



**City of Kingston
Report to Planning Committee
Report Number PC-24-010**

To: Chair and Members of the Planning Committee
From: Paige Agnew, Commissioner, Growth & Development
Resource Staff: Tim Park, Director, Planning Services
Date of Meeting: December 7, 2023
Subject: Recommendation Report
File Number: D35-004-2022
Address: 2312 Princess Street
District: District 2 - Loyalist-Cataraqui
Application Type: Official Plan & Zoning By-Law Amendment
Owner: 976653 Ontario Inc.
Applicant: Patry Inc.

Council Strategic Plan Alignment:

Theme: 1. Support Housing Affordability

Goal: 1.1 Promote increased supply and affordability of housing.

Executive Summary:

The following is a report recommending approval to the Planning Committee regarding applications for Official Plan and zoning by-law amendments submitted by Patry Inc., on behalf of 976653 Ontario Inc., with respect to the subject site located at 2312 Princess Street.

The applicant is proposing to construct a new six-storey, mid-rise, apartment building containing 300 homes together with the interior conversion of an existing two-storey heritage building to accommodate a building containing three homes and 12 bedrooms. The proposed apartment building would be situated 30 metres from the heritage building while maintaining an approximate 12.5 metre setback from the north lot line. The apartment building would have a three-storey base

December 7, 2023

Page 2 of 33

while utilizing step-backs in building height along the building's northern wall at the fourth and fifth storeys to mitigate impacts on the residential area to the north while a similar step-back is used along the south wall opposite the heritage building to minimize the impact on that heritage feature.

Vehicle access to the proposed development is intended to be primarily by way of Andersen Drive while a reconfigured entrance off Princess Street would provide an additional opportunity for a 'right-in-only' turning movement into the site. The Princess Street entrance is proposed to be relocated from its current location, which flanks the property line and abuts the driveway for the neighbouring property, to a location further west and enhanced by way of a pedestrian walkway.

The lands are designated primarily as 'Arterial Commercial' with a portion at the north end of the site designated 'Residential' as set out in the Cataraqui North Neighbourhood Secondary Plan within the City of Kingston Official Plan. The site is also located within the Cataraqui Village Heritage Character Area as identified on Schedule 9 of the Official Plan. No exterior change to the heritage building is being proposed; however, the proposal does seek to allow for its conversion to a single detached house.

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the City's Official Plan to change the portions of the property which are currently designated Arterial Commercial to Residential along with a site-specific policy to allow for the increased density of the apartment building while allowing a reduced density to facilitate a possible future severance of the lands which accommodate the heritage building. The applicant is also requesting an amendment to the Zoning By-Law which would re-zone the subject lands to a combination of the Urban Multi-Residential 2 (URM2) Zone, for the area associated with the proposed apartment building; and, the Urban Residential 3 (UR3.B) Zone, for the area associated with the heritage building, each with an Exception Overlay to recognize specific characteristics of the proposed development.

The proposed mid-rise development represents the efficient use of an under-utilized parcel of serviced land located on the City's primary intensification corridor which hosts both express and regular transit service and extensive local amenities which provide opportunities for active transportation. The proposed development will add to the mix and affordability of housing options within the Cataraqui North Secondary Plan community. The design of the proposed building and site has been refined over the course of the technical review to address concerns regarding the compatibility of the development with adjacent residential uses and the issues of safety and driveway function in respect to the access along Princess Street. The proposed development represents good land use planning.

Recommendation:

That the Planning Committee recommends to Council:

That the applications for Official Plan and zoning by-law amendments (File Number D35-004-2022) submitted by Patry Inc., on behalf of 976653 Ontario Inc., for the property municipally known as 2312 Princess Street, be approved; and

December 7, 2023

Page 3 of 33

That the City of Kingston Official Plan, as amended, be further amended, Amendment Number 88, as per Exhibit A, (Draft By-Law and Schedule A to Amend the Official Plan) to Report Number PC-24-010; and

That Kingston Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62, as amended, be further amended, as per Exhibit B (Draft By-Law and Schedule A and B to Amend Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62) to Report Number PC-24-010; and

That Council determines that in accordance with Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*, no further notice is required prior to the passage of the by-law; and

That the amending by-law be presented to Council for all three readings.

December 7, 2023

Page 4 of 33

Authorizing Signatures:

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY COMMISSIONER

**Paige Agnew, Commissioner,
Growth & Development Services**

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

**Lanie Hurdle, Chief
Administrative Officer**

Consultation with the following Members of the Corporate Management Team:

Jennifer Campbell, Commissioner, Community Services	Not required
Neil Carbone, Commissioner, Corporate Services	Not required
David Fell, President & CEO, Utilities Kingston	Not required
Peter Huigenbos, Commissioner, Major Projects & Strategic Priorities	Not required
Brad Joyce, Commissioner, Infrastructure, Transportation & Emergency Services	Not required
Desirée Kennedy, Chief Financial Officer & City Treasurer	Not required

December 7, 2023

Page 5 of 33

Options/Discussion:**Statutory Public Meeting**

This recommendation report forms the basis of a statutory public meeting at Planning Committee. Anyone who attends the statutory public meeting may present an oral submission, and/or provide a written submission on the proposed application. Also, any person may make written submissions at any time before City Council makes a decision on the application.

If a person or public body would otherwise have an ability to appeal the decision of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Kingston to the Ontario Land Tribunal but the person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the City of Kingston before the by-law is passed, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision. If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to the City of Kingston before the by-law is passed, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Land Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Planning Committee will consider the recommendations in this report and make its recommendation to City Council at this meeting.

Anyone wishing to be notified of Council's decision on the subject application must submit a written request to:

Ian Clendening, Senior Planner
The Corporation of the City of Kingston
Planning Services
216 Ontario Street
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3126
iclendening@cityofkingston.ca

Background and Decision Date

In accordance with By-Law Number 2007-43, these applications were subject to a pre-application meeting held on October 26, 2021, with Planning Services and various other departments and agencies. Following this, a complete application submission was made by the applicant on March 25, 2022.

In accordance with the *Planning Act*, this application is subject to a decision by Council on or before July 23, 2022, which is 120 days after a complete application was received. In the absence of a decision by Council in this timeframe, the applicant may exercise their right to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). Staff have been working with the applicant to address concerns and technical issues related to access to the site and traffic safety as well as the massing and impact associated with the proposed built form on the abutting residential area.

December 7, 2023

Page 6 of 33

Site Characteristics

The subject property is situated at the northeast corner of Princess Street and Andersen Drive, roughly 340 metres west of Sydenham Road. The property is an irregularly shaped lot, widening out towards the rear, measuring 1.45 hectare in size and having approximately 147 metres of frontage along Andersen Drive to the west and 55 metres of frontage along Princess Street to the south. The site is currently developed with a two-storey building at the southwest corner of the lot which is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and was, up until recently, occupied by the Lakeshore School.

The surrounding area contains a variety of commercial, institutional, open space, and residential land uses (Exhibit D – Neighbourhood Context Map). To the east and west of the subject lands are a range of highway commercial uses of various scales. Immediately south of the property, on the opposite side of Princess Street, the predominant land use consists of additional highway commercial development and institutional uses before transitioning to one and two storey single detached residential further south. Abutting the site to the north, the land use consists of semi-detached houses having walk-out basements which accommodate the grade change between Ellesmeer Avenue and the subject lands. Further north of the site there exists an addition of a variety homes which can be found in the form of single-detached homes and townhouses.

The site is located within walking distance of various amenities, including FreshCo, the Kingston Gospel Temple, Quarry Chiropractic and Wellness Centre, Rona Home & Garden Centre and is situated along an express transit route (501/502) which connects Downtown with Cataraqui Centre as well as regular transit service in the form of the number 7 and number 14 bus routes which run adjacent to the property along its Princess Street and Anderson Drive frontage respectively. Sidewalks flank the north and south sides of Princess Street as well as the west side of Andersen Drive. Currently there are no dedicated cycling facilities in this area; however, this section of Princess Street has been identified as a 'Proposed Spine Route' under the City's Active Transportation Master Plan.

The surrounding area is one which has seen relatively recent development, with both of the residential areas north and south of the subject lands having been developed in the early 2000's along with a number of commercial developments along this section of Princess Street since that time. Additionally, a five-storey apartment building containing 230 residential homes is currently under construction approximately 100 metres east of the subject property at 2274 Princess Street.

Proposed Application and Submission

The applicant is proposing to construct a six-storey apartment building and convert the existing heritage designated building located on the property, which until recently accommodated an educational institution, to a single detached house. The proposed apartment building would accommodate a total of 300 homes consisting of a variety of 48 studios, 150 one-bedroom, 48 one-bedroom with dens, and 54 two-bedroom configurations. The heritage building would be converted to a single detached dwelling and accommodate a total of 12 bedrooms within three

December 7, 2023

Page 7 of 33

homes. Access to the site is proposed to be by way of Andersen Drive and Princess Street with the access from Princess Street limited to that of a 'right-in-only' access point.

Based on the total number of homes within the proposed apartment building and single detached dwelling and the lot area of 1.45 hectares, the proposed density is 209 homes per hectare. Taken individually, the apartment building would have a density of the approximately 264 home per hectare across the 1.14-hectare site while the heritage building would have a density of ten home per hectare.

The proposed apartment building would be setback 12.47 metres from the north lot line and 5.5 metres from the west lot line along Anderson Drive and 30 metres from the heritage designated building. The apartment building is characterised using step-backs along the north and south building faces and a recessed building envelope in the mid-section of the building along the north lot line which serves to create an 'inner courtyard' area. Outdoor amenity space for the residents is proposed in the inner courtyard, an outdoor area at the northeastern portion of the subject lands, and within the building through the provision of balconies and rooftop terraces. A common indoor amenity area measuring 285 square metres is proposed for a total of 4,585 square metres of combined amenity space and green space.

The applicant proposes to recess the building face along the north lot line an additional 1.2 metres at the fourth storey and a further 5.6 metres at the fifth storey resulting in the maximum height of the building at the sixth storey level of 20.7 metres being setback 19.2 metres. On southern face, the building steps back at the fourth floor four metres. These measures have been taken in large part to soften the impact on the abutting residential properties to the north, and to respect the heritage attributes of the site.

Parking for the apartment building is proposed to be in the form of a combination of surface and underground parking with a total of 282 parking spaces. An overall ratio of 0.9 stalls per home is achieved through the provision a two-level underground garage accommodating 238 spaces, and surface parking which accommodates an additional 23 parking stalls including eight accessible stalls. In addition to resident parking, the surface parking also accommodates five visitor spaces and three car-share spaces. For bicycle parking, 275 long-term spaces and 30 short-term spaces are provided.

In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following:

- Planning Rationale and Justification Report
- Concept Site Plan
- Floor Plans
- Heritage Impact Statement
- Shadow Study

December 7, 2023

Page 8 of 33

- Tree Inventory & Preservation Plan
- Traffic Impact Study
- Noise Impact Study
- Landscape Concept
- Servicing Report
- Storm Water Management Report
- Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment

All submission materials are available online through the Development and Services Hub (DASH) at the following link, [DASH](#), using “Look-up a Specific Address”. If there are multiple addresses, search one address at a time, or submission materials may also be found by searching the file number.

Summary of Changes to Applications from First to Submission

Through revisions to the initial submission, the applicant has made a number of modifications to address the concerns raised. These changes include the base of the apartment building being moved an additional 2.5 metres south, away from the north lot line, while a specific provision has been added into the amending by-law which excludes a driveway in this location. The fourth storey of the apartment has been moved back 0.7 metres, while the fifth storey has been moved 3.2 metres south where it is now in line with the sixth storey with both the fifth and sixth storeys now only having a marginal projection along the east end. These changes have been made to minimize the extent of shadowing over the abutting properties and the extent of overlook into the rear yards of the neighbouring properties.

In an effort to further address the privacy and overlook concerns of area residents, the applicant has also made changes to the balcony and fifth floor terrace including the removal of all balconies above the third floor along the north wall which are now provided as juliette balconies. On the fifth floor, the roof-top terrace has been broadly reconfigured, coinciding with the reduced fifth and sixth storey floor plate at the east end, and is now defined by a large open area at the east end whereas previously it had been a narrow strip along the north end. Of additional note, a garden feature is proposed to create an additional visual barrier between the terrace area and the lands further north.

In respect to vehicular access, the driveway entrance at Princess Street has been relocated approximately ten metres west from its current location in an effort to create a more defined entrance to each lot by separating the two abutting driveways which currently span width of 21 metres. The entrance has also been programmed as a ‘right-in-only’ to assist with traffic flow and safety.

December 7, 2023

Page 9 of 33

Within the site, parking has been reconfigured to allow better access to the accessible and visitor stalls while the number of stalls has been reduced from an oversupply of 367 total parking stalls, ten of which were intended for the school use, to 286 parking stalls, three of which are intended for the single detached dwelling. The apartment continues to provide a majority of the parking within an underground parking area, however; since the first submission, the entry has been shifted to where it now provides access along the southernmost building wall whereas previously the entry was generally opposite the driveway entrance off Anderson Drive, near the main pedestrian entryway. Short-term bike parking which is now required under the provisions of Kingston Zoning By-Law but was not required at the time of their submission has been added to the proposal where it is provided near the main building entrance where the underground parking access had previously been situated. Long term bike spaces are also now provided and are situated in three secured bike storage areas located within the underground parking area.

In respect to the heritage building on the property, the applicant now seeks to permit the conversion to a residential use, and allow for the possibility of a future severance by way of Official Plan policy allowing for a lower density than the minimums otherwise required of this area, and zoning relief to allow for a reduced rear yard setback and a total of twelve bedrooms within the single detached house which is to accommodate three homes.

The relationship between the heritage building and the apartment building has been enhanced by way of an additional ten metres of separation distance between the two buildings while the step-back at the third storey has been raised to the fourth storey while the south building wall which faces this heritage feature has been afforded a greater degree of articulation to frame the heritage building.

Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement (2020) provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development, which are intended to be complemented by local policies addressing local interests.

The proposed development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2020). The development will provide additional housing options within the urban settlement area boundary, while supporting intensification and infill within the serviced urban area. Utilities Kingston has confirmed that adequate services exist for the proposed development. Traffic surrounding the site has been appropriately addressed through directing the primary entrance/exit to Anderson Drive while limiting Princess Street to a 'right-in-only' at a new location. The site is in proximity to extensive commercial, employment, recreational, and institutional uses and is serviced by both express and regular transit service helping facilitate the land use patterns encouraged by the Provincial Policy Statement.

No external change is proposed to the heritage building, and the residential use of this cultural heritage resource allows for the conservation through continued use of this built heritage resource consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement with the reduced density, in part, a reflection of the deep setback from Princess Street with mature trees in front and west side

December 7, 2023

Page 10 of 33

yards forming a part of the site's heritage attributes. Consistent with provincial policy with respect to the conservation of cultural heritage resources, the applicant has submitted a Heritage Impact Statement demonstrating that the that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved as a result of the proposed development noting that the design of the building will create a compatible, unified background for the heritage resource.

The proposed development represents the efficient use of land that and is suitable and desired for residential intensification. A detailed review of the applicable policies is attached in Exhibit E.

Official Plan Considerations

The subject property is predominantly designated Arterial Commercial but with sections in the rear designated as Residential within the Catarauqui North Neighbourhood Secondary Plan in the City of Kingston Official Plan (Exhibit D – Official Plan, Land Use). The site is also located within the Catarauqui Village Heritage Character Area as identified on Schedule 9 of the Official Plan (Exhibit E – Heritage Areas, Features and Protected Views). The subject property is in a Corridor and a Housing District as illustrated in the City Structure set out in Schedule 2 of the Official Plan and is located within the Urban Boundary.

The Official Plan amendment application proposes to change the land use designation of that portion of the subject lands currently designated Arterial Commercial to Residential in the Catarauqui North Secondary Plan of the Official Plan. The application also proposes a site-specific policy to permit a high-density residential use of up to 264 homes per net hectare which would allow the development under both the current lot fabric with 209 homes per hectare while also allowing consideration of a severance of the 1.14-hectare portion of the subject land upon which the apartment building is intended to be built. An additional provision within the site-specific policy would allow for a corresponding reduction in the minimum density requirements by exempting the heritage building from the 14 homes per hectare minimum densities otherwise required withing the Residential designation.

The Residential land use designation of the Catarauqui North Secondary Plan encourages a variety of compatible housing types and building styles to accommodate the different and changing needs of the community. It is the intent of this designation to have varying densities of development distributed throughout the neighbourhood to ensure that a high proportion of residents live within a short walking distance of local facilities and services which this development proposal would help to achieve.

The proposal has evolved to ensure that it meets the land use compatibility policies of the Official Plan. A development's compatibility with its surrounding environment is measured by the degree in which the proposal would create adverse effects or negatively impact the character or planned function of an area. Compatibility concerns include shadowing, the loss of privacy due to intrusive overlook, visual intrusion that disrupts the streetscape, and incompatibility in terms of scale, style, massing and colour with mitigation measures such as setbacks, transition and fencing an appropriate means of maintaining compatibility.

December 7, 2023

Page 11 of 33

To ensure compatibility, the applicant has increased the building setback from the north lot line, including greater step-backs where the three-storey base increases to four, and thereafter six storeys generally achieving a 45-degree angular plane. These features provide a gradual transition in height along Anderson Drive as the site progresses from the more intensive, commercial oriented area near Princess Street and the rear of the property where the three-storey component of the integrates with the two-storey residences.

The enhanced setback measuring 12.47 metres from the north lot line provides an area of open separation between the two uses and which is further enhanced by a vegetated buffer and fencing intended to provide additional transition as well as prevent shadowing and loss of privacy.

Regarding shadowing, the applicant has provided a revised Solar Analysis reflecting the updated plans which increased the setbacks and removed much of the fifth and sixth storey massing from the far east side of the building. As a result of these measures the shadows cast by the development have no impact at all on the abutting northern properties between the spring and fall equinoxes as shadows do not project into the rear yards of these properties (Exhibit J - Renderings & Solar Analysis). During these times of the year outdoor enjoyment of backyard spaces is at its highest where activities such as gardening, barbequing, and other active or passive recreation makes use of these spaces, and the proposed development would not have any shadow impact during these times. Towards the winter solstice when the sun-angle is at its lowest, shadowing begins to traverse across the rear yards to varying degrees but would not have an undue adverse impact.

