



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

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

Business

a) Central Kingston Growth Strategy Final Recommendations Report

The consent of the Committee is requested for the **amendment** of Business Item a).

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**.

Correspondence

- a) Correspondence received regarding the Central Kingston Growth Strategy Final Recommendations Report, dated between July 20 and August 12, 2021.

From: Donald Mitchell
Sent: July 20, 2021 5:57 PM
To: Szilagyi, Mike; Agarwal, Sukriti
Subject: RE: CKGS - Materials from today's presentation

Thank you for the opportunity Mike & Sukriti. I appreciated attending as the former MAAC rep. It was my intention to provide some written thoughts regarding Accessibility (barrier free) considerations. I'll send that along as able but it is unlikely to meaningfully change your project. It seems very scaled down than when I first engaged.

Two quick examples that came to mind from comments of others today—

Sir John A intensification area at 6 & 6 storeys should consider appropriate degree of fronting on Sir John A where the known traffic speeding issues would (arguably) be assisted or improved by intentional pedestrian activity and the presence of people in what is poorly designed as a driving centric realm of another era of planning. Further, if development picked up the deficiency of sidewalk infrastructure on the eastern side and clarified the various crossings then there is case to be made that persons of disability would be advantaged by such enhancements and the general safety of the area would improve in many ways.

Semi-detached with common wall on the lengthwise property line could provision better vehicular function and people pathways of travel (segregated and dimensionally appropriate) which could advantage persons of disability in low-rise form. However, much of what we are seeing at PC or CoA are largely able-bodied rentals catering to one demographic. Fronted on a primary street with at-grade entrance and good site plan might make accessible modification economic and practical.

Any other comments if thought worthwhile I'll send along later. Thanks again. Cheers Don.

From: Joy Morning

Sent: August 11, 2021 9:37 PM

To: Stroud, Peter <pstroud@cityofkingston.ca>

Cc: Neill, Jim <jneill@cityofkingston.ca>; Fawcett, Elizabeth <EFAWCETT@cityofkingston.ca>;

Paterson, Bryan <bpaterson@cityofkingston.ca>

Subject: Sydenham/Williamsville/Kingston Central Growth

17 months of construction at 58 Elm and 233 Colborne Streets shows the need for revising current by-laws, infrastructure and community analyses, oversight and on-going inspection.

1. The current project is not that proposed by Varsity Properties, the original applicant who did not start construction, but years later sold it. As no further community notification of a revised, larger and altered styled project was issued, it would seem that the city did not require one.
2. It is questionable if any infrastructure analysis occurred. Elm is one of the narrowest residential streets in the city. Many of the houses sit one to three feet from the sidewalk. All heavy equipment and vehicles had to use Elm and not the wider Colborne road. The building at 68 Elm had to be dug up more than once when the infrastructure would not support such a massive project. For 17 months, dirt and diesel fumes have polluted the air as large earth-moving machines and over-sized construction trucks, machines and caterpillar vehicles have blocked driveways, overrun small front lawns, chipped and cracked the sidewalks on both sides of the road, extending far beyond the actual site of the flats. The road in front of 51 and 49 Elm has been depressed downward with the constant heavy equipment. That portion of the road was softened in the spring of 2015 during repair to the water and sewage mains joining to clay pipes under the sidewalk. The city has yet to repair that patch of road as promised.
3. Fairway Properties should be required to repair all the road and sidewalk damage caused by its project, not just the portion in front of the flats.

I suggest a moratorium on future massive projects on similar narrow residential streets in the city. I appreciate your attention to this matter and look for a reply soon.



PO BOX 27, Kingston,
Ontario, Canada K7L4V6
+1 343-363-1901

August 9, 2021

via email

Councillor Jim Neill, Chair
Planning Committee
City of Kingston
216 Ontario Street
Kingston, ON K7L2Z3

Re: Central Kingston Growth Strategy – PC-21-052

Dear Councillor Neill:

The FHF has monitored the progress of this study since 2018. The Foundation provided comments in July 2020, and received responses from staff. We have three major concerns, first, related to timing of this report, the second being a procedural one, in terms of the wording of the staff recommendation and some of the elements of the proposed changes, and the third one, in terms of the heritage considerations which are referenced in Exhibit D to the WSP report, entitled Urban Design Guidelines.

1. Timing

The staff report involves 303 pages and includes a great deal of information for anyone to analyze between Friday before the Planning Committee meeting to the following Thursday, August 12. To add to this, the report comes forward during the summertime when many people are out of town.

2. Staff Recommendation

The staff report recommendation states: *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 approved.*

Exhibit A is the main WSP report, p. 15 to 253 of the package which includes the Urban Design Guidelines; Exhibit B, Assumptions for the Servicing and Infrastructure Assessment, p. 253 to 257; Exhibit C, Transportation Review of Intensification Areas, p. 258 - 276. What exactly is Planning Committee being asked to approve?

Exhibit A, Policy Recommendations, includes two major components, Official Plan recommendations, and Zoning by-law proposals. The Near Campus Neighbourhoods will have a section of the Official Plan to deal with development, a new S. 10G. (included as Appendix C). It would appear from p. 5, last para.) of the staff report, this will proceed via an OPA in the fall of 2021. Does a Committee/Council approval endorse these recommendations without a broader public consultation? This is unclear.

Also, page 5 of the staff report indicates that WSP prepared a Strategic Directions report, which does not appear in the report's Table of Contents. Elsewhere it is noted that such amendments (to Section 2 of the OP) will be processed during the next OP Update. This should be clarified for the Committee.

