



**City of Kingston  
Planning Committee  
Meeting Number 20-2021  
Minutes**

**Thursday, August 12, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.  
In a virtual, electronic format**

---

**Committee Members Present**

Councillor Neill, Chair  
Councillor Hill (arrived at 6:42 p.m.)  
Councillor Hutchison  
Councillor Kiley  
Councillor Osanic

**Regrets**

There were none.

**Staff Members Present**

Sukriti Agarwal, Acting Manager, Policy Planning  
Paige Agnew, Commissioner, Community Services  
James Bar, Manager, Development Approvals  
Elizabeth Fawcett, Committee Clerk  
Janet Jaynes, Deputy City Clerk  
Blair Johnson, Corporate Records & Information Officer  
Tim Park, Director, Planning Services  
Mike Szilagyi, Planner

**Meeting to Order**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

### **Approval of the Agenda**

Moved by Councillor Kiley

Seconded by Councillor Hutchison

**That** the agenda be amended to include the addendum, and as amended, be approved.

**Carried**

### **Confirmation of Minutes**

There were none.

### **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**

There were none.

### **Delegations**

There were none.

### **Briefings**

There were none.

### **Business**

#### **a) Central Kingston Growth Strategy Final Recommendation Report**

Ms. Agarwal and Mr. Szilagyi conducted a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Central Kingston Growth Strategy Final Recommendation Report. A copy of the presentation is available upon request through the City Clerk's department.

Councillor Hutchison commented that there were a number of good items in the recommendations. He expressed concern over the allowances on Brock Street around Victoria Park given the older, Victorian aesthetic and he stated that the square should be maintained as low-rise, single-family dwellings. Mr. Szilagyi stated that the corridor of Brock Street was considered as a whole and that the established heights are based on the width of the right-of-way. He noted that there are no existing heritage properties around the park.

Ms. Agarwal added that intensification is being considered in areas that are located near amenities such as this park space.

Councillor Hutchison asked whether shadowing was considered for a potential 12-storey building at the corner of Bath Road and Sir John A Macdonald Boulevard and what could be considered for ingress and egress of the site. Mr. Szilagyi spoke to Slides 34 to 37 of the presentation to demonstrate the potential shadowing on the site. He noted that the developer of the site would need to determine the appropriate ingress and egress onto Sir John A. Macdonald Boulevard through a traffic study.

Ms. Agnew noted that the Transportation Services department did review the Growth Strategy document. She noted that proximity to express public transit, the walkability of the area and expanding active transportation opportunities for the area would all be considered when reviewing an application.

Councillor Hutchison sought clarification on through-lots located along Portsmouth Avenue and whether there would be space to put a second building on the back side of those lots facing the other side of the street. He asked whether split zoning would be possible to allow for townhouses on the residential facing side of the lot and multi-residential facing the Portsmouth Avenue side. Mr. Szilagyi explained that through-lots are considered to have frontages on both streets to encourage that type of development. He noted that split zoning would likely be too complicated on the size of lot.

Councillor Osanic requested information regarding notice to the public given the recommendations to create high-density areas.

Councillor Hill arrived at the meeting at 6:42 p.m.

Ms. Agnew clarified that the recommendations before the Committee are for information only as an introduction to the detailed policy and explained how the public can continue to participate in the process.

In response to Councillor Osanic, Mr. Szilagyi spoke to the increased setbacks and open space requirements being implemented to provide space for trees in an effort to mitigate tree canopy loss. He addressed the intensification area along Bath Road indicating that intensification is being contemplated over 20 to 25 years and will not be an immediate change.

Councillor Osanic commented that mid-rise buildings would be more appropriate around Victoria Park and that the proposed 6-storey building height seems too tall for the area.

Councillor Kiley asked how the policy is climate friendly and helps the City to reach its climate goals. He asked whether the proportionality analysis mentioned in the report is

the same as massing. He noted that it would be helpful to see the proposed scaling of buildings from a pedestrian perspective.

Ms. Agnew spoke to the use of a mid-rise building height of 4 to 6-storeys and identifying areas that could accommodate more building height. She noted that intensification is suggested along arterials roads with better transit and walkability for more active transportation options. She stated that the mid-rise building also permits more wood frame construction that is beneficial from a carbon reduction perspective. She commented on the existing zoning regulations that allow for a significant floor space index which results in buildings that can feel too large for the neighbourhood and the ways in which the Central Growth policy is being designed to address proportionality through other means such as lot depth.