Outdoor amenity area for the residents has been significantly reconfigured including the removal of balconies above the third storey along the north wall which would face the single-detached residences to the north which have been replaced with Juliette balconies to prevent residents from lingering outside in a manner which could allow for significant overlook into the rear yards of the existing neighbourhood. This is complimented by further efforts to reduce any privacy and overlook concerns by tailoring the fifth-floor terrace to an open area directed eastwards while a garden feature separates the edge of the terrace from the edge of the building.

Staff will work closely with the applicant at the site plan control stage to ensure that all of these requirements are fully implemented.

The development of this site fulfills a number of the other key policies within Section 2 of the Official Plan in terms of the intent of Housing Districts, Corridors, Principles of Growth, Phasing of Growth, Intensification Targets, Order of Development, Urban Boundary, and Protection of Resources. When reviewed in the context of these policies, the subject property is an excellent and priority candidate for high density residential intensification, as an underutilized parcel located on an intensification corridor within the serviced urban boundary and within walking distance of open space, commercial uses, employment and public transit. The proposed development will assist the City in achieving the minimum intensification targets for residential growth.

December 7, 2023

Page 12 of 33

In summary, the proposed re-designation of the front portion of the subject lands from Arterial Commercial to Residential, with a site-specific policy area for the entirety of the subject lands to address an increase in density and to recognize the limitations of the irregularly shaped parcel maintains the overall intent of the Official Plan and allows the site to be development residentially, as intended by the Secondary Plan. The development of the site with the proposed use will add to the mix of housing types and affordability within Cataraqui North, thereby creating a more complete community and additional options for aging in place within the Cataraqui North neighbourhood.

The proposed development and associated Official Plan amendment conform to the general intent of the Official Plan. A detailed review of the applicable Official Plan policies is attached in Exhibit G.

Zoning By-Law Discussion

The property is not currently subject to the Kingston Zoning By-Law, instead being subject to Zoning By-Law Number 76-26 which zones the property General Commercial “C2-30-H” Zone subject to a holding symbol (Exhibit H – Kingston Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62). The C2-30 zone permits a variety of commercial uses with residential uses within this zone being restricted to an accessory dwelling unit located on the ground floor.

An amendment is required to permit the proposed residential use with the lands proposed to be incorporated into the Kingston Zoning By-Law through the proposed amendment which would place the lands within the Urban Multi-Residential Zone 2 (URM2) Zone, for those areas where the apartment building is located; and, the Urban Residential 3.B (UR3.B) Zone, for those areas where the existing heritage building is located. Additionally, an Exception Overlay is proposed to recognize certain characteristics of the irregularly shaped lot and particular features of the proposed development.

The Exception Overlay for the apartment building is intended to allow for an increased building height; a reduced interior and rear setback; allowances for additional balcony area; and, variations to certain parking requirements. Additional provisions to the Exception Overlay have also been added to ensure that the ultimate development of the does not result in unexpected impacts to the surrounding area including a limit on the number of homes; prohibition of a driveway along the north lot line; requirement for a landscaped are along the north lot line.

The following table provides a comparison of the requirements of the zoning by-law for the URM2 zone against the requirements that are proposed to accommodate the development application.

December 7, 2023

Page 13 of 33

Table 1 Zoning Comparison Table URM2 & Proposed Exception Overlay

Zone Provision	By-Law Section	Required (URM2)	Proposed (E139)	Relief Required?
Maximum number of Dwelling Units	Not applicable	Not applicable	300	No
Maximum height (metres)	Table 12.3.1	12.5 metres	20.7 metres	Yes
Minimum Rear Setback	Table 12.3.1	The greater of: a) 7.5 metres b) 25% of lot depth (37.75 metres)	12.47 metres	Yes
Minimum Interior Setback	Table 12.3.1	6.0 metres	3.5 metres	Yes
Maximum % of wall to be occupied by balconies	4.20.1.2	A maximum of 30% of the horizontal length of each face of the main wall of each storey may be occupied by balconies;	Inner Courtyard Faces: West: 29% South: 36% East: 46% Outer Facades: West: 35% North-West: 30% (2nd floor) North-East: 31% (2nd floor) East-North: 30% East-Central: 33% East-South: 32% South-East: 36%	Yes

December 7, 2023

Page 14 of 33

Zone Provision	By-Law Section	Required (URM2)	Proposed (E139)	Relief Required?
Balconies location	Not applicable	Not applicable	Within 15 metres of the rear lot line no balconies other than juliette balconies are permitted above the 3rd floor.	No
Amenity Area Setback	Not applicable	Not applicable	The fifth floor outdoor amenity area must be set back a minimum of 2.0 metres from the buildings north main wall;	No
Planting Strip	Not applicable	Not applicable	A minimum 2.0 metre wide planting strip must be provided along the rear lot line.	No
Privacy Fence	Not applicable	Not applicable	A privacy fence with a minimum height of 2.4 metres must be provided along the rear lot line.	No
Driveway Location	Not applicable	Not applicable	A driveway and a drive aisle may not be located within 12 metres of the rear lot line.	No
Minimum drive aisle width	7.4.1.	Perpendicular Parking: 6.7 metres	6.0 metres	Yes
Car-share Spaces	Table 7.1.1.	0.05 spaces per dwelling unit (15 spaces)	3 spaces	Yes
Visitor Spaces	Table 7.1.1.	0.15 spaces per dwelling unit (45 spaces)	10 spaces	Yes

December 7, 2023

Page 15 of 33

Zone Provision	By-Law Section	Required (URM2)	Proposed (E139)	Relief Required?
Small car parking space	7.4.9.4.	A maximum of 10% of parking spaces provided on a lot, excluding accessible spaces, visitor spaces and car-share spaces, are permitted to be parking spaces for small cars (26 spaces)	50	Yes
Parking Space Design	7.4.10.1	Not applicable	Up to 20 spaces within a parking structure may be partially obstructed on one side by a wall or column	Yes
Parking Provisions for Multi-unit Residential	7.4.9.3	<p>Parking spaces must be located in a permitted private garage, parking structure, driveway or parking lot in the rear yard or interior yard, except as follows:</p> <p>(a) Visitor spaces may be located in the front yard or exterior yard provided the visitor space is not closer than 3.0 metres to any lot line and not closer than 7.5 metres to any street line;</p>	A maximum of 50 parking spaces may be located within a front yard or exterior yard provided no parking space is closer than 9.0 metres to a front lot line and 15 metres from a rear lot line.	Yes

December 7, 2023

Page 16 of 33

Zone Provision	By-Law Section	Required (URM2)	Proposed (E139)	Relief Required?
Location of Loading Spaces	7.5.7.	Loading spaces must be located in the rear yard or in the interior yard and must be provided with a visual screen in such a manner that the loading space is not visible from a street or any abutting residential use	Loading Space may be located in a front yard provided it is not closer than 30 metres to a front lot line or exterior lot line.	Yes
Minimum Number of Long-Term Bike Spaces	Table 7.3.1	0.9 per dwelling unit	0.75 per dwelling unit	Yes
Weather protected Short-term Spaces	7.3.13.5	50% of required	No weather protected Short-term Spaces	Yes

Building Height and Setbacks

The proposed amendments seek to permit a maximum height of 20.7 metres to allow for a six-storey built form over portions of building. A height map is intended to form a part of the by-law to require step-backs at specific distances from the surrounding lot lines to ensure an appropriate transition.

The height map provides for a maximum of six storeys beginning at 56.8 metres distance from the east most lot line and 19.2 metres from the north lot line and progressing across the remainder of the building with the exception of an interior courtyard which measures 31.4 metres width and setback a distance of 31.7 metres from the north lot line, and opposite the heritage building where the sixth storey steps down to four storeys.

As the site transitions to the residential neighbourhood to the north, provisions of the draft by-law would require building step backs which generally maintain a 45-degree angular plane with the base of the building starting at a height of 10.5 metres at a distance of 12.4 metres from the north lot line. This 10.5 metre height at the base of the building is within the maximum height range of 10.7 metres, or 9.0 metres in the case of a flat roof, allowed within the UR3.B zone which regulates the residential neighbourhood immediately north, but with a significantly greater rear setback of 12.4 metres versus 6 metres required of the UR3.B zone.

December 7, 2023

Page 17 of 33

The rear setback of the URM2 zone is determined based on the greater of 7.5 metres or, 25 percent of lot depth. The proposed building exceeds the 7.5 metre requirement; however, the significant depth of this irregularly shaped lot requires a rear setback of 37.75 metres based on the 25 percent of lot depth, and as such the applicant is seeking an amendment to allow for a 12.4 metre setback.

Overall, the proposed development directs outdoor amenity area generally associated with a rear yard towards the western end of the lot and within the building itself. The three-storey height at the base of the building is consistent with the heights allowed in the residential neighbourhood to the north. The generous setback between the proposed apartment building and the north lot line and the manner in which the grade increases in elevation progressing northwards both act to minimize the impact of the built form as the area transitions from higher density apartments to semi-detached residences. The inclusion of a two-metre-wide planting strip would further act to mitigate this transition.

Progressing further away from the north lot line, the building progresses to a fourth and sixth storey at distances of 13.6 metres and 19.2 metres from the north lot line, achieving an angular plane of 47 degrees between the edge of the roof and the north lot line. The applicant has provided a shadow analysis which demonstrates that the shadows do not encroach, or encroach only marginally, between the Spring and Fall Equinox. During the Winter Solstice, and around this date when the Sun's inclination is the lowest, and shadows therefore the longest, it is recognized that the shadows associated with the proposed development would traverse at varying extents across the rear yards of the lots to the north. Outside of the Winter Solstice, these impacts abate as the shadows recede towards that of the Spring and Fall Equinox (Exhibit J – Renderings and Solar Analysis). Overall, the impact is assumed to be limited in time, minor in nature, and compatible under the Official Plan.

Balconies

The Kingston Zoning By-Law regulates the extent of a building wall which may be covered in balconies which project out from the face of the building as a means of affording a greater animation to the façade, limiting the space this feature may occupy to 30%. The applicant has put forward a development proposal which utilizes a number of 'wings' to the building with a total of 12 unique exterior walls which range in balcony coverage ranging between 30 to 36 percent along outer facades and between 29 and 46 percent along the inner courtyard. The additional space occupied by balconies along the building wall allows individual homes to have access to a modest outdoor amenity space measuring approximately 4.25 metres width and having a maximum projection of 2.0 metres from the wall of the building.

As a result of concern for balconies overlooking into the rear yards of the residential area to the north, balconies have been removed from the third storey homes along face towards the north lot line. The prohibition on balconies above the second floor enhances the protection for surrounding residential areas which have been built into the URM8 Zone which allows balconies above the second floor while simultaneously permitting a lesser rear setback than proposed for the subject property.

December 7, 2023

Page 18 of 33

Balconies provide a substitute for the private back yard amenity generally associated with a single-detached residence affording a degree of private outdoor space that supports uses typically not found or allowed in parks such as eating meals or hosting private social events. The inclusion of limited amounts of balconies, while exceeding the 30 percent limit along the building wall will not result in undue overlook or privacy concerns for the abutting properties and add to the residential amenity for the building's residents.

Parking Facilities and Driveway Requirements

Vehicle parking requirements of the Kingston Zoning By-Law are intended to ensure that a site can accommodate its intended function. The proposal meets the numeric quantity of parking stalls required though variations in certain criteria are proposed to accommodate the irregularly shaped lot and the design challenges of providing underground parking.

The Kingston Zoning By-Law directs loading spaces to the rear or side of a building in an effort to minimize the visual impact of these features, especially from the street. The proposed layout contemplates a lay-by area near the front entrance of the building but at a location which is well recessed from the street. The resultant location allows easy access for residents who are moving into or out of the building while protecting the visual aesthetics of the area and helping to maintain the pedestrian friendly character.

An amendment is also sought to allow vehicle parking otherwise prohibited within the front yard. The proposed layout of the parking facilities recesses the parking away from the street to the extent possible, however; due to the extensive lot depth and the irregular parcel fabric, a portion of the parking facilities have been provided either in the front yard, or within an area which would become a part of the front in the event of a severance of the heritage building. The layout of the parking allows ample space for vegetation which softens the impact of the parking areas. The front yard is also made considerably larger than generally contemplated under the provisions of the zoning by-law as a result of the large setback of the heritage building and the location of the apartment building well recessed from Princess Street to accommodate the irregular lot fabric and the presence of the heritage building.

Minor reductions in the vehicle parking for car-share and visitor spaces are also proposed, with a combined total of 13 spaces allocated to these uses whereas 60 would otherwise be required for the 300 homes proposed and would compliment the 270 parking stalls intended for the residents which is well within the range of 0.8 to 1.0 stalls per unit required. Given the greater share of one-bedroom units and the fact that the site is very well connected through public transit, the reduced visitor parking can be justified by the greater share of public transportation which would accommodate visitation to the site.

To address the constraints associated with the underground parking, the applicant is also seeking specific allowances to permit a greater share of small car spaces and to allow a maximum of 20 parking spaces to be partially obstructed by a supporting column necessary to the construction of the building. The allowance for small cars roughly doubles the as-of-right permission for 26 spaces to be for small cars to a total of 50 spaces. Small car spaces measure

December 7, 2023

Page 19 of 33

4.8 metres by 2.4 metres which can accommodate the average car or mid-sized sedan but would be insufficient to accommodate the average sports utility vehicle or pickup truck. Given that the units are intended for the rental market and would not be tied to specific units, the proposed reduced parking size would allow the site to work at a functional level with a greater degree of flexibility to accommodate the needs of the residents. In similar fashion, a total of 20 parking spaces are intended to be partially encumbered by the presence of a supporting column which would remain able to accommodate vehicle parking but would represent a known obstacle in which the individual associated with the parking stall would be required to navigate around. The marginal additional accommodation required of the user of the encumbered parking space is more than offset by the efficient layout of the underground parking area and the location of the supporting columns and would continue to allow for the operate at a functional level.

Bike Facilities

The applicant has provided 30 short-term bike spaces and 225 long-term bike spaces to accommodate the anticipated needs of the residents. Short-term bike spaces are provided near the main entry to the building and, while provided in the quantity required by the Kingston Zoning By-Law, are not intended to be weather protected whereas half of the required short-term bike spaces are otherwise required to be weather protected. Based on the developer's experience these spaces are often under utilized and the proposal consists of providing fewer spaces but of a higher quality. Specifically, there are a total of 78 bike spaces provided in individual lockers, represents 30 percent of all long-term bike spaces while an additional area provides general long-term bike spaces for 150 using a 'stacked' horizontal bike space layout. As many residents will choose to utilize the site's transit offerings for their transportation, the slightly reduced provision of long-term bike spaces is appropriate for this location.

For the building designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the applicant seeks relief from the provisions of the UR3.B Zone to allow for a total of twelve bedrooms within the proposed three dwelling units intended to be accommodated within the building. Additional relief is sought to allow for a lesser rear setback of 3.5 metres which could facilitate a future severance of the property should this development option be pursued but does not form part of the current proposal.

The following table provides a comparison of the requirements of the zoning by-law for the UR2.B Zone against the standards that are proposed to accommodate the development.

December 7, 2023

Page 20 of 33

Table 2 Zoning Comparison Table UR3.B & Proposed Exception Overlay

Zone Provision	By-Law Section	Required (UR3.B)	Proposed (E140)	Relief Required?
Maximum number of bedrooms	Table 11.4.3.	8	12	Yes
Minimum Rear Setback (metres)	4.28.1	6	3.5	Yes

Building Setbacks

A reduction in the rear yard is proposed to allow for the consideration of a future severance of the heritage building from the remainder of the property. Given the site characteristics, the most likely configuration of a severance would be that of a corner lot with the narrower street frontage being along Princess Street at the south end of the property, making the rear lot line the north lot line. This area of the property accommodates an addition to the heritage building which is further recessed from the street line to a distance of approximately 13 metres, while further to the rear an open area exists before transitioning into the parking area for the apartment building.

Rear setbacks are generally used to accommodate a private outdoor amenity area. The lands which surround the heritage building provide a considerable amount of this type of amenity for the residents, including the extensive front yard. The reduced setback at the rear would not impact the overall utility of the site and would not result in any adverse impacts on privacy.

Bedroom Limit

The heritage building is a relatively large building with information from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) indicating a gross floor area of more than 600 square metres, inclusive of the garage addition. The adaptive transformation of this heritage building to accommodate three dwelling units with a total bedroom count of twelve is an appropriate use of a site in a high-density area with a large building initially constructed for a residential purpose and now proposed to be repurposed as such as a means of conserving a built heritage resource.

Other Applications

In the event of approval, the development would be subject to Site Plan Control. Community Benefits Charges would be applicable for the apartment building.

December 7, 2023

Page 21 of 33

If the applicant wishes to pursue a severance to separate the two buildings, a consent application would be required.

Technical Analysis

This application has been circulated to external agencies and internal departments for review and comment. All comments on the proposal have been addressed and no outstanding issues with this application remain at this time.

Public Comments

The following is a summary of the public input received to date, including a summary of the feedback received at the Public Meeting on August 11, 2022. Members of the public who had provided written comment were afforded notice of revised submission material by way of e-mail notification of such on May 15, 2023, and September 28, 2023, and were invited to provide comment. All original written public comments are available in Exhibit M of this report.

Loss of Privacy/Overlook

Comment: Given our back gardens are not deep in lot size, that [12.4 metres] is incredibly close for a building that will tower above. It's enough that I have lost any pleasing view but now I will be staring right into the second-floor apartments from my living room.

Comment: This is the main reason I 'seriously' request the adoption of julliette balconies ONLY on the northeast and northwest wings of the apartment unit. There is no reason why this cannot be adopted.

Comment: Parts have now been stepped back or removed from the top floor to make way for extremely expanded rooftop terraces (totalling over 7000 square feet) on the north and northeast sides. Much skepticism is invited about there not being any noise disturbance issues for abutting neighbours.

Comment: A towering building will overtake the back yards, there will be no privacy.

Comment: Lack of privacy remains an issue – the large building so very close to our property contravenes our right to privacy.

Comment: I am pleased to see Juliette balconies installed on northeast and northwest wings above the second floor but strongly ask the planning committee, council and developer to consider the Walnut Grove residents and please insist that the second-floor outdoor apartment balconies in these locations be *changed* to Juliette style as well. This will at the very least will minimize the intrusiveness of the building in our backyards and our indoor living space.