The Foundation has two areas of concern with respect to the proposed intensification sites. The first relates to the proposal for 6-storey structures adjacent to Victoria Park. There have been discussions about designating this park under the Ontario Heritage Act, as the park opened in 1892. The Committee will recall that the City recently installed the first piece of public art in 40 years there. Placing 6-storey buildings on the east and west sides of this park would without question reduce the open space appeal of this area. If one looks at the 4-storey development at MacDonnell and Johnson Streets, this built form is compatible with the surrounding residences. In our view, 6 storey development is not appropriate near Victoria Park.

The second concern relates to the Bath Road sites. Proposing redevelopment of the YMCA site on Bath Road (across the street from the Kingston Centre) along with two nearby churches is not in the public interest, in our view. The YMCA is one of the important amenities that draw people to this geographic node. Assigning density to church sites is also questionable.

The second main component of Exhibit A involves recommendations for the new Zoning By-law. As the second draft of the zoning by-law was released last week for public consultation through to early November, it appears that Planning Committee is being asked to support the inclusion of these provisions for further public consultation. An outright approval by the Committee is premature in our view.

As for Exhibits B and C, it is unclear what an approval by Committee or Council means, nor is the staff report clear on this matter. The staff report seems to indicate that these memos provide interim information at best.

3. Central Kingston Neighbourhoods Urban Design Guidelines, (Appendix D of Exhibit A, p. 171 – 252), is included in the main WSP report, so clearly these guidelines are included in the recommendation to the Planning Committee.

We recognize that the form of public engagement has been varied, with a reliance on receiving input on an ongoing basis from a community working group. From the report, there appears not to have been any consultation with the Heritage Kingston Committee, and this is an important step in the process, especially since there are many heritage considerations noted for the Sydenham Heritage District, and for other neighbourhoods in the study area.

Further, this set of Urban Design Guidelines has not been released for review to the general public to our knowledge. Given the complexity of the Guidelines and its relation to provisions of the draft zoning by-law, this should be done.

A third concern is that there are two existing sets of Urban Design Guidelines currently referenced in the City's Official Plan, which apply to the study area. See S. 8.2 of the Official Plan which refers to Design Guidelines for New Communities, and S. 8.3 which refers to Design Guidelines for Residential Lots. There is likely to be much overlap between these documents, particularly the Guidelines referenced in S. 8.3 of the Official Plan. Has this been reviewed?


The staff report states that the urban design guidelines will be further reviewed in the context of the next Official Plan review, which is not scheduled for several years. Therefore, what status does a Committee/Council approval give this document?

In summary, this major work being undertaken by the City is deserving of more consideration by Planning Committee, in our view. At the least, the recommendation before Committee should be clarified to indicate that the approval is subject to a number of future actions by the City, all of which will require further public consultation.

A number of our board members are not available this week to present these comments via zoom, but we do hope that the Committee members and staff will consider these comments.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the CKGS proposals.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shirley Bailey".

Shirley Bailey, President
Frontenac Heritage Foundation

cc. Planning Committee members and staff

Final Recommendations Report removed much of these lands within the proposed intensification area, leaving only those properties with frontage on the north side of Brock Street and the north and south sides of Johnson Street. The proposed intensification area no longer includes properties with frontage along University Avenue south of the intersection between Brock Street and University Avenue, or within the area of Aberdeen Street, Division Street, Williams Street, or Barrie Street southern of Johnson Street.

The Final Recommendations Report states these lands were removed from the proposed intensification area because of the need for further review, emanating from servicing constraints in the area, as well as the need for a market feasibility assessment of purpose-built rental apartments, which will be undertaken in the context of the next Official Plan update in 2023. These are not satisfactory reasons for excluding these lands. The change to the boundary of the intensification area significantly reduces the number of properties, appropriately located within the central area of the City, to accommodate intensification and additional residential density and building height. The City previously provided strong rationale in the Strategic Direction Report for including the Campus Expansion Area and properties along the southern portion of Brock Street within the Johnson and Brock Corridor Area. These properties and the boundary of the corridor area should be altered to match that which was shared in the Strategic Directions Report.

The Final Recommendations Report aims to implement intensification area policies via an Official Plan Amendment that will be initiated in Fall of 2021. The Official Plan Amendment will include a new Special Area Policy for the intensification areas. Within the Johnson and Brock Corridor, building heights are planned to be between four and six storeys. The target density for the area is 130 dwelling units per hectare. The height and density policies in the Final Recommendations Report for the Johnson and Brock intensification area are consistent with the recommendations in the Strategic Directions Report. As such, we do not have any concerns with the proposed level of intensification recommended in the Report, however we do recommend that the boundary of the intensification area be altered to match that in the Strategic Directions Report to ensure that the growth and residential units previously planned for are realized.

Finally, we would like to note that the public has been given little chance to review this document prior to its presentation to Planning Committee. Releasing the Final Recommendations Report five days prior to its presentation does not provide the public sufficient time to review the substantial changes in detail or to provide thorough comments. Based on the current state of the Report, along with the proposed policy recommendations to be implemented through future Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments, we anticipate appeals occurring.

Summary

On our client's behalf, we request that:

1. The Johnson and Brock Corridor Area identified in the Central Kingston Growth Strategy Final Recommendations Report include the Campus Expansion Area and southern portions of Brock Street, aligning with the previously outlined intensification area in the Strategic Directions Report.

We would be pleased to meet with City staff to further discuss our comments. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at 613.542.5454 x 221 or keene@fotenn.com. We also ask to be notified of status updates related to the Central Kingston Growth Strategy.

Respectfully submitted,



Mike Keene, MCIP RPP
Principal, Planning + Development
Fotenn Planning + Design