 Wright Crescent property, it would appear that parking spaces and a roadway will be directly adjacent to this property. It was my understanding in earlier discussions, that some landscaping would occur along the property line to reduce noise from traffic and to enhance privacy. This does not appear to be the case (Section 2.7.4 c). I am extremely concerned about this and would much prefer some kind of landscape barrier along the fence line.*

*Currently, there is a black chain-link fence separating the property of the proposed development and that of 115 Wright Crescent; the fence is owned by the FCC#6. There are several trees which closely abut the fence. Is there a guarantee that when the trees are removed, that no damage will occur to the fence, or if there is damage, will the developer repair any damage to the fence?*

Thank you for considering my questions and/or concerns in relation to the development of the former 7 Wright Crescent property.

Cheryl King-VanVlack  
Unit 73, 115 Wright Crescent  
Kingston, Ontario K7L 4T8