December 7, 2023

Page 22 of 33

Comment: I am concerned with the impact of this proposed building that results in unacceptable intrusive overlook, excessive shadowing, and negative impact on the neighbouring residents' ability to enjoy their properties.

Response: As outlined in the body of the report, the fifth-floor terrace has been reconfigured to orient activity towards the east while a garden feature along the north edge of the building has been added to provide additional separation.

Balconies have been removed along the north wall of the building above the second storey preventing residents from enjoying outdoor activity which may overlook the residential area to the north. This is further supplemented by the provision of a fence and vegetative buffering which will further mitigate any impact. Outdoor balconies and an outdoor patio area are afforded to the units on the 2nd and first floors respectively which provide a degree of amenity to these units while not having any privacy impact beyond the normal overlook associated with existing neighbouring properties which host much larger balconies and decks.

Traffic

Comment: The increased volume of residents in this development and that of the unit to the east will have an immediate impact on myself and fellow residents along Ellesmeer, and surrounding neighborhood. None of which will be remotely positive in nature.

Comment: I am also concerned about the impact that a 300 plus unit residential building will have on the vehicular traffic in the area.

Comment: It will also increase the traffic on Andersen as people head North on it to get to the 401, Sydenham Rd. Cataraqui Woods Drive and other areas to the north.

Comment: Traffic congestion and accidents are bound to occur. Princess St. at Andersen is busy now and the 1st. apartment building is not even occupied yet. Did the traffic studies take into account peak hours of traffic along Princess St.? Traffic along Princess at the Sydenham rd intersection is already heavily congested with traffic lineups all the way back to the former Ambassador hotel from Sydenham rd. With added traffic & congestion could mean delay in these emergency vehicles, which delay could lead to a life & death situation.

Comment: Andersen Dr, already a heavily travelled street with frequent speeding will be significantly worse.

Comment: What also needs to be considered traffic wise is all the building that is going on along Taylor Kidd behind Best Buy area. Which will also add significant traffic volumes to the intersection at Princess and Taylor Kidd that is already overloaded. Anyone who frequently drives in this area doesn't need a study to tell them that.

Comment: There will be increased traffic, increased noise, increased shadowing and a loss of privacy in our backyards.

December 7, 2023

Page 23 of 33

Comment: Has the City of Kingston conducted comprehensive traffic studies outlining the impacts that a 302-unit building will have on the intersection of Princess and Andersen? Access to the building at 2312 Princess St. should be analyzed before this application is approved.

Comment: Traffic in this area is already at a maximum with several commercial sites and Princess Street and Andersen as the main access routes.

Comment: The traffic on Princess St is already heavy and with the additional traffic from 2274 Princess it will be further challenged.

Comment: It would make sense to do an impact study after the current building has been completed and occupied to determine what effect it will have on traffic & noise pollution before allowing another high density building to be constructed and another presumed 348 vehicles attempting to navigate on these already congested streets.

Comment: The intersection at Princess St and Sydenham Rd is already a disaster for traffic. Nobody needs a traffic study to tell them that. Vehicles can be lined up from the traffic lights at Sydenham Rd to the top of the overpass on Princess above the train tracks. The last thing this area of Kingston needs is 242 more units at 2274 Princess and 302 more at 2312 Princess.

Comment: With 242 units at 2274 and 302 at 3212 Princess there will be more traffic on Princess and also on Anderson which will impact our safety and impair our ability to access arterial streets.

Response: The applicant has revised the proposal to have a 'right-in-only' off Princess Street with the entrance moved further west to create a separation from the abutting entrance associated with the property further east. This limitation will minimize traffic conflicts with the right-hand turn lane. Full eastbound and westbound traffic opportunities are made possible by the site's access to Anderson Drive which can accommodate the anticipated flow.

Princess Street, Sydenham Road, and John Counter Boulevard are all Arterial Roads intended to accommodate intra-urban traffic. These roads face increasing traffic volumes predominantly based on the growth of the city and not individual developments. The City does have plans for improvements to these intersections with the projects being funded primarily through the use of Development Charges which the proposed development would be subject to.

Modifications to the entrance have been made to ensure the safety of turning movements onto and off of Princess Street. The intersection between Princess Street and Anderson Drive would continue to function in a satisfactory manner despite the increased volumes.

December 7, 2023

Page 24 of 33

Massing/height

Comment: The one to two meters increase is barely relevant given the astounding proximity of the apartment to begin, in the initial plan.

Comment: Proposed 6 storey building will not "blend in" with the surrounding buildings.

Comment: A second massive building will completely overload our small neighbourhood.

Comment: This number of storeys will drastically overpower our (and our neighbours') bungalows and shadowing will still be an issue.

Comment: has been moved 2 metres farther south from our property lines, this overgrown structure is still larger than the first building at 2274 Princess St. and we believe it is on a smaller piece of land. Its crowding of abutting property lines does not comply with land use compatibility. In fact, it just adds to the dense, overcrowded congestion in this small community of well-established bungalow homes.

Comment: At the end of the day I will be staring into a block- wall of windows and any reasonable view of open sky without shadowing.

Comment: I have such serious concerns about 10 meters from my fence line. That is exceptionally close.

Comment: design of the building results in an unacceptable level of intrusive overlook. The impact of the height and length of the north wall is compounded by the location of ALL of the outdoor amenity space along the same wall.

Comment: The overlook into our homes and backyards from the terraces, balconies, and windows along the north and east sides of the building is terrible given the proximity to our homes. The balconies reduce the already small distance between the building and our homes and should be eliminated or at least only French balconies.

Comment: The building layout appears to have been designed to upset current residences. It is jammed into an odd shape property.

Comment: The additional height would reduce the enjoyment of local residence.

Comment: The proposed building is too large, too high (6 storeys) for the property.

Comment: One of the reasons we chose to spend our retirement days in this community was due to the quiet, low density residential nature of not only our own subdivision but of all the surrounding area. This proposed development would completely destroy this atmosphere.

Comment: The number of units for this development is greater than the number of units being built at 2274 Princess St., yet the lot is smaller.

December 7, 2023

Page 25 of 33

Comment: Making additional changes to allow for another over sized building of 302 units, will overpopulate the neighborhood, crowding store's, buses, parks and intersections.

Comment: This is higher than his current property under construction at 2274 Princess St. (4 storeys) which also abuts similar houses to ours on our street. A 6-storey building would increasingly dwarf the row of consistent bungalows on Ellesmeer Avenue.

Comment: The sheer enormity of the density issue and the impact it potentially would cause on the community cannot be understated and must be addressed.

Comment: We are not in favour of changes made to the Official Plan or Zoning By-Laws due its impending overcrowding of this neighbourhood in general, and, of our small retirement community of Walnut Grove in particular.

Response: The proposed building creates an animated building façade along Anderson Drive which steps down as it transitions to the lower density area to the north. A vegetative buffer and a 12.4 metre open area which constitutes the rear setback creates a further visual delineation between the higher density proposed development and that of the existing area.

Loss of Vegetation and Environmental Concerns

Comment: This developer is unnecessarily removing mature trees from a property the importance of mature trees to fight our climate emergency and will insist that more trees are retained.

Comment: The City is offering residents young trees to be planted to grow the green canopy and protect the environment and at the same time allowing developers to cut down the mature trees that are already there.

Comment: Additionally, the lovely, wooded area to our east has already been stripped bare in recent months, leaving zero greenspace and increasing the density.

Comment: Why are we stripping bare of vegetation an already said zone, which instead should be an opportunity for user friendly greenspace with appropriate housing if that's a goal.

Comment: This rezone proposal certainly appears to be neglectful in maintaining eco friendly zones which cities of the future claim to tout.

Comment: The property is too small to build a six-storey apartment building. Where is the green space going to be & will there be room for trees.

Comment: Trees will be gone. It will be a wood and concrete jungle behind the homes.

Response: Through the development process, the applicant would be responsible for replacing the tree canopy lost as a result of the proposed development in accordance with the City's

December 7, 2023

Page 26 of 33

Trees By-Law. A vegetative barrier is to be implemented along the north lot line and is intended to grow into a mature line of trees enhancing the tree canopy.

In regard to sustainability concerns, it should be noted that wood construction, has been demonstrated to be a more environmentally sustainable form of construction when compared to concrete and steel while the density afforded through this mid-rise building prevents the need to expand the urban area outward into the surrounding natural area, with the 300 units requiring approximately 15 hectares of land at a lower density-built form.

Shadows

Comment: no sun getting to the yards.

Comment: it looks like the houses to the north of the proposed building will be in the dark for most of December.

Comment: Lack of light – shadowing we presume, will remain a problem.

Comment: According to the shadow study, the proposed building will shadow my house all day in the late fall and winter. Most of my living space with large windows face south. My living room/dining room, my master bedroom and my recreation room. The sunlight is important to me, without it my heating bills will significantly increase, and my overall mental health will be impacted.

Comment: During the entire month of December (and parts of months on either side) we will have absolutely no sunlight coming into the entire south side of our house.

Comment: It is completely unacceptable for our homes to be in partial or complete shadow from November to January. We will be in complete shadow during the month of December, during the bleakest part of the winter.

Comment: There will be an unacceptable amount of shadowing during the winter months. The shadow study shows that on December 25, (which means for several weeks both before and after this date), the houses will be in shadow for the entire day.

Comment: The overshadowing that will occur in the winter months will affect our lovely south exposure at a time of year when it is most desirable.

Comment: Even with the reduced height in parts of the stepped building (north side), the shadow (solar) study still shows that we will not get sunlight for a large part of the day during the months of Dec.

Comment: It might block the sun out completely during certain times of the year. Having a building so close by would significantly affect property values of Ellesmeer Ave that we

December 7, 2023

Page 27 of 33

should be compensated for through a significant drop in property taxes. The building should be pushed to at least 60 meters from the back lots of Ellesmeer Ave properties.

Comment: As a homeowner, I do not wish to have a large building towering over my back garden blocking my sun and view, and subsequently have to stare into homeowners' balconies.

Response: Shadows cast between the spring and fall equinox do not encroach into the rear yards of the abutting properties to the north of the site and would therefore have no impact at all on the enjoyment of these properties during the summer and surrounding seasons when gardening and other outdoor activities are most common. Shadows would traverse across the rear yards of properties to varying extents during the winter months but would not result in adverse impacts which would prevent the normal use of these properties.

Noise

Comment: Noise levels will increase significantly from current levels due to AC units and exhaust fans.

Comment: There will be increased noise.

Comment: The impact on the enjoyment of our backyards by the increased noise level of the pool and terraces especially the roof top terraces with loudspeakers will be considerable and the nighttime lighting of these areas will be invasive. The lighting of the area is already bad enough with the existing businesses.

Comment: feel there will be a significant increase in noise produced by the proposed building. My house lines up directly with the proposed swimming pool. The terraces will overlook my property and they are planning to install loudspeakers.

Comment: The large pool area, with no wall on the north to stop noise from travelling into our backyards is completely unacceptable to us.

Comment: We are also concerned about air conditioner noise and placement of the dumpsters which are noisy when emptied.

Response: Activities during construction and post construction will be required to comply with the requirements of the City's Noise By-Law. At the Official Plan amendment and zoning by-law amendment application stage, a proponent is required to submit a Noise Feasibility Study that provides an assessment as to whether the proposed development will be able to comply with the Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks' NPC-300 Guidelines in terms of the impacts of transportation noise and stationary noise on the subject site as well as the impact of stationary noise on surrounding sensitive uses.

The applicant has provided the requisite Noise Impact Study and Update to the satisfaction of the City. At the site plan stage, the applicant will need to provide a Detailed Noise Study that

December 7, 2023

Page 28 of 33

specifically details the selection of noise generating equipment that the building will require and any necessary on-site mitigation and/or warning clauses that need to be considered for the project to continue to meet the NPC-300 Guidelines.

Construction Noise & Blasting

Comment: Two levels of underground parking means a lot of blasting which potentially could result in large cracks in the foundations of all the homes backing onto this area, not to mention the cracking of interior walls.

Comment: The blasting and the dust generated by this for two levels of underground parking will disrupt our lives for months. The other building at 2274 Princess Street required about two months of blasting, which was loud and there was a lot of vibration.

Comment: The blasting, digging, and removal of trees along the fence line will do irreparable damage to the existing fence, which is close to 20 years old. A new, higher, fence (at least 10 feet) would be reasonable.

Comment: Two levels of underground parking would mean a longer period of very disrupting noise and startling vibration while construction is underway.

Response: The City's Noise By-law restricts the timing of construction activities while Construction practices are regulated by the Ontario Building Code and blasting activities are regulated provincially under O. Reg. 244/97. Any damages resulting from construction practices would be the liability of the offending party, and general liability insurance is a standard practice/requirement for the construction and mortgage industries.

Economic Impact

Comment: Due to shading in the winter, our heating bills will be increased significantly.

Comment: I expect our winter heating cost to increase ten to twenty percent and our resale value to drop up to 100 thousand dollars.

Comment: Properties, especially ones along Ellesmeer Avenue will bear the cost of devaluation due to the crowding of such a massive building.

Comment: When we purchased our homes on Ellesmeer Avenue, this land was zoned, by the city, for low density housing. If the zoning is changed to allow this development, the resale value of houses on the south side of Ellesmeer Avenue will be reduced by a considerable amount.

Response: No evidence indicates that the presence of the building would have a detrimental impact on property values while the impact on property values, whether beneficial or detrimental, do not constitute a consideration in the land use planning process.

December 7, 2023

Page 29 of 33

Given that the shadows are largely contained within the subject lands with the exception of the period immediately around the Winter Solstice, where shadows traverse across the rear yards of the properties to the north, it is unlikely that the proposed building would have a meaningful impact on heating costs.

Safety

Comment: All wood construction brings fear of a fire hazard should such an occurrence happen.

Comment: Emergency vehicles Ambulance and Fire go along Princess St. on a daily basis. Princess St. being a main artery for them to get to a lot of other areas. With added traffic & congestion could mean delay in these emergency vehicles, which delay could lead to a life & death situation.

Comment: We didn't see any access roads on the map for emergency vehicles, such as fire trucks, etc. Is this not a requirement?

Response: The City's Building Services and Fire Services departments reviewed the proposed development and found no issue. Standards for fire safety are set out in the *Ontario Building Code Act* and the *Fire Protection and Prevention Act* both of which allow this type of wood frame construction. The 6.7-metre-wide drive aisle serves as a fire access route in the event of an emergency and the building would be developed in accordance with all applicable law.

Application is Premature

Comment: Strongly object to the requested increase in density. There already is an apartment building presently being built by Patry at 2274 Princess Street with fewer units on a bigger piece of land. Because this building is not yet completed, no one knows what the impact will be of this construction regarding traffic, noise, safety, light pollution, privacy, etc. for our community.

Comment: Allowing this amendment should be denied especially until the already approved unit being built has been established and further studies of the effects of that can be analyzed.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study incorporated 2274 Princess Street as well as other recent development in the "Background Developments" and used established methodologies projecting traffic volumes out to 2031. Detailed studies were put forward for consideration as a part of the, then proposed, development at 2274 as similar studies have been put forward for this proposal.

December 7, 2023

Page 30 of 33

Colour and design

Comment: The dark colour of the exterior cladding on the bottom 3 storeys emphasizes the immensity of this large structure. Could the developer consider a lighter cladding colour that could be added to the lower floors as well.

Response: This comment has been forwarded to the applicant; however, recent changes to the Planning Act prevent municipalities from regulating building materials and colour through Site Plan Control. Notwithstanding this limitation, due to the presence of the heritage Building there is a requirement for consideration and sensitivity to the compatibility of this built heritage feature. The Heritage Impact Statement addressed façade treatment stating, "The building is divided visually in half between the 3-storey podium which will be clad with brick and will provide a complementary background for the heritage building. The upper 3 floors which will be about 10 meters in height and clad in a cream or taupe smooth-texture stucco. This material will provide a neutral palette reducing the visual impact of the building's height and mass. The main entrance will be enlivened by an entry canopy and heritage style paving stones." Any building design and treatment would be required to be compatible with the heritage building.

Drainage

Comment: I have is that the storm drain that is located in the southwest corner of my backyard is about 4' lower than the subject property which has caused issues for the existing fence.

Response: The site will be regraded, and the development would proceed in accordance with an approved Storm Water Management Plan which would address any standing water deficiencies which may exist on the property currently.

Fencing

Comment: Suitable fencing is required to provide increased security, safety and privacy in a way that is suitably aesthetic.

Comment: Like the site at 2274 Princess St., we would like to have, as a minimum, an attractive taller fence built (8 feet min.) by Patry Inc. and the removal of the standing one done and paid for by his company as well.

Response: The applicant would be installing a 2-metre-wide vegetative barrier as well as a privacy fence to separate the development from the abutting residential area.

Effect of Public Input on Draft By-Law

Through the technical review process and the Public Meeting, the applications have evolved significantly since it was initially submitted. The concerns raised from the public about the compatibility of the proposed development has been considered through and reflected in the

December 7, 2023

Page 31 of 33

technical review comments. These comments have been reflected in the changes in built form brought forward by the applicant and supported through additional technical studies.

Elements of built form compatibility that were brought forward by staff and the public have been incorporated into a robust set of regulations in the amending zoning by-law to ensure compatibility, including a height map, landscape buffering requirements and ensuring that the development adheres to a minimum 12 metre rear yard setback.

These regulations in the by-law implement the intended scale of the property and increase compatibility with adjacent land uses, including residential and commercial heritage properties.

Conclusion

The recommended Official Plan and zoning by-law amendment will apply site-specific exceptions to permit the development of an underutilized property in an area which is well serviced by existing amenities facilitating active transportation options and a greater range of housing options. The proposed development affords adequate protection from undue adverse impacts to the stable residential neighbourhood to the north and protects the heritage attributes of the built heritage located on the property.

Through the plans and submitted technical reports, the application has demonstrated that the proposed development will be compatible with surrounding land uses and will address functional needs of residents. The proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms to the Official Plan, and represents good land use planning. The application is recommended for approval.

