City of Kingston
Planning Committee
Meeting Number 05-2024
Addendum

Thursday, February 15, 2024 at 6:00 p.m.
Hosted at City Hall in Council Chamber

---

11. Correspondence

a) Correspondence received regarding the Proposed Housing and Administrative Amendments Report (File Number D01-002-2024), dated February 14, 2024.

Schedule Pages 1 – 3

b) Correspondence received regarding the Proposed Housing and Administrative Amendments Report (File Number D01-002-2024), dated February 15, 2024.

Scheduled Page 4

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

Feb. 14, 2024

Ms. Laura Flaherty
Planning Services
City of Kingston
216 Ontario Street
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

Re: Report PC-24-018, Planning Committee: 'Community Meeting Report – Proposed Housing and Administrative Amendments'

Dear Laura,

The Frontenac Heritage Foundation is a not-for-profit charitable organization dedicated to the preservation of structures and sites of cultural and historical interest across the Kingston region. Founded in 1972, the Foundation has provided input on many proposals and development applications over time.

Digesting a staff report of 534 pages in just a few days is a monumental task, and this is a report which fundamentally changes the City's Official Plan, and provides a plethora of administrative amendments to the new Zoning By-law dating from early 2023. Changes to the Official Plan are being made to keep the money flowing from the upper tiers of government. It reminds one of days long past when the Province would write a zoning by-law for a municipality – maybe the Province would like to take those tasks back again instead of leaving municipalities using scarce staff resources to keep re-shaping their planning documents to suit the ever-changing policy regime.

Exhibit A No. 1 and Exhibit B: The fundamental shift in terminology from density ranges to the use of low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise tells a reader simply that density ranges don't matter, with the apparent assumption that the more density, the better. There is a great deal of skepticism in the community, that should any developer come forward with an amendment for greater height, for example mid-rise to high-rise (with NO upper limit set) it will be happily accommodated by the current City Council.

The removal of all references to the term 'stable' is concerning. The term 'stable' in our view, never meant 'static' or 'permanent'. The many OP policies being deleted are now being replaced by policies requiring that new development will be required to be

compatible, and those of us in the community who have argued this matter in Tribunal hearings know how flexible those parameters are (and therefore fairly useless). In particular, the removal of the term ‘stable’ in the context of the Old Sydenham Heritage Conservation District is a particular concern, where about 550 buildings are heritage protected, and where densities are already fairly high (in a low-rise building context).

Exhibit A, No. 6 Zoning By-law Amendments, ii) The Foundation does not support the change from 8 to 12 bedrooms but do appreciate that most of the performance standards are being kept.

Exhibit C – With all the proposed amendments, this is effectively an entirely new zoning by-law for the City of Kingston.

S. 3.8.14, P. 201 A mobile home is included in the definition of house. Does this mean that a mobile home can be used as an additional residential unit on a property?

Table 5.8.2, P. 227– Express Transit Area Performance Standards includes “To be determined through a minor variance application”. This sounds like conditional zoning – what is the legislative authority for setting these conditions of approval?

Clause 13.2.4 refers to a heritage building, and a heritage lot. This seems to ignore the fact that designation under the OHA designates the entire lot, including the building. Could this perhaps be stated in a less convoluted fashion?

Exhibit E - P. 490 **–** For the many clauses added to the Zoning By-law, is it possible to include a civic address so one does not need to go to a map to see where the zone is, and in the cases where zoning is approved via an OLT hearing, the number of the file, so that people in the future who want to understand the background on a specific development proposal, are more easily able to do so?

Exhibit G Comments

P. 519 – In terms of the consolidation of UR Zones, we would express concern on behalf of a lot of residents who took the time to understand the Zoning By-law process barely a year ago, and now the zones are being consolidated.

P. 520-1 – This is a **very** large area that is being up-zoned, and the Foundation expresses the concern that this process is not adequate in terms of giving proper notice to the landowners in the area.

P. 522 – This clause appears to rezone a property (Providence Manor) for an adaptive re-use. While the proposal before the city may well be worthwhile, this appears to be a shortcut to approval. Some of these changes in this staff report are not administrative but seem to be intended to forego the regular process of approval.

P. 526 – Reference is made to a new D3 Schedule. Why has this schedule not been included?

Exhibit A No. 25 (p. 15): With respect to the Downtown and Harbour Area, we note with concern the following proposed changes:

P. 526-7 - New Schedule G which applies a "Non-Residential Conversion Overlay covers the area on both sides of Princess Street extending from Division St. to Lake Ontario. There have been longstanding Official Plan policies encouraging residential development on upper storeys of commercial buildings, so it is not clear why this new Schedule G is needed. This entire area is shown as the Lower Princess Street Heritage Character Area where many properties are either listed, designated or worthy of designation. As noted in the text, heritage approval is indeed necessary.

P. 527-8 - Piecemeal changes to Schedule DH-3 setting out longstanding ground floor commercial requirements. It is not clear why this is being undertaken. In previous times, such changes would have required a detailed study of commercial needs in the historic core.

No doubt there are a multitude of changes which have been missed in this cursory review. Given the short period of time to review and comment on this large package, I cannot say that I speak on behalf of the FHF board because there has simply NOT been sufficient time for us to review the proposed changes and have them reviewed by the rest of the FHF board.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this proposal. Should you wish to discuss these comments, I would be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,

Shirley Bailey, President
Frontenac Heritage Foundation

cc. Planning Committee Members

3

OP & ZB Housing and Administration policy rewrite

Donald Mitchell [redacted]

Thu 2/15/2024 1:11 PM

To:Glenn,Conny <cglenn@cityofkingston.ca>;O'Connor,Christine <cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca>
Cc:Osanic,Lisa <losanic@cityofkingston.ca>;McLaren,Jeff <jmclaren@cityofkingston.ca>;Oosterhof,Gary <goosterhof@cityofkingston.ca>;Cinanni,Vincent <vcinanni@cityofkingston.ca>;Chaves,Paul <pchaves@cityofkingston.ca>

Dear Planning Committee:

In advance of sending City Staff more detailed feedback, I would like to request committee members are mindful of three aspects tonight regarding the public meeting for the subject file.

I'm hopeful committee members look beyond the "ink" to address the "blank" page of *community* building. What are the aspects that are missing that will support and ease the impacts of many of these changes? Keeping in mind that many of these changes are about to make as-of-right what residents have been raising as concerns in their feedback over the past decade or longer when engaging development applications. Where is the comprehensive vision that will sustain exponential population growth in core areas?

Please ensure that a more authentic effort is made by the City to prioritize the public becoming aware and understanding of how these changes will affect their lives/homes.

Barrier free: Aging in place with access to housing and the fullest of amenities & open space in reasonable distance within low-rise areas. Please ensure we don't deliver a predominantly ableist form and function in our city.

Thanks for your time and consideration of these thoughts. I'm unable to make the meeting, as are others, but I recognize this is really important and impactful change.

Cheers, Don.

Donald Mitchell, resident [redacted]