Mr. Szilagyi indicated that the right-of-way is used to calculate the permitted height of a building to create proportionality from a pedestrian perspective.

Ms. Agarwal spoke to the regulations of lot area to allow for proportionally sized buildings. She added that the lot coverage, floor space index, and the landscaped open space are used to determine proportionality.

The Chair was passed to Councillor Kiley.

In response to Councillor Neill, Ms. Agarwal reviewed the public consultation initiatives that staff have used to engage the public in discussion on the policy including open houses, workshops, neighbourhood walks and the Get Involved Kingston platform.

Councillor Neill commented that Victoria Park does have heritage value and that this should be considered while developing the plan for intensification in the area.

Councillor Neill resumed the role of Chair.

The Chair afforded the public an opportunity to speak.

Ms. Sharkey, 28 Hill Street, spoke on behalf of the Sydenham District Association to express their recognition of good policy strategies to increase density in the study area including the eight-bedroom limit, a specified maximum dimension for buildings rather than floor area ratio for low density areas, the limited intensification zones along Johnson and Brock Streets and the changes proposed to Collingwood and Union Streets. She indicated that the Association is not supportive of the maximum 18 metre building depth, the height of the roofs, the proposal to disregard the urban development guidelines which are helpful, and the regulations for new Sydenham Heritage District zone. She asked that Council consider an interim by-law to halt development until the

new zoning by-law goes into effect to avoid the continued out-of-character development that continues in these areas.

Ms. Schmolka, 702 Newmarket Lane, stated she was glad that the policy is only being received, not approved at this point. She noted a need for community meetings in the various neighbourhoods to give residents a chance to become informed between now and November. She asked whether with the publication of this report that developers will rush to have applications approved prior to these regulations taking effect. She asked what the term green lighting means. She sought clarification on the setbacks on Brock and Johnson Streets and whether they are right at the sidewalk. She asked why the intensification area on Portsmouth Avenue doesn't go from King Street to Johnson Street and why there is a gap. She asked how secondary suites fit in with the regulations on lot coverage. She asked if the City infrastructure in these areas can sustain intensification and what capacity studies are being done to demonstrate this. She referenced the presentation slides regarding shadowing and noted that the sun is important in the winter months and the amount of shadowing expected for the lot at Bath Road and Sir John A Macdonald Boulevard should be considered significant.

Mike Keene, Fotenn Consultants, 4 Cataraqui Street, spoke on behalf of Student Village Housing, and asked staff to reconsider including the land along Brock and University Streets in the intensification area. He noted in staff's presentation that an OP amendment application is scheduled to appear before the Committee this fall prior to the recommendations in the report being approved and requested clarification on the approval process and timelines suggested by staff.

Mr. Gventer, 93 Hillcrest Avenue, expressed concern with how fast neighbourhoods are changing stating that buyers are willing to pay cash for housing and small apartments are rented for \$2,000 a month. He stated that staff will need to act quickly to implement these recommendations before the situation is irreversibly changed. He spoke specifically to the changes seen in the Kingscourt area and the incompatibility of some of the housing being approved for the neighbourhood. He stated that there will be no affordable housing remaining in the area if the changes continue and that Kingscourt should be turned into a heritage district area to protect it.

Mr. Grenville, 24 Jenkins Street, expressed that he still had some confusion over the purpose of the meeting and stated that continued consultation with the affected neighbourhoods is required. He stated that he has been on the working group for the Central Kingston Growth Strategy and expressed concern that the public were only given a week to review a 300-page document with significant changes to the recommendations as this was the first time he had seen the report. He agreed that

neighbourhood forums need to be formed and that staff should provide real-life examples as to how the policy solves the issues that have developed from past planning decisions.

Mr. Gordon, 67 Gibson Avenue, conducted a PowerPoint presentation to the history of zoning by-laws in Kingston and the difficulty these policies have created in the current zoning approach. He specifically spoke to the recommendations for the Sydenham Heritage District indicating that apartment buildings should not be permitted. He also spoke in favour of an interim control by-law to regulate development until the policy can be implemented.

Mr. Mitchell, 32 Gibson Avenue, spoke on behalf of the Sydenham District Association confirming that they don't support the 18-metre principal building depth and suggested eliminating the floor space index altogether as it doesn't support the eight-bedroom limit that has recently been adopted. He expressed concern with the recommendations for the heritage district zone as it does not protect the character of the area even if it meets the objectives. He spoke specifically about Lily Lane and the use of the buildings as residential. He stated that preserving low-rise areas without allowing fair density increase is land-hoarding or character-hoarding and cities are beginning to realize this is causing the affordability issue.