Existing Policy/By-Law:

The proposed amendment was reviewed against the policies of the Province of Ontario and City of Kingston to ensure that the changes would be consistent with the Province's and the City's vision of development. The following documents were assessed:

Provincial

Planning Act

Provincial Policy Statement, 2020

Municipal

City of Kingston Official Plan

Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62

December 7, 2023

Page 32 of 33

Notice Provisions:

Pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*, notice of the statutory public meeting was provided 20 days in advance of the public meeting in the form of a sign posted on the subject property and by mail to 607 property owners (according to the latest Assessment Rolls) within 120 metres of the subject property. In addition, a courtesy notice placed in The Kingston Whig-Standard on December 3, 2023.

If the application is approved, a Notice of Passing will be circulated in accordance with the provisions of the *Planning Act*.

At the time of writing of this report, 28 pieces of written public correspondence have been received and all planning related matters have been addressed within the body of this report. Any public correspondence received after the publishing of this report will be included as an addendum to the Planning Committee agenda.

Accessibility Considerations:

None

Financial Considerations:

None

Contacts:

James Bar, Manager, Development Approvals, 613-546-4291 extension 3213

Ian Clendening, Senior Planner, 613-546-4291 extension 3126

Other City of Kingston Staff Consulted:

None

Exhibits Attached:

- Exhibit A Draft By-Law and Schedule A to Amend the Official Plan
- Exhibit B Draft By-Law and Schedule A to Amend Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62
- Exhibit C Key Map
- Exhibit D Neighbourhood Context
- Exhibit E Consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement
- Exhibit F Official Plan, Land Use

December 7, 2023

Page 33 of 33

- Exhibit G Conformity with the Official Plan
- Exhibit H Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62, Schedules 1, E, and F
- Exhibit I Site Plan and Floor Plans
- Exhibit J Renderings & Solar Analysis
- Exhibit K Site Photographs
- Exhibit L Public Notice Notification Map
- Exhibit M Public Comments

By-Law Number 2023-XXX

A By-Law To Amend The City Of Kingston Official Plan (Amendment Number 88, 2312 Princess Street)

Passed: [Meeting Date]

Whereas a Public Meeting was held regarding this amendment on August 11, 2022 and on December 7, 2023;

Now Therefore the Council of The Corporation of the City of Kingston, in accordance with the provisions of Section 17 of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.P13, hereby enacts as follows:

1. The City of Kingston Official Plan is hereby amended by the following map change which shall constitute Amendment Number 88 to the Official Plan for the City of Kingston.
 - (a) **Amend** Schedule 'CN-1' Cataraqui North Secondary Plan, of the City of Kingston Official Plan, so as to re-designate a portion the property located at 2312 Princess Street, as shown on Schedule 'A' to By-law Number 2022- ____, from 'Arterial Commercial' to 'Residential'.
2. That the City of Kingston Official Plan, as amended, be further amended by adding the following new Policy as Section 10C.3.19.1:

"2312 Princess Street, Schedule CN-1

10C.3.19.1 That lands associated with the existing building designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act are not subject to the minimum density ranges.
3. That the City of Kingston Official Plan, as amended, be further amended by adding the following new Policy as Section 10C.3.34.1:

"2312 Princess Street, Schedule CN-1

10C.3.34.1 That high density residential development may be located at the northeast corner of Princess Street and Anderson Drive, 2312 Princess Street, subject to the following restrictions:

 - a. The maximum density is 264 dwelling units per net hectare of land.

4. This by-law shall come into force and take effect on the day that is the day after the last day for filing an appeal pursuant to the *Planning Act*, provided that no Notice of Appeal is filed to this by-law in accordance with the provisions of Section 17, Subsection 24 of the *Planning Act*, as amended; and where one or more appeals have been filed within the time period specified, at the conclusion of which, the By-Law shall be deemed to have come into force and take effect on the day the appeals are withdrawn or dismissed, as the case may be.

Given all Three Readings and Passed: [Meeting date]

Janet Jaynes
City Clerk

Bryan Paterson
Mayor




Planning Services

Schedule 'A' to By-Law Number _____

Address: 2312 Princess Street
File Number: D35-004-2022


Schedule CN-1 Cataraqui North Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

 Lands to be Re-designated from 'Arterial Commercial' to 'Residential'

Certificate of Authentication

This is Schedule 'A' to By-Law Number _____, passed this _____ day of _____ 2023.

Mayor Clerk



By-Law Number 2023-XX

**A By-Law to Amend By-Law Number 2022-62, “The Kingston Zoning By-law”
(Transfer of Lands into Kingston Zoning By-Law, Introduction of Exception
Numbers E139 and E140, and removal of Holding Overlay H180 (2312 Princess
Street))**

Passed: [Meeting Date]

Whereas the Council of The Corporation of the City of Kingston enacted By-Law Number 2022-62, “Kingston Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62” (the “Kingston Zoning By-Law”);

Whereas the subject lands are identified as “Not Subject to this By-Law” on Schedule 1 of the Kingston Zoning By-Law;

Whereas the Council of The Corporation of the City of Kingston deems it advisable to amend the Kingston Zoning By-Law to incorporate the subject lands into the Kingston Zoning By-Law and to introduce a new exception number and remove a holding overlay;


Therefore be it resolved that the Council of The Corporation of the City of Kingston hereby enacts as follows:

1. By-Law Number 2022-62 of The Corporation of the City of Kingston, entitled “Kingston Zoning By-Law Number 2022-62”, is amended as follows:
 - 1.1. Schedule 1 – Zoning Map is amended by removing reference to “Not Subject to this By-law”, and by adding the zone symbols ‘URM2’ and ‘UR3.B’, as shown on Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this By-Law.

- 1.2. Schedule E – Exception Overlay is amended by adding Exception Number E139 and Exception Number E140, as shown on Schedule “B” attached to and forming part of this By-Law.
- 1.3. Schedule F – Holding Overlay is amended by removing Hold Number ‘H180’, as shown on Schedule “C” attached to and forming part of this By-Law;
- 1.4. By adding the following Exception Number E139 in Section 21 – Exceptions, as follows:
- “**E139.** Despite anything to the contrary in this By-law, the following provisions apply to the lands subject to this Exception:
- (a) The lands subject to this Exception are considered one **lot** for zoning purposes;
 - (b) The maximum number of **dwelling units** in an **apartment building** is 300;
 - (c) The **front lot line** is the **lot line** dividing the **lot** from Princess Street.
 - (d) The **exterior lot line** is the **lot line** dividing the **lot** from Anderson Drive;
 - (e) The maximum **building heights** are specified on Figure E139, with a maximum 0.5 metre variance on noted dimensions permitted;
 - (f) The **building setbacks** are shown on Figure E139, with a maximum 5% variance on noted dimensions permitted;
 - (g) Maximum percentage of a **main wall** occupied by **balconies** facing an inner courtyard is 46%, facing a **rear lot line** is 30%, and all other **main walls** is 36%;
 - (h) Projecting or recessed **balconies** are not permitted above the second floor when they are within 15 metres of the rear lot line.
 - (i) A minimum 2.0 metre wide **planting strip** must be provided along the **rear lot line**;
 - (j) A privacy **fence** with a minimum height of 2.4 metres must be provided along the **rear lot line**;
 - (k) The fifth floor outdoor **amenity area** must be set back a minimum of 2.0 metres from the buildings north **main wall**;
 - (l) A **driveway** and a **drive aisle** may not be located within 12 metres of the **rear lot line**;

- (m) The minimum **drive aisle** width is 6.0 metres;
- (n) Minimum number of **car-share spaces** is 3;
- (o) Minimum number of **visitor spaces** is 10;
- (p) A maximum of 50 **parking spaces** are permitted to be **parking spaces** for small cars, with a minimum length of 4.8 metres and a minimum width of 2.4 metres, with signage that identifies the space as “small car parking space”;
- (q) Up to 20 **parking spaces** within a **parking structure** may be partially obstructed on one side by a wall or column;
- (r) A maximum of 50 **parking spaces** may be located within a **front setback** or **exterior setback** provided no parking space is closer than 9.0 metres to a front lot line and 15 metres from a rear lot line;
- (s) A **Loading Space** may be located in a **front yard** provided it is not closer than 30 metres to a **front lot line** or **exterior lot line**;
- (t) A minimum of 0.75 **long-term bike spaces** are required per **dwelling unit**;
- (u) **Short-term bike spaces** are not required to be weather-protected.

(v) **Figure E139:**



1.5. By adding the following Exception Number E140 to Section 21 – Exceptions as follows

- (a) The lands subject to this Exception are considered one lot for zoning purposes;
- (b) Maximum number of **bedrooms** is 12 **bedrooms**;
- (c) Minimum **rear setback**: 3.5 metres; and

2. The lands shown on Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this By-Law are incorporated into the Kingston Zoning By-Law and the provisions of City of

Kingston By-Law Number 76-26, entitled "Township of Kingston Restricted Area By-Law", as amended, no longer apply to the lands.

3. This By-Law shall come into force in accordance with the provisions of the *Planning Act*.

Given all Three Readings and Passed: [Meeting Date]

Janet Jaynes
City Clerk

Bryan Paterson
Mayor



Planning Services

Schedule 'A' to By-Law Number

Address: 2312 Princess St
File Number: D35-004-2022



Reference Kingston Zoning By-Law Schedule 1 - Zoning Map

- Rezoned from Not Subject to this By-law to UR3.B
- Rezoned from Not Subject to this By-law to URM2

Certificate of Authentication

This is Schedule 'A' to By-Law Number _____, passed this _____ day of _____ 2023.

Mayor Clerk







Planning Services

Schedule 'B' to By-Law Number

Address: 2312 Princess St
File Number: D35-004-2022


Reference Kingston Zoning By-Law Schedule E - Exception Overlay

-  Lands to be Added as Exception Number E139
-  Lands to be Added as Exception Number E140

Certificate of Authentication

This is Schedule 'B' to By-Law Number _____, passed this _____ day of _____ 2023.

Mayor Clerk



Disclaimer: This document is subject to copyright and may only be used for the purposes of the project for which it was prepared. It is not to be used for any other purpose without the prior written consent of the City of Kingston. The City of Kingston assumes no responsibility for any errors or omissions in this document. The City of Kingston does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in this document. ©2023 The City of Kingston. All rights reserved.



Planning Services

Schedule 'C' to By-Law Number _____

Address: 2312 Princess Street
File Number: D35-004-2022


Kingston Zoning By-Law 2022-62 Schedule F - Holding Overlay

Lands to be Removed from Holding Overlay H180

Certificate of Authentication

This is Schedule 'C' to By-Law Number _____, passed this _____ day of _____ 2023.

Mayor Clerk





Planning Committee



Key Map

Address: 2312 Princess St
File Number: D35-004-2022


 Subject Lands



Andersen Dr






Princess St



Planning Committee
Neighbourhood Context (2021)

Address: 2312 Princess Street
File Number: D35-004-2022

-  Subject Lands
-  Property Boundaries
-  Proposed Parcels



Preliminary List of Applicable Policies of the Provincial Policy Statement

Policies applicable to the subject application include, but are not limited to the following. The application will be evaluated against the applicable policies in a future comprehensive report.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
1.1.1(a)	<p>Healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by:</p> <p>a) promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term;</p>	Building Strong Healthy Communities	The proposed development is located on a serviced and underutilized parcel located within the urban boundary. The proposal will use land efficiently to create added residential density within the settlement area of the municipality.
1.1.1(b)	<p>b) accommodating an appropriate affordable and market-based range and mix of residential types (including single-detached, additional residential units, multi-unit housing, affordable housing and housing for older persons), employment (including industrial and commercial), institutional (including places of worship, cemeteries and long-term care homes), recreation, park and open space, and other</p>	Building Strong Healthy Communities	The proposed development adds to the mix of land uses and mix of housing options within the Princess Street corridor and within the Cataraqui North Secondary Plan area.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	uses to meet long-term needs;		
1.1.1(c)	c) avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns;	Building Strong Healthy Communities	The proposed development is not expected to result in any environmental or public health and safety concerns.
1.1.1(d)	d) avoiding development and land use patterns that would prevent the efficient expansion of settlement areas in those areas which are adjacent or close to settlement areas;	Building Strong Healthy Communities	The proposed development represents an integration of locating residential intensification where it will help to support public investment in transit, infrastructure and helps avoid extending servicing and delays putting pressure on expanding the urban boundary to accommodate residential growth.
1.1.1(e)	e) promoting the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs;	Building Strong Healthy Communities	The proposed development will use existing public service facilities.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
1.1.1(f)	f) improving accessibility for persons with disabilities and older persons by addressing land use barriers which restrict their full participation in society;	Building Strong Healthy Communities	The development will be required to comply with Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) standards for private development, including common indoor and outdoor spaces. In addition, there will be at least 23 barrier free units and with the exception of the vertical clearance for accessible spaces in the parking garage, the accessible parking will be compliant with the applicable zoning regulations.
1.1.1(h)	g) promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity; and	Building Strong Healthy Communities	Locating the proposed development within the urban boundary on an arterial road and on lands designated for residential development alleviates pressures to expand the urban boundary outward into the rural area of the City and therefore will help to preserve overall biodiversity.
1.1.1(i)	h) preparing for the regional and local impacts of a changing climate.	Building Strong Healthy Communities	The proposed development supports efforts to combat the changing climate regionally and locally by developing in a high density, compact form, resulting in less land consumption when compared to lower density built form.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
1.1.3.1	Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development.	Settlement Areas	The proposed development that seeks to add 303 residential units to the City's housing stock is located within the urban boundary of the municipality, which is equivalent to the definition of settlement area in the PPS. The development is proposed on a serviced, underutilized property in an area where intensification is promoted by the City's land use planning documents. The site is located in proximity to commercial amenities and public transit.
1.1.3.2(a)	Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses which: a) efficiently use land and resources;	Settlement Areas	The proposed development is a compact, high density form that makes efficient use of land. It is appropriate for the infrastructure and public service facilities that are already available.
1.1.3.2(b)	b) are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion;	Settlement Areas	The site does not require the expansion of any municipal services and makes more economical use of the City's linear infrastructure.
	c) minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change, and	Settlement Areas	The higher density and transit oriented nature of the development will prevent the outward expansion of the City while

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	promote energy efficiency;		simultaneously reducing greenhouse gas emissions otherwise associated with longer and car oriented commuting patterns.
	d) prepare for the impacts of a changing climate;	Settlement Areas	See 1.1.3.2(c)
	e) support active transportation;	Settlement Areas	The characteristics of the proposed development, its location and context provide support for existing transit service
	f) are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed;	Settlement Areas	The higher density development on an existing transit corridor represents transit supportive development
1.1.3.3	Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for transit-supportive development, accommodating a significant supply and range of housing options through intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs.	Settlement Areas	The proposed development is located within the urban boundary adjacent to an arterial road where there is access to multiple transit routes, including express transit. Adding 303 rental housing units to this parcel of land through intensification and with a reduced provision of off-street parking is a transit-supportive development. The proposed development will make use of existing available infrastructure and public service facilities, with sanitary servicing capacity provided through an active capital works project to

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			upgrade the Days Road pumping station.
1.1.3.4	Appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification, redevelopment and compact form, while avoiding or mitigating risks to public health and safety.	Settlement Areas	The recommended zoning standards for this site promote intensification in a compact form. There are no known risks to public health and safety resulting from the subject applications.
1.1.3.5	Planning authorities shall establish and implement minimum targets for intensification and redevelopment within built-up areas, based on local conditions. However, where provincial targets are established through provincial plans, the provincial target shall represent the minimum target for affected areas.	Settlement Areas	The City, through its Official Plan, has established a minimum intensification target within the urban boundary, whereby a minimum of 40% of residential development is to occur through intensification. The proposed development will contribute to the City's efforts to achieve this target.
1.4.1(b)	<p>To provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities required to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area, planning authorities shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) maintain at all times where new development is to occur, land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three-year supply of residential 	Housing	The proposed development will assist the City by adding to the range and mix of housing options and its ability to accommodate residential growth through intensification on serviced lands.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment, and land in draft approved and registered plans.</p>		
1.4.3(b)	<p>Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities to meet projected market-based and affordable housing needs of current and future residents of the regional market area by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) permitting and facilitating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. all housing options required to meet the social, health, economic and well-being requirements of current and future residents, including special needs requirements and needs arising from demographic changes and employment opportunities; 2. all types of residential intensification, 	Housing	<p>The Official Plan has established a target that 25% of all new housing meet the Plan’s definition of affordable housing. At this time, it is not known if any of the dwelling units within the building will meet the definition of affordable housing, however the development is expected to contribute to the goal of providing an appropriate range and mix of housing within the urban boundary and to provide additional tenure of residential units within the Cataraqui North Secondary Plan Area to meet the social, health, economic and well-being requirements of current and future residents.</p>

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	including additional residential units, and redevelopment in accordance with policy 1.1.3.3;		
1.4.3(c)	c) directing the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs;	Housing	The subject property is located within the urban boundary, on an arterial road and in an area where infrastructure and public service facilities are available.
1.4.3(d)	d) promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed;	Housing	The proposed density of the development within the proposed built form of an apartment building is an appropriate form of intensification for its location and will efficiently use land, infrastructure and will support active transportation and the use of public transit.
1.4.3(e)	e) requiring transit-supportive development and prioritizing intensification, including potential air rights development, in proximity to transit,	Housing	The proposed development is located adjacent to many transit routes, including express transit.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	including corridors and stations; and		
1.4.3(f)	f) establishing development standards for residential intensification, redevelopment and new residential development which minimize the cost of housing and facilitate compact form, while maintaining appropriate levels of public health and safety.	Housing	The recommended site specific zoning for the site facilitates a compact form of development, while maintaining appropriate considerations for health and safety.
1.6.3(a)	<p>Before consideration is given to developing new infrastructure and public service facilities:</p> <p>a) the use of existing infrastructure and public service facilities should be optimized;</p>	Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities	The proposed development is located in the serviced urban boundary where existing water, road infrastructure and public service facilities are available.
1.6.6.2	Municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas to support protection of the environment and minimize potential risks to human health and safety. Within settlement areas with existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services,	Sewage, Water and Stormwater	The proposed development is a residential intensification project located within the municipally serviced urban boundary of the municipality.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	intensification and redevelopment shall be promoted wherever feasible to optimize the use of the services.		
1.6.6.7(a)	<p>Planning for stormwater management shall:</p> <p>a) be integrated with planning for sewage and water services and ensure that systems are optimized, feasible and financially viable over the long term;</p>	Sewage, Water and Stormwater	The proposed stormwater management for the development incorporates both quantity and quality controls to ensure the control and filtering of contaminants as well as overall health and safety. The site provides 40% of the site as open space which helps in terms of maximizing vegetative and pervious surfaces for the site.
1.6.6.7(b)	b) minimize, or, where possible, prevent increases in contaminant loads;	Sewage, Water and Stormwater	Storm water management controls will be implemented in accordance with Provincial and Municipal standards.
1.6.6.7(c)	c) minimize erosion and changes in water balance, and prepare for the impacts of a changing climate through the effective management of stormwater, including the use of green infrastructure;	Sewage, Water and Stormwater	See 1.6.6.7(a)
1.6.6.7(d)	d) mitigate risks to human health,	Sewage, Water and Stormwater	There are no anticipated effects to safety or the environment.

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	safety, property and the environment;		
1.6.6.7(e)	e) maximize the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces; and	Sewage, Water and Stormwater	See 1.6.6.7(a)
1.6.6.7(f)	f) promote stormwater management best practices, including stormwater attenuation and re-use, water conservation and efficiency, and low impact development.	Sewage, Water and Stormwater	See 1.6.6.7(a)
1.6.7.2	Efficient use should be made of existing and planned infrastructure, including through the use of transportation demand management strategies, where feasible.	Transportation Systems	The development is proposed to make use of the existing road network.
1.6.7.4	A land use pattern, density and mix of uses should be promoted that minimize the length and number of vehicle trips and support current and future use of transit and active transportation.	Transportation Systems	The proposed high density use is located on an arterial road, within walking distance of public transit stops and commercial, employment, recreational and institutional uses and amenities. The provision of off-street vehicular parking is proposed to be reduced and the recommended zoning includes bicycle parking for residents and visitors. All of these factors are supportive of the use of other modes of travel and

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			reducing the length and number of vehicle trips to and from the site.
1.7.1(a)	<p>Long-term economic prosperity should be supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) promoting opportunities for economic development and community investment-readiness; b) encouraging residential uses to respond to dynamic market-based needs and provide necessary housing supply and range of housing options for a diverse workforce; c) optimizing the long-term availability and use of land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities; d) maintaining and, where possible, enhancing the vitality and viability of downtowns and main streets; e) encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features 	Long-Term Economic Prosperity	<p>The proposed development responds to market based needs and adds to the range of available housing options for the workforce by adding 300 1 and 2 bedroom rental units. The proposed development will contribute to the sense of community and sense of place within the Cataraqui North neighbourhood through a compact design. The design of the building and mitigation of adverse effects has been evaluated through the lens of a Heritage Impact Statement that has been reviewed to the satisfaction of Heritage Services staff. The proposed intensification project helps to add residential density to an underutilized property adjacent to transit and amenities and within the urban boundary, which is positive from a climate change perspective as it avoids the consumption of additional lands beyond the urban boundary to accommodate growth and locates growth in an area where trips can be made easily without a car.</p>

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes;</p> <p>f) promoting the redevelopment of brownfield sites;</p> <p>g) providing for an efficient, cost-effective, reliable multimodal transportation system that is integrated with adjacent systems and those of other jurisdictions, and is appropriate to address projected needs to support the movement of goods and people;</p> <p>h) providing opportunities for sustainable tourism development;</p> <p>i) sustaining and enhancing the viability of the agricultural system through protecting agricultural resources, minimizing land use conflicts, providing opportunities to support local food, and maintaining and improving the agri-food network;</p>		

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j) promoting energy conservation and providing opportunities for increased energy supply; k) minimizing negative impacts from a changing climate and considering the ecological benefits provided by nature; and l) encouraging efficient and coordinated communications and telecommunications infrastructure. 		
1.8.1(a)	<p>Planning authorities shall support energy conservation and efficiency, improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate through land use and development patterns which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) promote compact form and a structure of nodes and corridors; b) promote the use of active transportation and transit in and between residential, employment (including 	Energy Conservation, Air Quality and Climate Change	The proposed development responds to the policies in the Official Plan regarding nodes and corridors by proposing a high density residential land use within an identified intensification corridor.


Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>commercial and industrial) and institutional uses and other areas;</p> <p>c) encourage transit-supportive development and intensification to improve the mix of employment and housing uses to shorten commute journeys and decrease transportation congestion;</p> <p>d) promote design and orientation which maximizes energy efficiency and conservation, and considers the mitigating effects of vegetation and green infrastructure; and</p> <p>e) maximize vegetation within settlement areas, where feasible.</p>		
2.6.1	Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology	The Heritage Impact Study has confirmed that the setback of the apartment building and the use of step backs create a built form which is compatible with the built heritage resource.
2.6.2	Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology	The site has been cleared of Archaeological Potential

Policy Number	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.		
2.6.3	Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology	See 2.6.2




Planning Committee
Official Plan, Land Use
 Address: 2312 Princess St
 File Number: D35-004-2022

- Subject Lands
- ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL(CNNSP)
- RESIDENTIAL (CNNSP)
- ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL
- CATARAQUI NORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD SECONDARY PLAN (CNNSP)



Andersen Dr

Princess St



Preliminary List of Applicable Official Plan Policies

Policies applicable to the subject application include, but are not limited to the following. The application will be evaluated against the applicable policies in a future comprehensive report.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
2.1.1(a)	<p>Most growth will occur within the Urban Boundary, shown on Schedule 2, where development will be directed to achieve greater sustainability through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. appropriate (minimum) densities; 	Sustainable Development	<p>The proposed development represents an appropriate high density development in relation to its surrounding context and the strategic policy direction in the Official Plan regarding growth management. The subject property is on full municipal services, on an Arterial Road and having access to numerous surrounding amenities.</p>
2.1.1(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. land use patterns that foster transit and active transportation; 	Sustainable Development	<p>The proposed developments is surrounded by commercial amenities including a grocery store immediately opposite the site and places additional residential units adjacent to bus stops which service a variety of express (501 & 502) and regular (7 & 4) transit service.</p> <p>Sidewalks flank both sides of Princess Street and the west side of Anderson Drive which provides pedestrian linkage to Chadwick Parkette approximately 240 metres north.</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			Dedicated bike lanes provide additional active transportation options slightly further from the site in the form of the east-west corridor along Taylor Kidd Boulevard and the north-south corridor along Centennial Drive. While in the immediate area, it is planned that Princess Street will form a 'Spine Route' as outlined in the City's Active Transportation Master Plan.
2.1.1(e)	e. direction of new development and key land uses to areas where they can best result in sustainable practices;	Sustainable Development	The site is located within walking distance of a wide array of commercial needs including that of a grocery store which
2.1.1(g)	g. maximized use of investments in infrastructure and public amenities;	Sustainable Development	The higher density development maximizes the City's investment in infrastructure and public amenities by allocating a greater number of residential units to the same amount of linear infrastructure.
2.1.1(h)	h. strategies that will revitalize both neighbourhoods and employment areas, and rehabilitate brownfield sites for re-use;	Sustainable Development	The proposed development makes effective use of an underutilized parcel of land with full municipal services bringing additional investment into this area as well as residents who will

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			ultimately procure items and services from the surrounding shops.
2.1.1(k)	k. climate positive development;	Sustainable Development	<p>Storm water is managed on site and the site makes use of underground parking thereby limiting the amount of impermeable surfaces.</p> <p>The development is located on transit service and in an area with a number of commercial amenities reducing the reliance on the private automobile.</p>
2.1.1(l)	l. promotion of green infrastructure to complement infrastructure;	Sustainable Development	The development intends to use natural vegetation to provide an additional visual buffer between the apartment building and the residential neighbourhood to the north.
2.1.1(m)	m. encouraging a mix of land uses that provide for employment, education, personal service and convenience retail in close proximity to residential land uses, subject to compatibility matters as outlined in Section 2.7	Sustainable Development	The proposed development adds to the mix of land uses within the area including the provision of rental units in a variety of bedroom configurations.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
2.1.4(e)	<p>In reviewing development applications, the City will promote sustainability through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. practices that conserve or recycle materials, energy, or other resources; 	Sustainable Development	<p>The development makes use of an existing heritage building on the property which is to be repurposed for residential use thereby reducing the amount of green house gas emission which generally go along with new construction.</p> <p>Additionally, a vegetative barrier consisting of trees are intended to form a visual barrier along the north lot line which serves an additional benefit of reducing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.</p>
2.1.1(g)	<p>Most growth will occur within the Urban Boundary, shown on Schedule 2, where development will be directed to achieve greater sustainability through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. maximized use of investments in infrastructure and public amenities; 	Sustainable Development	<p>The site is located within the Urban Boundary and is serviced by a high degree of infrastructure and public amenities including transit service, roads, sidewalks etc. which would be more effectively utilized through the added intensification.</p>
2.1.1(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. parks that are planned to be accessed by urban residents within a ten-minute walk and situated in locations that lessen the need for pedestrians to cross an arterial road or major highway; 	Sustainable Development	<p>The site is within 800 metres distance (approximately 10 minutes walking distance) from a number of parks including Chadwick Parkette; Augusta Common West Park; and, Bert Meunier Common all of which can</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			be accessed without crossing an arterial or major highway.
2.1.1(k)	k. climate positive development;	Sustainable Development	Higher density development located in close proximity to transit offerings is generally perceived as climate positive.
2.1.4(l)	l. design that reduces municipal costs associated with the provision of infrastructure and municipal service delivery over the long term;	Sustainable Development	The more intensive use of the City's linear infrastructure will reduce the cost of the service.
2.1.4(m)	m. encouraging a mix of land uses that provide for employment, education, personal service and convenience retail in close proximity to residential land uses, subject to compatibility matters as outlined in Section 2.7;	Sustainable Development	The development proposes rental units in a variety of configurations which will aid in the mix of land uses.
2.2.4	The Urban Boundary shown by the dashed line on Schedule 2 has been established to recognize the substantially built up areas of the City where major sewer, water and transportation infrastructure has been planned. The land within	City Structure	The subject lands are located within the Urban Boundary and the development would help achieve the City's objective of directing growth to within this area.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>the Urban Boundary will be the focus of growth and development in the City and contains sufficient land to accommodate the projected growth for a planning horizon of 2036. The Area Specific Phasing area within the Urban Boundary is subject to site-specific urban growth management policies. The Special Planning Area sites are also within the Urban Boundary and are now committed to a substantial land use but could accommodate future growth.</p>		
2.2.5	<p>Housing Districts are planned to remain stable in accordance with Section 2.6 of this Plan, but will continue to mature and adapt as the City evolves. Re-investment and upgrading will be encouraged through minor infilling and minor development (i.e., that which can integrate compatibility within the prevailing built form standards of height, density and amenity that are generally found in the neighbourhood). Housing Districts will be designated for residential uses of different types, but will also contain areas of open space, community</p>	City Structure	<p>Portions of the subject lands are located with the City's Housing Districts. As outlined throughout the proposed development does not compromise the stability of the surrounding area and demonstrates its compatibility with the surrounding built form of the neighbourhood in which the site is located.</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	facilities and commercial uses.		
2.4.1(a)	<p>The City supports sustainable development of a compact, efficient, urban area with a mix of land uses and residential unit densities that optimize the efficient use of land in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. reduce infrastructure and public facility costs; 	Phasing of Growth	<p>The development proposes a density of 209 units per hectare which makes efficient use of the City’s linear infrastructure such as water and wastewater pipes and road network. The density proposed is located on multiple existing transit routes and would aid in making this service more viable.</p>
2.4.1(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions; 	Phasing of Growth	<p>The proposed wood frame construction is less resource intensive than steel or concrete building and provides housing in a form which is transit supportive thereby allowing for ongoing reduction in greenhouse gas emissions through a greater share of public transit use.</p>
2.4.1(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. support active transportation and viable public transit; 	Phasing of Growth	See 2.4.1(a) and (b)
2.4.1(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. conserve agriculture and natural resources within the City; and 	Phasing of Growth	<p>The higher density development prevents the undue sprawl of lower density housing further into the natural and agricultural areas.</p>
2.4.1(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. reduce reliance on private vehicles. 	Phasing of Growth	<p>The proposed development provides</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			<p>ample bike infrastructure and is transit supportive.</p> <p>The location in close proximity to grocery and other daily needs will allow a greater share of the residents to make use of active transportation and reduce their reliance on private vehicles.</p>
2.4.4(b)	<p>New residential development and new secondary plans are subject to the following policies and minimum densities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. for large-scale developments and greenfield areas, a minimum of 37.5 residential units per net hectare is established for new residential development in order to be transit supportive; 	Phasing of Growth	The development achieves this minimum and supports transit oriented development.
2.6.1.	It is the intent of this Plan to promote development in areas where change is desired while protecting stable areas from incompatible development or types of development and rates of change that may be destabilizing.	Protecting Stable Areas	The subject property has frontage on Princess Street, an arterial road and is located on the periphery of a residential neighbourhood. The proposed development has been designed to be compatible with its surroundings and is not expected to destabilize the surrounding neighbourhood. The

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			proposed development is anticipated and desired in this location along the Princess Street Corridor, on the edge of a neighbourhood, in a walkable area that is close to amenities and transit.
2.7.1.	Development and/or land use change must demonstrate that the resultant form, function and use of land are compatible with surrounding land uses.	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The proposed form, function and use are compatible with surrounding land uses. Potential adverse effects that were identified early on in the technical review process have been adequately addressed through a number of mitigation measures that resulted in a refined design.
2.7.2	The demonstration of compatible development and land use change must consider the potential for adverse effects and matters that have the potential to negatively impact the character, planned function and/or ecological integrity of an area, and the health and safety of humans. Where there exists a potential for negative impacts, a land use compatibility study, focused specifically on the identified land use compatibility matters, will be required.	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The applications have demonstrated that the proposed development is not expected to negatively impact the character, planned function and/or ecological integrity of the area and the health and safety of humans. A separate land use compatibility study is not required for the subject applications.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
2.7.3(a)	<p>The land use compatibility matters to be considered under Section 2.7.2 include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>a. shadowing;</p>	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>A revised Solar Analysis reflecting the updated which have increased the stepbacks and removed much of the fifth and sixth storey massing from the far east side of the building. The resultant shadows have no impact on the abutting northern properties between the spring and fall equinoxes as shadows do not project into the rear yards during the times when outdoor enjoyment of backyard spaces is at its highest (e.g., gardening, barbequing, active/passive recreation, etc.). Towards the winter solstice when the sun-angle is at its lowest, shadowing begins to traverse across the rear yards to varying degrees but would not have an undue adverse impact.</p>
2.7.3(b)	<p>b. loss of privacy due to intrusive overlook;</p>	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>Balconies have been removed along the north wall of the building above the second storey while a fence and vegetative buffer further mitigate any impact. The fifth floor terrace has been reoriented towards the east while a garden feature has been added to the northern edge.</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
2.7.3(c)	c. increased levels of light pollution, noise, odour, dust or vibration;	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>Adverse effects due to the generation of odour, dust, light pollution or noise are not anticipated to result from the proposed development. A lighting plan will be required at the time of site plan control to ensure that there are no adverse impacts with respect to lights spilling over onto any adjacent residential properties.</p> <p>A noise study has been prepared to the satisfaction of the City and a Detailed Noise Study will be required at the site plan control stage to ensure that the proposed development implements any necessary on-site mitigation to meets the Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks NPC-300 Guidelines for both the residents of the building and adjacent sensitive uses.</p>
2.7.3(d)	d. increased and uncomfortable wind speed;	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The proposed development is not anticipated to result in any increased or uncomfortable wind speeds.
2.7.3(e)	e. increased level of traffic that can disrupt the intended function or amenity of a use	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The proposed development is not anticipated to create an increased level of traffic

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>or area or cause a decrease in the functionality of active transportation or transit;</p>		<p>that would disrupt the function or amenity of a use or area or cause a decrease in the functionality of active transportation or transit.</p> <p>A Traffic Impact Study was submitted in support of the application. The conclusion of the reports is that the existing road network can accommodate the increase in traffic that would be generated by the development.</p>
2.7.3(f)	<p>f. environmental damage or degradation;</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility Principles</p>	<p>The site does not have any environmentally sensitive areas, and where trees are lost through the development, they would be compensated for through the City's Trees By-law, including through the provision of a treed barrier affording a greater separation between the development and the lots further north.</p>
2.7.3(g)	<p>g. diminished service levels because social or physical infrastructure necessary to support a use or area are overloaded;</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility Principles</p>	<p>Diminished service levels are not anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed development. The development will make efficient use of the existing available water and road infrastructure and will have sanitary capacity.</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
2.7.3(h)	h. reduction in the ability to enjoy a property, or the normal amenity associated with it, including safety and access, outdoor areas, heritage or setting;	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>The proposed development is not anticipated to result in the reduction of residents adjacent to the subject property from being able to enjoy their properties. The Solar Analysis demonstrates that shadows do not encroach onto the abutting properties between the spring and fall equinox when outdoor activities are the most common.</p> <p>A Heritage Impact Study has been submitted which confirms that the proposed apartment building would compliment the built heritage feature through a 30 metre setback and building step back features which act to frame the heritage building.</p>
2.7.3(i)	i. visual intrusion that disrupts the streetscape or buildings;	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>The step-backs to the rear of the building maintain a near 45 degree angular plane to the rear property line aiding in the transition between the six-storey building to the three-storey base and the two storey residences further north.</p> <p>The building fills in a vacant and underutilized part of the site with a compatible built form that</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			transitions to both the heritage structure and the neighbourhood to the north.
2.7.3(j)	j. degradation of cultural heritage resources;	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The Heritage Impact Study has confirmed the development is compatible with the heritage building.
2.7.3(k)	k. architectural incompatibility in terms of scale, style, massing and colour; or,	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The development is similar in form to a five storey building further east along Princess Street while the site integrates with the residential area to the north through step-backs and setbacks. See also 2.7.3.(i)
2.7.3(l)	l. the loss or impairment of significant views of cultural heritage resources and natural features and areas to residents.	Land Use Compatibility Principles	See 2.7.3(j)
2.7.6(a)	Only development proposals that meet the long-term needs of the intended users or occupants will be supported. Proponents, whether developing individual buildings on a single site, or multiple buildings being built at one time or phased over time, will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The proposed density is 209 dwelling units per net hectare, which is a level of intensification that is supported by the site's location along an intensification corridor, in proximity to employment, commercial, recreational and institutional uses and also near public transit. The scale and massing are appropriate for the property on which the