Mr. Martin, 961 Linwood Drive, asked staff to stipulate where intensification should occur, what are the most important factors for determining this, and whether there is infrastructure in place for this intensification. He asked if the recommendations are financially feasible for developers. He asked if public meetings could be set up in each of the Councillor's districts to explain the recommendations and receive feedback on the policy given the limited number of public members participating in the current meeting.

Ms. Agarwal provided additional information regarding the proposed roofing height restrictions, the urban design guidelines and the regulations for the heritage district area. She explained the green lighting process, provided information on the setbacks for Johnson and Brock Streets and clarified the intensification areas along Portsmouth Avenue. She indicated why the intensification area was reduced around Queen's University campus. She reviewed the process for the OP amendment and the timelines for staff recommendations on the Growth Strategy. She addressed the concerns regarding the Kingscourt area noting that staff have given Kingscourt its own zone to better reflect what is existing in the area. Ms. Agarwal spoke to the calculation on building depth versus floor space in relation to standard lot sizes. She provided more information regarding Lily Lane with respect to limiting additional units. She provided the

definition of an apartment building and indicated that additional public consultation options will be explored by staff.

Ms. Agnew provided the determining factors for the proposed intensification areas and spoke to a services study that has been conducted to better understand the infrastructure capacity and determine the required upgrades for new growth.

In response to Councillor Kiley, Ms. Agarwal clarified the typical building size based on the building depth calculations for a standard lot would be approximately 3,800 square feet for all 3 floors in the A-zone.

Councillor Osanic asked staff to indicate which development projects would have been impacted by these policy changes. Mr. Szilagyi noted he did not have specific examples to speak to at this time but staff have been aware of the requested information and are in the early stages of seeing how the proposed policy changes will be implemented and how they would apply to real life examples.

Councillor Hutchison asked why the 3800 square feet was chosen as a maximum building size. Mr. Szilagyi noted that the 18-metre building depth was recommended through the consultants based on industry standards and examples in other cities, but should there be concern with this number, it can be reviewed and adjusted.

Ms. Agnew added that the consultants analyzed the current built form of the area as well as looking at other cities and confirmed that if the size is determined to be too generous that it can be revised.

In response to Councillor Hutchison, Ms. Agnew stated that staff does not know the average house size in the Sydenham district ward off hand but could provide this to the Councillor at a later time. Ms. Agawal confirmed that this building depth maximum is being proposed for the low-density areas including detached, semi-detached and row housing, not apartment buildings, except for the Sydenham heritage district.

The Chair was passed to Councillor Kiley.

Councillor Neill asked whether staff are proposing a specific bedroom limit for the development on lower Beverley Street as mentioned by Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Park spoke to the applications on Beverley Street noting that regulations for bedroom counts were not in place at the time of approval. He added that the unit count was limited to 3 units.

Ms. Agnew briefly spoke to a chart showing the Gross Floor Area by Neighbourhood.

Councillor Neill resumed the role of the Chair.

Councillor Hutchison asked how the report addresses the concern expressed by the public with respect to eliminating apartment buildings as of right in the Sydenham district. Ms. Agnew spoke to the definition of apartment under the proposed new zoning by-law and the contemplation of the varied size of apartment buildings. She noted that staff can take the comment back to review moving forward. She confirmed that apartment buildings currently exist as a permitted use in the new zoning by-law within the Sydenham district.

The Chair was passed to Councillor Kiley.

In response to Councillor Neill, Ms. Agnew provided additional information regarding interim control by-laws and the challenges the City may face with trying to implement one for the Central Growth Strategy given the size of the study area. She indicated that more information would be required from Council regarding what limitations would be desirable.

Councillor Neill resumed the role of Chair.

Moved by Councillor Kiley  
Seconded by Councillor Hill

**That** the Planning Committee recommends to Council:

**That** the Central Kingston Growth Strategy Final Recommendations Report, dated July 2021, the Servicing and Infrastructure Assumptions, and the Transportation Review of Intensification Areas (Exhibits A, B, and C to Report Number PC-21-052) be received.

**Carried**

### **Motions**

There were none.

### **Notices of Motion**

There were none.

### **Other Business**

There was none.



**Correspondence**

There was none.

**Date and time of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Planning Committee is scheduled on Thursday, September 2, 2021.

**Adjournment**

Moved by Councillor Hutchison

Seconded by Councillor Osanic

**That** the meeting of the Planning Committee adjourn at 8:36 p.m.

**Carried**