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>the functional needs of the occupants or users will be met by providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. suitable scale, massing and density in relation to existing built fabric; 		<p>development is proposed in that appropriate transition features such as step backs and buffers are used to separate the surrounding uses.</p>
2.7.6(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. appropriate landscaping that meets or improves the characteristic green space amenity of the site and surroundings and enhances the City's tree planting program; 	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>A vegetative buffer is proposed along the north lot line while green space and amenity area are afforded throughout the building and upon the lot.</p> <p>A total of 40% of the lot is to remain as greenspace which is predominantly located at the northern end of the site.</p>
2.7.6(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. adequate land area and appropriate site configuration or provision for land assembly, as required; 	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>The site makes use of an irregularly shaped lot, but accommodates sufficient space for amenity and parking area.</p>
2.7.6(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. efficient use of municipal services, including transit; 	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>The proposed development does not require the expansion of any services, and allows for a more cost effective form of delivery of existing services.</p>
2.7.6(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. appropriate infill of vacant or under-utilized land; and, 	Land Use Compatibility Principles	<p>The majority of the site has remained vacant and the proposed development makes efficient use of the site.</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
2.7.6(f)	f. clearly defined and safe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site access; • pedestrian access to the building and parking spaces; • amenity areas; • building entry; and, • parking and secure and appropriate bicycle facilities. 	Land Use Compatibility Principles	The proposed configuration makes appropriate accommodation for amenity areas and allows for site access, and building entry and parking consistent with the principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design)
2.8.5	Stormwater runoff will be managed on site where feasible, and runoff may be required to be stored, treated and directed away from the natural heritage system. Its quantity will be required to be controlled to prevent impact on downstream areas. Stormwater connections are not permitted in areas where combined sewer infrastructure exists in the City.	Protection of Resources	Through the development of the site, existing standing water issues would be resolved through the implementation of a Storm Water Management Plan which would coincide with the development.
4.6.3	The reconstruction of existing roads and the construction of new roads within settlement areas are to include safe, convenient and accessible pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks, corner ramps, pedestrian signals and crosswalks of universal design. The enhancement of roadways, sidewalks, sidewalk safety barriers,	Transportation	Pedestrian and street linkages are enhanced in this transit oriented site through the implementation of sidewalks and the separation and delineation of the existing driveway which flanks the neighbouring property.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	and transit facilities to maximize mobility and access for all will be required in all construction and reconstruction projects.		
7.4.1	The Archaeological Master Plan is intended to manage archaeological resources in the City and provide policy direction in assessing areas of archaeological potential.	Archaeological Resource Conservation	The site has been cleared of Archaeological Potential.
8.4	<p>Through the review of development proposals, construction of public works, or the preparation and approval of area plans, the City will promote the provision of barrier-free access and safety by:</p> <p>a. providing for age-friendly needs and the requirements of people with disabilities, and others requiring access supports through improved amenities such as parking, benches, and washrooms, clear signage, visual or auditory indicators, and other means as appropriate;</p> <p>b. improving public security through enhanced lighting, visibility of public areas, provision of entrance locations in well-traveled</p>	Urban Design - Accessibility and Safety	The proposal will be designed to meet minimum standards of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). The site will comply with the minimum parking standards for barrier free access. Details such as lighting, signage, benches, signage, emergency routing, clear entry ways will be addressed through site plan control. Efforts to incorporate CPTED principles will be addressed through site plan control to ensure that there is a sense of safety throughout the property. The urban design study indicates that tactile warning plates and coherent pedestrian crossing locations should be incorporated to facilitate a comfortable,

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>areas, and ease of access for emergency personnel or vehicles;</p> <p>c. clearly defining building entrances and avoiding designs that would create areas that are hidden from public view and thus potentially available for criminal activity;</p> <p>d. arranging public uses and amenities within a convenient walking distance;</p> <p>e. providing adequate walkway widths, visually permeable materials and structures, and landscaping elements that do not obstruct sightlines in the design of streetscapes, transportation facilities, or public buildings and places; and,</p> <p>f. promoting safe environments by applying Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concepts and principles in the design of buildings, site layout and landscaping of development sites.</p>		safe and accessible site for pedestrians.
8.6	The City requires the design of new development to be visually compatible with	Urban Design – New Development	The siting, scale and design of the building are an appropriate response to the design cues given

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>surrounding neighbourhoods and areas of cultural heritage value or interest through its site plan control review, preparation of zoning standards, and urban design guidelines, as appropriate, that address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. siting, scale and design of new development in relation to the characteristics of the surrounding neighbourhood or the significant cultural heritage resources including, scale, massing, setbacks, access, landscaped treatment, building materials, exterior design elements or features; b. protecting natural heritage features and areas and cultural heritage landscapes through the siting, design and review of new development; c. promoting innovation in building design to create an interesting and varied built environment, to increase sustainability by improving energy efficiency, and to deliver barrier-free accessibility; <p>achieving compatibility in land use and with a predominant architectural</p>		<p>by the fact that the site is located along a mixed use intensification corridor on the outer limits of the Cataraqui North neighbourhood. It has a similar scale and interface with its surroundings to that of the Retirement residence currently under construction at 2666 Princess Street and the apartment building at 2274 Princess Street.</p> <p>The proposed inner courtyard and step-backs at the north and south sides of the building will contribute to the variety of built form of the area and is consistent with the Official Plan policies that strive for a diverse, inclusive and barrier free built environment.</p> <p>The proposed development is compatible from a land use perspective and the proposed architectural style of the building will make a positive contribution to the streetscape. The buildings fit and function are suitable for the site and its context. The proposals consistency with the land use compatibility policies of Section 2.7 of the Official</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	style, street pattern or site arrangement where that style or arrangement forms a valuable component of the existing neighbourhood or the cultural heritage value or interest of the identified area. Section 2.7 provides additional policy in this regard;		Plan have been addressed within this exhibit.
9.3.2	<p>Every application for amendment to this Plan will be evaluated on the basis of the following general considerations and any others that are pertinent to the particular application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the conformity of the proposed amendment to the general intent and philosophy of this Plan, particularly the vision and planning principles, including sustainability, stability and compatibility outlined in Section 2, and consistency with provincial policy; b. the availability and suitability of land already designated for the proposed use, and the need for (or market feasibility of) the proposed use; c. the compatibility of the proposal, or the adequacy of proposed mechanisms for achieving compatibility, 	Administration & Implementation – Official Plan Amendments - Criteria	<p>The proposed official plan amendment, including the request for a Site-Specific Policy Area conforms to the general intent of the Official Plan from a sustainability, stability and compatibility perspective. The proposed amendment is consistent with the PPS (2020).</p> <p>Although both the Residential and Arterial Commercial land use designations permit high density residential, it is desired to remove the dual designation on the lands and consolidate it to one designation for ease of interpretation moving forward. It is desired to make better use of this serviced parcel that is located on Princess Street to add a type of housing that is currently absent in the Cataraqui North neighbourhood.</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	<p>with adjacent and planned uses, including cultural heritage resources and natural heritage features and areas;</p> <p>d. the potential of the proposal to cause instability within an area intended to remain stable;</p> <p>e. the ability of the City's infrastructure to accommodate the proposal without costly expansion, upgrading, or required deferral of other planned infrastructure improvements in other areas of the City;</p> <p>f. the financial implications (both costs and revenues) to the City;</p> <p>g. the degree to which approval of the amendment would establish an undesirable precedent; and,</p> <p>h. consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement and provincial legislation and guidelines.</p>		<p>The proposed development has been mitigated to achieve land use compatibility, including compatibility with adjacent cultural heritage resources and the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>As the proposed development has been evaluated to be compatible, it is not expected to create any instability within the neighbourhood.</p> <p>There is existing water and road infrastructure to service the proposed development.</p> <p>There are no anticipated negative financial impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>The OLT has affirmed on multiple occasions that land use planning decisions do not constitute precedent. The subject site is located in a Secondary Plan Area and there are no other comparable parcels of underutilized lands located on an arterial road within the Cataraqui North neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed within Exhibit E as being consistent with</p>

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			the Provincial Policy Statement (2020).
9.5.9(a)	<p>When considering an application to amend the zoning by-law, the Planning Committee and Council will have regard to such matters as:</p> <p>a. conformity of the proposal with the intent of the Official Plan policies and schedules;</p>	By-Laws	The proposed zoning by-law amendment conforms to the intent of the Official Plan policies and schedules as proposed to be amended through the concurrent application for official plan amendment.
9.5.9(b)	<p>b. compatibility of the proposal with existing uses and zones, sensitive uses, the natural heritage system, cultural heritage resources, and compatibility with future planned uses in accordance with this Plan;</p>	By-Laws	The proposed development includes elements of mitigation in terms of the fencing, landscaping requirements as well as the rear yard setback and height map to ensure that the built form will achieve compatibility with existing uses, zones and adjacent cultural heritage resources.
9.5.9(c)	<p>c. compatibility of proposed buildings or structures with existing buildings and structures, with zoning standards of adjacent sites, with any future planned standards as provided in this Plan, and with any urban design guidelines adopted by the City for the area;</p>	By-Laws	The proposal has been refined to lower the height and increase the setback at the rear of the site. The proposed building generally achieves a 45 degree angular plane (i.e., 47 degrees), which is one method of reducing compatibility concerns by creating built form transition and reducing shadowing impacts.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
9.5.9(d)	d. the extent to which the proposal is warranted in this location and the extent to which areas zoned for the proposed use are available for development;	By-Laws	The subject site is located on the City's primary corridor, where residential intensification is desired. This development is a unique opportunity to add much needed variety in housing type and affordability within the Cataraqui North neighbourhood.
9.5.9(e)	e. the suitability of the site for the proposal, including its ability to meet all required standards of loading, parking, open space or amenity areas;	By-Laws	The propose density is desirable and suitable for its proposed location. The proposal meets requirements with respect to landscaped open space and amenity areas and parking for residents has been provided in accordance with the Zoning By-law while minor deviations in the car-share and visitor parking and bike spaces reflect the site's location along an active transit corridor.
9.5.9(f)	f. the suitability of the density relative to the neighbourhood and/or district, in terms of units per hectare, bedrooms per hectare, floor space index, and/or employees per hectare, as applicable;	By-Laws	As outlined throughout this Exhibit, the development is suitable for the neighbourhood.
9.5.9(g)	g. the impact on municipal	By-Laws	No negative impacts on municipal infrastructure

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	infrastructure, services and traffic;		servicing or roads are expected as a result of this development.
9.5.9(h)	h. comments and submissions of staff, agencies and the public; and,	By-Laws	Comments from the public and comments from the technical review have resulted in successful revisions to the proposed design.
9.5.9(i)	i. the degree to which the proposal creates a precedent.	By-Laws	The OLT has affirmed on several occasions that Planning Act decisions do not create precedent.
10C.1.6	To promote excellence and innovation in urban and environmental design that is sensitive to, and scaled to, the natural and built environments.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan - Objectives	The proposed development will make a positive urban design contribution to the streetscape and the building design has employed many strategies to ensure that it is scaled and sensitive to the surrounding built environment.
10C.1.7	To encourage the preservation of significant features of the natural environment, such as watercourses and stands of mature trees, and integrate such resources into proposed developments, wherever possible.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan - Objectives	There are no significant natural heritage features on the site. Trees that are removed will be subject to compensation in a manner that is consistent with the City's Tree By-Law.
10C.1.8	To ensure that the safety and security of all neighbourhood residents is the prime consideration in all aspects of the	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan - Objectives	The safety and security of neighbourhood residents is not expected to be negatively impacted

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	planning and development of the neighbourhood.		by the proposed development.
10C.1.9	To integrate compatible land uses in order to achieve a more cohesive and safe neighbourhood.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan - Objectives	The proposed mid-rise apartment building represents compatible integration with the adjacent Walnut Grove neighbourhood. Adding more “eyes” on the area in terms of residents instead of a vacant, unlit parcel of land will increase the sense of cohesiveness and safety of the neighbourhood.
10C.1.11	To ensure that development and the provision of municipal services occurs in an efficient and economical manner, and provides an adequate supply of serviced land.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan - Objectives	The proposed development will make efficient use of available and upcoming servicing.
10C.1.12	To ensure that proposed development complements adjoining existing land uses, including environmental and heritage resources.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan - Objectives	The development has been designed to be compatible with the heritage resources on the property while design considerations have been developed to ensure compatibility with the abutting residential area.
10C.3.1	The Residential land use designation means that: the predominant use of land and buildings is for residential purposes; and, other uses which are complementary to and	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies – General	The proposed development is a residential use and is therefore consistent with the Residential land use designation of the Cataraqui North Secondary Plan.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
	serve principal residential uses such as elementary schools and parkettes are also permitted.	Residential Policies	
10C.3.2	A variety of compatible housing types and building styles are encouraged in order to accommodate the different and changing needs of the community.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies - General Residential Policies	The apartment rental units will add to the mix of housing types and building options to accommodate the different and changing needs of the community.
10C.3.3	Over-concentration of any one housing type or building design are discouraged.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies - General Residential Policies	The neighbourhood predominantly contains low density residential uses and therefore the proposed multi-unit development helps to diversify the housing options available in this neighbourhood.
10C.3.4	At least 25 percent of the approved residential units must be for affordable housing.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies - General Residential Policies	The proposed development adds to the degree of affordability of units within the neighbourhood.
10C.3.5	Residential areas must be designed to allow for convenient pedestrian movement incorporating universal design standards.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies - General Residential Policies	The future site plan control application will be reviewed to ensure that minimum universal design standards are achieved for exterior pedestrian areas of the site.

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
10C.3.6	An overall density of development, sufficient to foster a healthy and safe neighbourhood environment in which a wide range of services, amenities and employment opportunities can be provided in an efficient and financially-sustainable manner, is encouraged.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies - General Residential Policies	The proposed density is appropriate for the site, contributes to a healthy and safe neighbourhood and is located with ease of access to a wide range of services, amenities and employment opportunities.
10C.3.7	Varying densities of development, calculated on a net area basis, will be distributed throughout the neighbourhood to ensure that a high proportion of residents will live within a short walking distance of local facilities and services.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies - General Residential Policies	Permitting the proposed high density residential use on the subject site is consistent with this policy. Residents of the building will be able to enjoy short walks to local facilities and services.
10C.3.9	Every reasonable effort will be made to ensure that any proposed development is compatible with existing adjacent residential areas	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – Residential Policies - General Residential Policies	Significant modifications have been made to the proposed development to strike a more appropriate balance between residential intensification and compatibility with existing adjacent residential areas.
10C.3.28	Any form of high density residential housing which conforms to the development, density and building height policies outlined below is permitted.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – High Density Residential Policies	The proposed high density development conforms to the high density residential policies of the Cataraqui North Secondary Plan, with the exception of density. A site-specific policy is proposed to permit a slight increase in

Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			density from 125 units per net hectare to 264.
10C.3.29	The density of development for high density residential housing is intended to range from 27 to 125 dwelling units per net hectare of land.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – High Density Residential Policies	The proposed density of the development is overall 209 units per net hectare, which exceeds the intended range within the Cataraqui North Secondary Plan Area. In the event of a severance of these lands, the resultant density would be 264 and 14 units per hectare but would allow an appropriate intensification of an under utilized site as well as the adaptive re-use of a heritage building. Overall, while there is an increase in the units per hectare, the site is within the height limit of eight storeys.
10C.3.30	The maximum building height in high density residential areas is eight storeys.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – High Density Residential Policies	The proposed height range between 3 and 6 storeys is well below the maximum of 8 storeys established through this policy.
10C.3.31	High density residential buildings must be oriented to the street in order to create a prominent building presence along the street and in a manner that is compatible with adjacent development.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – High Density Residential Policies	The proposed Site-Specific Policy Area includes a policy for the site to acknowledge it as an irregularly shaped parcel with limited frontage on Princess Street and that the implementing zoning by-law and site plan control


Section	Policy	Category	Conformity with the Policy
			will be used to orient the building to the street to greatest extent possible given the limitations of the parcel configuration.
10C.3.32	Integrating apartment buildings and other multiple dwelling housing forms with adjoining uses must be encouraged provided the clustering of such uses into isolated enclaves is avoided.	Cataraqui North Secondary Plan – High Density Residential Policies	The proposed development is contiguous to the Walnut Grove neighbourhood and resident of the building will be located within walking distance of existing open space amenities of the Cataraqui North neighbourhood.




Planning Committee
Kingston Zoning By-Law 2022-62

Address: 2312 Princess St
 File Number: D35-004-2022

- Subject Lands
- Schedule 1 Zoning Map**
- Zone
- Not Subject to the Kingston Zoning By-law
- Schedule E - Exception Overlay**
- Legacy Exceptions (LXXX)
- Exceptions (EXXX)
- Schedule F - Holding Overlay**
- Holding Overlay (HXXX)





D35-007-2020
APPROVED

NOTES
CONTRACTOR MUST CHECK AND VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE FIRM BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK. ALL DIMENSIONS FORMER THE PROPERTY OF THE FIRM.

NO.	ISSUED TO	DATE	BY

Site Statistics

UNIT BREAKDOWN		GREENSPACE ±4,585 m ²	
Studio	48	Art Line Bed	49,352 m ²
1 Bed Units	48	±40% OF LOT AREA	
2 Bed Units	39	AMENITY SPACE	
Total	300	Common Room	±385 m ²
PARKING RATIO 0.98:		Patio/Balcony	±160 m ²
64 SURFACE SPACES		10,301 m ²	
12 UPGROUND STACKED		ROOF TOP ± 737 m ²	
234 UPGROUND SPACES		7,933 m ²	
234 SPACES TOTAL		GREENSPACE ± 4,585 m²	
Total Bike Parking (258 spaces)		89,352 m ²	
LOT AREA ±1,141,426.80 m ² (±11,371,680 ft ²) (121,455 ft ²)		TOTAL ± 5,583 m ² (70,646 ft ²)	
BUILDING ± 4,675 m ² (50,300 ft ²)		Site Coverage 41%	
GFA RES. ± 261,346 m ²		NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION UNITS, DIMS AND RATES	



PROJECT 1
2312 PRINCESS ST

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN


SCALE:	DATE: 5/1/23
JOB NUMBER:	DRAWING NO.:
DRAWN BY:	





















































































































































Site Photos

View from Princess Street & Anderson Drive looking north



Image Courtesy of Google Streetview

View from Ellesmeer Avenue & Anderson Drive looking southwest



Image Courtesy of Google Streetview

View from western side of Subject Lands looking north-northeast



View from Ellesmeer Avenue looking South



View from Anderson Drive at rear Entrance of RONA looking northwest



View from mid section of Subject Lands looking north



Comparison – 2274 Princess Street as viewed from Ellesmeer Avenue



Comparison – 2274 Princess Street as viewed from Ellesmeer Avenue



Comparison – 2274 Princess Street as viewed from Ellesmeer Avenue



Comparison – 2274 Princess Street as viewed from Ellesmeer Avenue






CITY OF KINGSTON Public Notice Notification Map

Address: 2312 Princess St
File Number: D35-004-2022

- Subject Lands
- Property Boundaries
- 120m Public Notice Boundary
- 77 Properties in Receipt of Public Notice



Clendening, Ian

From: mobrien [REDACTED] >
Sent: October 17, 2023 1:14 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: Re: Revised Submission - D35-004-2022 (2312 Princess Street)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Ian,

Sorry for the delay in getting back to you regarding some questions I have re: the latest news and DASH postings for the 2312 Princess St. development.

After having some quiet time to examine the newest reports submitted by the developer, as well as your own added comments, there still are a few questions remaining, if you don't mind answering.

1. You have stated that "only juliet balconies are permitted ABOVE the 2nd floor for those units facing towards Ellesmeer Avenue.". Am I correct in assuming then that the balconies on the north wall for levels 1 and 2 inclusive will definitely be regular, deep balconies?

2. Under the Sept. 26th submission titled "4th Submission ZBA-OPA Tracker, no. 17 - there is still reference to u-turns being permitted at the intersection of Andersen and Princess Sts. for those exiting and wanting to go east on Princess St. to the downtown area. Is that correct? As most know who travel through that intersection on a daily basis, that intersection is already rife with heavy traffic issues (barely safe for pedestrians to cross, super speeding cars through that intersection, heavy load of automobiles) and the thought of having u-turns allowed at that spot suggests even worse traffic issues. It is hard to be reassured that that intersection can tolerate further sudden, unpredictable and heavier flow of traffic with travellers deciding to do u-turns. Perhaps we are not understanding that correctly and would appreciate clarification.

3. The solar/shadowing study from May 23, 2023 remains very troublesome as it continues to demonstrate that at certain times of year (especially Dec. and surrounding weeks) precious daylight will definitely be obstructed for many who live to the north of the building. Thus we are still asking that the height of the building be reduced to remain the same as 2274 Princess Street - ie. max. 4 floors on the north side. This was an adjustment that was granted to those involved in the 2274 project in the planning stages and we feel we should be offered the same concession. As you are aware, 2312 is a much larger building on a much smaller piece of property and its overstated size continues to be clearly problematic to abutting residents.

If you can address any of these concerns or clarify any points, I would greatly appreciate it. I am organizing a meeting in Nov. with Walnut Grove residents who are gravely concerned and I would like to be able to clarify some of these points. And it would just be good that we have the same understanding of proposals when working with your Planning Services department.

With thanks,
Mary O'Brien

Clendening, Ian

From: nancy lovell [REDACTED] >
Sent: October 2, 2023 9:35 AM
To: Clendening, Ian
Cc: Chaves, Paul
Subject: Re: Revised Submission - D35-004-2022 (2312 Princess Street)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Ian,

I thank you for the latest updates to the 2312 Princess St. Patry Property Development. I am very pleased and thankful to see the amendment by zoning department to prohibit the proposed road along the back of our properties.

Unfortunately, I see little else has been changed or addressed by the developer.

The apartment development is 'still ' a mere 12.4 meters from my fenceline. Given our back gardens are not deep in lot size, that is incredibly close for a building that will tower above. It's enough that I have lost any pleasing view but now I will be staring right into the second floor apartments from my livingroom where I spend 90% of my time. This is the main reason I 'seriously' request the adoption of julliette balconies ONLY on the north east and north west wings of the apartment unit. There is no reason why this cannot be adopted. It's planned on all other floors. Only the developer will gain from the balconies as they can charge a premium for an apartment with a balcony. I would like to hope your department and the city will adopt this proposal. I feel since the zoning was changed for this plot of land my voice has been lost with its development.

The increased volume of residents in this development and that of the unit to the east will have an immediate impact on myself and fellow residents along Ellesmeer, and surrounding neighborhood. None of which will be remotely positive in nature.

Therefore I respectfully desire the city, and planning department to support us in many of these requests moving ahead in the next phase.

Kindest regards,
Nancy Lovell
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Ellesmeer Ave

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

On Thu, Sept 28, 2023 at 4:22 p.m., Clendening, Ian
<iclendening@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

By way of this e-mail, I wanted to keep you up-to-date regarding the proposed Official Plan & Zoning By-law amendment for the property at 2312 Princess Street (Our file D35-004-2022) which you have previously provided comment on.

Through the review of the last submission referenced in the correspondence of May 15, the applicant has made further revisions to the proposal. The full submission is available on the City's DASH portal.

Some of the key revisions to the proposal include:

- In response to concerns over traffic safety, access to Princess Street would be limited to a 'right-in only' entrance.
- In response to concerns that a private road could be placed along the north lot line in the future, an additional provision has been added to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment which specifically prohibits such. A landscape buffer is also required along this property line.

The latest submission maintains the building setbacks, including step backs at various heights, which were put forward during the last submission, and described more particularly as:

- 1st – 3rd storey: setback 12.4 metres
- 4th storey: setback 13.6 metres
- 5th – 6th storey: setback 19.2 metres

Only juliet balconies are permitted above the 2nd floor for those units facing towards Ellesmeer Avenue.

At this time, City staff are reviewing the material and invite the public to review the proposal as revised. I can confirm that future correspondence will be sent at such time as a Public Meeting has been scheduled.

All comments put forward to date will form a part of the public record and put before the Planning Committee at the time of the Public Meeting, and I invite any comment you may have on the application as revised which would be afforded the same benefit as well as consideration during the current staff review.

Kindly,



Ian Clendening (he/him/his)

Senior Planner

Planning Services

City of Kingston

Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard,



216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 extension 3126

iclendening@cityofkingston.ca

The City of Kingston acknowledges that we are on the traditional homeland of the Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat, and thanks these nations for their care and stewardship over this shared land.

From: Clendening, Ian
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2023 2:05 PM
Subject: Revised Submission - D35-004-2022 (2312 Princess Street)

Further to your interest in the application for Official Plan & Zoning By-law amendment for the property at 2312 Princess Street (Our file D35-004-2022), I wanted to advise you that the applicant has provided revisions to the proposal.

At this time, Staff are undertaking a review of the material submitted, and by way of this correspondence, I wanted to afford you an early opportunity to review the proposal as revised.

Further notice will be provided once a Public Meeting has been scheduled.

All material can be accessed at the following link: <https://aca-prodca.accela.com/KINGSTON/Cap/CapDetail.aspx?Module=Planning&TabName=Planning&capID1=REC22&capid2=00000&capid3=000VM&agencycode=kingston&IsToShowInspection>

Once you click through the hyperlink click the “Record Info” drop down menu to select “Supporting Information” as illustrated below. This will bring you to a list of all documents available.



[Home](#) [Permits](#) [Planning](#)

Search for Development Applications

Record D35-004-2022:
OPA, ZBA, DPC, DPS
Record Status: In Technical Review

Record Info ▾


Record
Details

Processing
Status

Related
Records

Supporting
Information

Application



Kindly,



Ian Clendening (he/him/his)

Senior Planner

Planning Services

City of Kingston

Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard,

216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 extension 3126

iclendening@cityofkingston.ca



The City of Kingston acknowledges that we are on the traditional homeland of the Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat, and thanks these nations for their care and stewardship over this shared land.

Clendening, Ian

From: Virginia Jones [REDACTED] >
Sent: July 1, 2023 4:32 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: 2312 Princess St. Kingston

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Mr. Clendening

I am a resident of Walnut Grove backing onto the proposed apartment building at 2312 Princess St.

I would like to address my concerns regarding this proposal.

* The property is too small to build a six storey apartment building. Where is the green space going to be & will there be room for trees.?

*Two levels of underground parking means a lot of blasting which potentially could result in large cracks in the foundations of all the homes backing onto this area, not to mention the cracking of interior walls.

*Traffic congestion and accidents are bound to occur. Princess St. at Andersen is busy now and the 1st. apartment building is not even occupied yet.

Did the traffic studies take into account peak hours of traffic along Princess St.? Traffic along Princess at the Sydenham rd intersection is already heavily congested with traffic lineups all the way back to the former Ambassador hotel from Sydenham rd. Is putting hundreds of more housing in this area supposed to make this traffic problem better?

Emergency vehicles Ambulance and Fire go along Princess St. on a daily basis. Princess St. being a main artery for them to get to a lot of other areas . With added traffic & congestion could mean delay in these emergency vehicles , which delay could lead to a life & death situation .Please take this Traffic concern seriously when considering YOUR DECISION .

*Privacy for residents is a major concern as well for the homes backing onto the property. A towering building will overtake the back yards, there will be no privacy. There will be increased noise , no sun getting to the yards . Trees will be gone .It will be a wood and concrete jungle behind the homes.

** Please consider these concerns and leave the property as Low Density.

Regards Virginia Jones

Sent from my iPad

Clendening, Ian

From: Diane Anderson [REDACTED] >
Sent: June 14, 2023 1:06 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: Development at 2312 Princess St. (File No. D35-004-2022)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the City of Kingston Planning committee,

This is a follow-up to my original letter sent to you on August 2 2022.

I oppose that the zoning for this area be changed to allow a high-density residential building to be constructed. The proposed 6 storey building will not "blend in" with the surrounding buildings.

I am not against the land being developed but it should not overshadow the surrounding houses, including the heritage house that is on the property.

From the shadow report it looks like the houses to the north of the proposed building will be in the dark for most of December. The way these houses were designed means that most of us spend the majority of our waking hours on the south side of our houses. We all have walk-out basements to a very small backyard. We also have large windows on the south wall of our houses and a balcony on the main level. I just moved into my house 2.5 years ago and the main reason I chose this house was because of the south facing windows and doors. I know I have a choice and can move but moving is not in-expensive and not a pleasant task for a retired senior.

I do pay a significant amount of property tax to live in my moderate house here on Ellesmeer. I also currently feel safe and secure here.

I am also concerned about the impact that a 300 plus unit residential building will have on the vehicular traffic in the area. Andersen Drive at that end is relatively busy as it is. It is sometimes difficult to safely cross Andersen on foot at Ellesmeer. Princess Street(Hwy 2) is also currently a very busy thoroughfare. I think a new traffic study should be done after the new building at 2274 Princess St. is occupied. Where 2274 exits onto Princess St is a tricky spot with it being just beyond the curve going up the hill and past Tim Hortons. And this is just west of two busy intersections at Counter Blvd. and Sydenham Rd. And with there being a right hand turn only when exiting 2274 will greatly affect the traffic heading west on Princess St. It will also increase the traffic on Andersen as people head North on it to get to the 401, Sydenham Rd. Cataraqui Woods Drive and other areas to the north.

I would like to see some kind of development at 2312 Princess St. but a 6 storey residential building with 302 units and two floors underground for parking is just too much.

I hope the planning committee will work with the residents in the area and hopefully something can be built that will not have a huge adverse impact on anyone. We would like to maintain our peaceful park-like community as much as possible.

Thank you for your consideration,
Diane Anderson
161 Ellesmeer Ave.
Kingston, ON
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Clendening, Ian](#)
Cc: [Glenn, Conny](#); [Oosterhof, Gary](#); [McLaren, Jeff](#); [Osanic, Lisa](#); [Cinanni, Vincent](#)
Subject: Re: 2312 Princess St. Application
Date: June 12, 2023 1:04:09 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Ian and Planning Committee Members,

We are writing to you with a summary of concerns that we still have as residents directly abutting the building proposal listed below. They are regarding proposals for changes to both the Official Plan and Zoning By-laws Amendment. (We have already sent a letter to Councillor Paul Chaves, who we know is not only our district representative, but also a Planning Committee member.)

Re: Development at 2312 Princess St. (File No. D35-004-2022) J. Patry Inc.

After having read the most recently posted reports (April -May 2023) on DASH, we appreciate some changes made by the developer regarding this address. However, we do ask that you seriously consider our position on the following:

As voiced at the first Public Meeting, in general, we are not in favour of changes made to the Official Plan or Zoning By-laws due its impending overcrowding of this neighbourhood in general, and, of our small retirement community of Walnut Grove in particular. We understand the current need for housing, but this small area of the Loyalist-Catarqui District is already greatly impacted with the elevated density imposed by the new building currently underway at 2374 Princess Street.

1. The height of the building is still a problem. It remains largely at 6 storeys, with the realization that parts have now been stepped back or removed from the top floor to make way for extremely expanded rooftop terraces (totally over 7000 sq. ft.) on the north and northeast sides. Much skepticism is invited about there not being any noise disturbance issues for abutting neighbours.
2. This number of storeys will drastically overpower our (and our neighbours') bungalows and shadowing will STILL be a issue. Even with the reduced height in parts of the stepped building (north side), the shadow (solar) study still shows that we will not get sunlight for a large part of the day during the months of Dec. and the months of either side of this. This is unacceptable to us, as we rely very heavily on light from the south due to the layout design of our houses. The property at 2374 Princess St. had the agreement from the developer to cap it at 4 storeys on the north side for this very reason.
3. While it is evident that, thankfully, the location of the building's

footprint has been moved 2 metres farther south from our property lines, this overgrown structure is still larger than the first building at 2274 Princess St. and we believe it is on a smaller piece of land. Its crowding of abutting property lines does not comply with land use compatibility. In fact, it just adds to the dense, overcrowded congestion in this small community of well-established bungalow homes.

4. The dark colour of the exterior cladding on the bottom 3 storeys emphasizes the immensity of this large structure. Could the developer consider a lighter cladding colour that could be added to the lower floors as well?

For these reasons, we urgently ask that you consider our meaningful concerns. The enjoyment of our homes will be hugely compromised. The element of "balance", found to be an integral part of being "compatible", is drastically lacking.

Thank you for your attention in considering our concerns.

Kind regards,

Mary O'Brien and Grant MacDonald
163 Ellesmeer Avenue

Clendening, Ian

From: Clendening, Ian
Sent: May 29, 2023 9:12 AM
To: M Jones
Subject: RE: D35-004-2022 (2312 Princess Street)

Hi Marc,

Firstly, I wanted to thank you for providing comments and confirm their receipt.

In regards to the comment about the renderings, the omission of these documents has been passed along to the applicant, and I expect to have additional site renderings in the near future.

In regards to your other comments, these concerns are noted and will be passed along to the applicant and will form a part of the public record and put before the Planning Committee for consideration.

As you are aware, no Public Meeting has been scheduled at this time. At such time as a Public Meeting is scheduled, I will ensure you are advised of such.

Kindly,



Ian Clendening (he/him/his)

Senior Planner
Planning Services

City of Kingston
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard,
216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
613-546-4291 extension 3126
iclendening@cityofkingston.ca

The City of Kingston acknowledges that we are on the traditional homeland of the Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat, and thanks these nations for their care and stewardship over this shared land.

From: M Jones [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, May 27, 2023 2:44 PM
To: Clendening, Ian <iclendening@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: D35-004-2022 (2312 Princess Street)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Ian,

I wanted to write to you with my thoughts and concerns regarding 2312 Princess St.

Residents in this area purchased property with rear privacy which will now be eliminated by two apartment buildings. This will overload a small neighbourhood, significantly reducing property values. Current residents near by will experience a large increase in noise and traffic in an area that already has traffic problems.

What also needs to be considered traffic wise is all the building that is going on along Taylor Kidd behind Best Buy area. Which will also add significant traffic volumes to the intersection at Princess and Taylor Kidd that is already overloaded. Anyone who frequently drives in this area doesn't need a study to tell them that.

There are several renderings of the proposed building, however they have left out renderings of the rear (north side) of the building that current residents will have to live with.

Andersen Dr, already a heavily travelled street with frequent speeding will be significantly worse. I'd like to propose the speed limit on Andersen Dr be reduced to 40 KM.

The current west bound Princess St bus stop in front of Rona causes a lot of traffic problems by backing traffic through the intersection and preventing right hand turns off Andersen Dr. A pullout should be created at this bus stop so it can completely move off the road when stopping. Or move the bus stop further down the road to the west.

We understand more housing is needed but it should not be done in a way that is a major burden to residents that have already lived there for years and years. Noise levels will increase significantly from current levels due to AC units and exhaust fans.

If the planning committee and developer would take our concerns seriously and keep the property as low density housing with no balconies on the north side.

Marc Jones
155 Ellesmeer Ave Kingston

159 Ellesmeer Avenue
Kingston, ON
K7P 3H6

Ian Clendening, Senior Planner
Planning Services, City of Kingston
216 Ontario St.
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

May 22, 2023

Re: 2312 Princess St. – Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment, File D35-004-2022

Dear Mr. Clendening:

We are writing to you in response to the recently updated reports posted on the DASH site for the above site.

There are many concerns that we have and we feel that the application for the amendments should not be granted because of them. Here is a summary of the problems that this proposal brings to us as residents of Ellesmeer Avenue:

- Lack of privacy remains an issue– the large building so very close to our property contravenes our right to privacy. It is not compatible with existing neighbours' rights to privacy.
- Lack of light – shadowing, we presume, will remain a problem. There is no revised shadow study to confirm this but the 6-storey height segments will still cast darkness on residents' homes.
- This predominantly all-wood construction brings fear of a fire hazard should such an occurrence happen.
- Properties, especially ones along Ellesmeer Avenue, will bear the cost of devaluation due to the crowding of such a massive building which is so very close to neighbours' property lines.
- This high-density building is an addition to the other high-density one already under construction near Tim Horton's. A second such massive building will completely overload our small neighbourhood. Why must one neighbourhood bear the brunt of so much overbuilding?

We would appreciate if you, the Planning Committee and the developer take these issues into consideration in all future review of the proposal to have the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law amendments changed.

Regards,

Nancy Emily Jean Berga
Andy Berga

Nancy Berga and Andy Berga

159 Ellesmeer Avenue

RECEIVED

2 2023

PLANNING DIVISION
CITY OF KINGSTON


Clendening, Ian

From: Clendening, Ian
Sent: May 25, 2023 10:16 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Ian: Re: Revised Submission - D35-004-2022 (2312 Princess Street)

Hi Marry,

Many thanks for your comments and questions. I would like to offer the following:

1. With changes made to the location of the building on the site, terraces, etc., can we have a look at the NEW and accurate shadow study for this? As shadowing is a major concern, we feel it is crucial to have a revised shadowing study to review as well.
 - a. **This item was missed in the initial resubmission. I have reached out to the applicant and it is now available on DASH (you can organize material by date such that it will populate at the top of the list, unfortunately due to file size I am hesitant to attach to this e-mail).**
2. We are wondering why the Conceptual Rendering (3-D concept, not the elevation drawing) has been omitted for the view that residents would see looking south from their properties at the north end of the new building.
 - a. I have reached out to the applicant to provide this modeling.
3. As the proximity of the large structure is so close to adjacent properties on Ellesmeer Ave., it is very important to get a view comparable to all the views from the east and south, which are of less consequence to residents?
 - a. **As noted in (2), I have reached out to the applicant requesting this imagery.**
4. It is confusing that on both slide 1 and slide 2 of the Floor Plans (posted on April 26th) they are labelled "Parking Level 2". They contain slightly different numbers of spaces. Is it possible that this plan is mislabelled and that one of them is actually "Parking Level 1"?
 - a. **This appears to have been a mistake in the labeling of this document with Page 2 of the document intending to read "Parking Level 1" with the floor level correctly labelled at the bottom right of the PDF.**
5. Finally, can you confirm the meaning of "stacked" parking? Does this infer parking with one vehicle 'stacked' horizontally, as opposed to vertically? (This poses the curious question of how those vehicles that are on the interior of the 'stack' remove their vehicles when desired.)
 - a. **That is a great observation, as the underground parking area does in fact consist of a number of parking stalls which are designed one in front of another ("stacked parking" or "tandem parking"). Presumably the two stalls are intended to be allocated to a single unit and I look forward to clarifying some of the details of these ~42 stalls with the applicant. I have provided a small screenshot of the garage plan illustrating an example (stalls immediately below the yellow highlights)**



I will note that there is vertically stacked bike parking so you may need to be attentive as to what is being referred to in a given report/note in the submission

Kindly,

Ian Clendening (he/him/his)
 Senior Planner
 Planning Services

City of Kingston
 Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard,
 216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
 613-546-4291 extension 3126
 iclending@cityofkingston.ca

The City of Kingston acknowledges that we are on the traditional homeland of the Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat, and thanks these nations for their care and stewardship over this shared land.

-----Original Message-----

From: mobrien [REDACTED] t>
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 7:35 PM
To: Clendening, Ian <iclendening@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Ian: Re: Revised Submission - D35-004-2022 (2312 Princess Street)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Ian,

Thank you again for the alert and the opportunity to review the new reports posted on DASH re: the Proposed changes to the Official Plan & Zoning By-law amendment for 2312 Princess Street.

I have now had a chance to look at this in detail, with a few other eyes joining in, and there are four important questions I would like to ask you to answer, if possible.

1. With changes made to the location of the building on the site, terraces, etc., can we have a look at the NEW and accurate shadow study for this? As shadowing is a major concern, we feel it is crucial to have a revised shadowing study to review as well.
2. We are wondering why the Conceptual Rendering (3-D concept, not the elevation drawing) has been omitted for the view that residents would see looking south from their properties at the north end of the new building. As the proximity of the large structure is so close to adjacent properties on Ellesmeier Ave., it is very important to get a view comparable to all the views from the east and south, which are of less consequence to residents?
3. It is confusing that on both slide 1 and slide 2 of the Floor Plans (posted on April 26th) they are labelled "Parking Level 2". They contain slightly different numbers of spaces. Is it possible that this plan is mislabelled and that one of them is actually "Parking Level 1"?
4. Finally, can you confirm the meaning of "stacked" parking? Does this infer parking with one vehicle 'stacked' horizontally, as opposed to vertically? (This poses the curious question of how those vehicles that are on the interior of the 'stack' remove their vehicles when desired.)

Thank you for your time in clarifying these concerns. I would greatly appreciate if you could alert me, too, before the next Public Meeting is announced so as to have a bit more time to organize those wishing to respond.

Kind regards,
Mary

- > Further to your interest in the application for Official Plan & Zoning By-law amendment for the property at 2312 Princess Street (Our file D35-004-2022), I wanted to advise you that the applicant has provided revisions to the proposal.
- > At this time, Staff are undertaking a review of the material
- > submitted,

and by way of this correspondence, I wanted to afford you an early opportunity to review the proposal as revised.

> Further notice will be provided once a Public Meeting has been scheduled.

> All material can be accessed at the following link:

> https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2faca-prodca.accela.com%2fKINGSTON%2fCap%2fCapDetail.aspx%3fModule%3dPlanning%26TabName%3dPlanning%26capID1%3dREC22%26capid2%3d00000%26capid3%3d000VM%26agencycode%3d%26kingston%26IsToShowInspection&c=E,1,VsucE4II2gh_zxSB8J9mtjhJAK-Q-EGiNu0DZKfACDHUUCiKmjdoz6i2Mee4qwNrliH_7BEM0Yuj2pwL-cZQQY9qRno1LUXTSG2IX3bqEJM,&typo=1

> com%2fKINGSTON%2fCap%2fCapDetail.aspx%3fModule%3dPlanning%26TabName%3d

> Planning%26capID1%3dREC22%26capid2%3d00000%26capid3%3d000VM%26agencyco

> de%3d%26kingston%26IsToShowInspection&c=E,1,VsucE4II2gh_zxSB8J9mtjhJAK-Q-

> EGiNu0DZKfACDHUUCiKmjdoz6i2Mee4qwNrliH_7BEM0Yuj2pwL-cZQQY9qRno1LUXTSG2

> IX3bqEJM,&typo=1

Once you click through the hyperlink click the "Record Info" drop down menu to select "Supporting Information" as illustrated below. This will bring you to a list of all documents available.

Clendening, Ian

From: nancy lovell [REDACTED] >
Sent: May 18, 2023 5:58 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: Revisions to 2312 Princess St plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Ian,

I thank you for supplying the supporting information links in order for me to view the proposed revisions. I look forward to zooming into the future meeting.

After I reviewed such, I must say, I was somewhat disappointed with some of the proposed revisions. I see very little changes with regard to the citizens of the north on Ellesmeer Ave and their concerns. Certainly no height or basic size of the apartment unit has dramatically changed. That has been lost. Setbacks from our fencelines appears to be of no concern either. The one to two meters increase is barely relevant given the astounding proximity of the apartment to begin, in the initial plan.

However, I am pleased to see Juliette balconies installed on northeast and northwest wings above the second floor but strongly ask the planning committee, council and developer to consider the Walnut Grove residents and PLEASE insist that the second floor outdoor apartment balconies in these locations be *changed* to Juliette style as well. This will at the very least will minimize the intrusiveness of the building in our backyards and our indoor living space.

I can appreciate the consultations and studies engaged by the developer, et all, to move forward, but I do feel a lost battle with my concerns. I am not objectionable to an apartment unit either. However, more effort appears to be made to ensure the on site heritage building and its surroundings look nice, and that the view from Princess and Anderson Streets is pleasing to the public passerby, which in reality is shocking given both face busy roads, commercial structures and not residential homes which really face the biggest impact. At the end of the day I will be staring into a block- wall of windows and any reasonable view of open sky without shadowing.

In the past, I have lived in apartments and homes, both which have backed onto apartment units in major Canadian cities, even overseas in Paris and London. Never have I encountered a neighbouring apartment so close to my residence.

If this is a sign of the future planning directive in our fair city I am dismayed. Providing quick affordable housing (that is yet to be seen in this development) and changing planning zones to do so, appears to be the major agenda of our city. By jamming every square inch of openspace with slap up Lego box buildings, is not a reason to compromise on the importance of our long term commitment to the environment, well being of people, neighborhoods and the historical value and future of our beautiful city. I just hope a bit more of the latter will be taken into account, as the city moves ahead with future development.

I thank you for addressing my concerns and will be most interested in next steps forward.

With kindest regards

Nancy Lovell
153 Ellesmeer Ave

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Clendening, Ian

From: nancy lovell [REDACTED] >
Sent: March 1, 2023 11:21 AM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: RE: 2312 Princess Street Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Ian,

Thank you kindly for the update.

I have such serious concerns about 10 meters from my fenceline. That is exceptionally close!! I trust the planning department will consider this when the next submission is presented by Patry Development and that we can provide feedback before final decisions are made.

A compromise at the 'very' least would be to reduce the unit to five stories with the setback from Ellesmeer fenceline (property) to begin at 20-30 meters. We still will have a building towering over our back windows of which in my case, all of my living takes place as does most of my neighbours. I miss the tree and natural field views already. As I am handicapped and housebound 90% of the time, the loss of sun light for work and art endeavours is worrisome and disheartening.

I see already how the apartment unit east of us is already beginning to tower above. The larger setbacks should be considered for our homes as opposed to Princess Street entrance area.

Maybe the Patry team will reconfigure a more suitable plan.

I can only hope.

Again my thanks to you for following up so promptly and hearing my concerns.

Regards

Nancy Lovell
[REDACTED] Ellesmeer Ave
[REDACTED]

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)


On Wed, Mar 1, 2023 at 9:11 a.m., Clendening, Ian
<iclendening@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

Hi Nancy,

It is true we have not received a 2nd submission.

Based on my rough measurement from the back of your house to the edge of your property line (11.3 metres) plus the distance stated in the first submission (10.28 metres) the distance to the rear of the building to the edge of your dwelling (again, rough estimate) would be 21.58 metres.\

For ease of reference, I have provided a screenshot of the rear of the building. The building as initially proposed had a 3 storey building face extend to the 10.28 metre setback at which point various step-backs were incorporated on the 4th and 5th storeys. A patio feature was intended to be on the top of the 5th storey with access from the 6th story units.



Kindly,



Ian Clendening (he/him/his)

Senior Planner

Planning Services

City of Kingston

Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard,



216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 extension 3126

iclendening@cityofkingston.ca

The City of Kingston acknowledges that we are on the traditional homeland of the Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat, and thanks these nations for their care and stewardship over this shared land.

From: nancy lovell [REDACTED] >
Sent: February 28, 2023 1:41 PM
To: Clendening, Ian <iclendening@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: 2312 Princess Street Development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

As a homeowner backing on this apartment development I have a question based on the information I have received to date.

I understand height approval and design revisions have not yet been submitted.

Could you please provide me with distance from my back fenceline at 153 to the proposed apartment construction. There was discussion of 32' back but that was for a roof terrace I believe.

Could you confirm actual dimensions at this point?

Regards

Nancy Lovell

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Clendening, Ian

From: mobrien [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 15, 2022 2:50 PM
To: Clendening, Ian; Neill, Jim; Osanic, Lisa; Hutchison, Rob; Kiley, Robert; Simon Chapelle; Hill, Wayne
Subject: Clarifications re: 2312 Princess St. Proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Afternoon,

After having attended (and spoken at) the Planning Committee Meeting on Thurs. Aug. 11th re: the 2312 Princess St. proposal (File no. D35-004-2022), I feel compelled to make a few brief comments re: some things that were not quite clear, nor possibly correct, in the information shared by Mr. Mark Touw.

In an effort for us to work most effectively with the City's Planning Services and the Planning Committee, I think it is prudent to have clear and accurate information to think about.

Some points that I think need some clarification are:

1. By my count, there are 13 black walnut trees (nos. 11-21 inclusive, and no. 30 and no. 44) that are slated for removal off of this site and only some of them are near the heritage building. See the chart in the "Tree Inventory Report" on DASH.
2. I believe (as do many others) that the "school" (Lakeshore) has already moved out of the heritage property at the end of this school year and has relocated to Sydenham Road. Unless there is some other school lined up to take up residency in a future construction zone, this information could be seen as incorrect.
3. Regarding my comments about loud speaker and amplified sound, there is a legitimate reason for concern. And, contrary to Mr. Touw's comment, DASH does contain that level of detail within reports from J.E. Coulter in the "Noise Impact Study". This can be read on the report's page numbers 9, 10 and 13. There is, indeed, reference to the threshold of noise coming from terraces and balconies, in part through the existence of these 2 electronic sources. While I recognize that it is not a given that the building's management would permit this, the mere fact that it is mentioned gives great cause for concern. This would be in addition to noise from (also on the report's page 9) the capacity of 120 people (60 people on each of the two terraces) potentially overlooking our property.

I look forward to working with Planning Services and the Planning Committee when viewing new proposed changes that will allay concerns for those of us living in very close proximity to the development site.

Thank you for your diligent work.

Mary O'Brien

August 11, 2022

Planning Services

City of Kingston

216 Ontario St.

Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

Re: 2312 Princess St. (File No. D35-004-2022)

Dear Planning Committee:

As a homeowner directly abutting the north side of 2274 Princess St. I am writing to express my concern to the project at 2312 Princess St. All the objections RAID tabled in 2021 are now currently evolving into real time issues.

The developer is seeking changes to the zoning bylaws from Arterial Commercial and Low Density Residential to High Density Residential.

My question to Planning Services:

Has the City of Kingston conducted comprehensive traffic studies outlining the impacts that a 302-unit building will have on the intersection of Princess and Andersen? Access to the building at 2312 Princess St. should be analyzed before this application is approved.

With 242 residential units at 2274 Princess St coupled with 302 residential units at 2312 Princess St the impacts will be extraordinary and this needs to be thoroughly examined. Traffic along the referenced corridor is already precarious without the additional 544 residential units.

Although I support the need for housing in our community, I respectfully ask that careful consideration to be given to the impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic this proposal will have.

Regards,

Wendy Kleywegt-Bowen

121 Ellesmeer Ave, Kingston, ON

K7P 3H9

Clendening, Ian

From: Bob Heintz [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 10, 2022 10:43 AM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: 2312 Princess Street (file # D35-004-2022) from Patry Inc.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

From: Robert Heintz
141 Ellesmeer Ave.
Kingston ON K7P 3H6

I want to register my strong objection to changing the official plan to allow this development. When we purchased our homes on Ellesmeer Avenue, this land was zoned, by the city, for low density housing. If the zoning is changed to allow this development, the resale value of houses on the south side of Ellesmeer Avenue will be reduced by a considerable amount, and due to shading in the winter, our heating bills will be increased significantly. There will be increased traffic, increased noise, increased shadowing and a loss of privacy in our backyards. I know these problems have been pointed out in other letters, but I want to emphasize what it will cost us to see this project built. I expect our winter heating cost to increase ten to twenty percent and our resale value to drop up to 100 thousand dollars. This would apply to all the homes on the south side of the street from 117 to 167 Ellesmeer. If the zoning change is approved, we all deserve to be compensated for these unexpected expenses. How could this compensation be done? Will the city negotiate a settlement with each property owner or will it insist that Patry Inc. does this?

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

August 9, 2022

Dear Mr. Clendening:

Re: City File No. D35-004-2022 – 2312 Princess Street – Patry Inc.

I am writing to you to express my concern about some aspects of the application for 2312 Princess Street. In particular, I am concerned with the impact of this proposed building that results in unacceptable intrusive overlook, excessive shadowing, and negative impact on the neighbouring residents' ability to enjoy their properties.

Specifically, I refer to the:

1. length of the wall facing Walnut Grove;
2. height of the wall facing Walnut Grove;
3. proposed outdoor amenity spaces all of which overlook Walnut Grove
4. minimal setback from the property line shared with Walnut Grove.

Once again, this developer is intent on erecting a building that is oversized for the lot on which it will be situated resulting in the following unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties:

1. There will be an unacceptable amount of shadowing during the winter months. The shadow study shows that on December 25, (which means for several weeks both before and after this date), the houses will be in shadow for the entire day. This is the same impact that was going to be felt by the residents behind this developer's neighbouring building at 2274 Princess St. To resolve this, the length of the wall abutting neighbouring properties needs to be reduced, the top storey of the north wall removed, the building's proximity to the property line increased, and any additional steps necessary to significantly reduce the amount of shadowing to an acceptable level.
2. The design of the building results in an unacceptable level of intrusive overlook. The impact of the height and length of the north wall is compounded by the location of ALL of the outdoor amenity space along the same wall. While the developer may argue that this was done to break up the north wall and reduce its impact on the Walnut Grove properties, the reduction in privacy and increase in noise levels negates this supposed benefit and, in fact, worsens the intrusive overlook. It is imperative that the outdoor amenity areas be relocated to areas that do not overlook residential properties. There are three other sides available for this purpose.
3. Once again, this developer is unnecessarily removing mature trees from a property. Although I appreciate that the trees to the south of the building will be left standing, all of the remaining trees will be clear cut. I hope that, in the time since decisions were made regarding 2274 Princess Street which allowed the clear cutting of that valuable urban tree canopy, the City has become more environmentally aware of the importance of mature trees to fight our climate emergency and will insist that more trees are retained.

It IS possible to increase and diversify our housing, to design apartment buildings that are compatible with their adjacent neighbourhoods, and to retain our urban tree canopy. Please let your decisions reflect this.

Respectfully submitted,

June Blackburn

131 Ellesmeer Avenue

Email: [REDACTED]

Mr. Ian Clendening
Senior Planner City of Kingston
1121 John Counter Boulevard
Kingston, Ontario K7K 6C7

Dear Mr. Clendening,

As a resident of Walnut Grove (a community of single story homes) I am writing this to express my concern about the applications by Patry Inc. for amendments to the Zoning By-laws governing the 2312 Princess Street property. While we realize the need for housing in the city, my husband and I strongly object to the requested increase in density. There already is an apartment building presently being built by Patry at 2274 Princess Street with fewer units on a bigger piece of land. Because this building is not yet completed, no one knows what the impact will be of this construction regarding traffic, noise, safety, light pollution, privacy, etc. for our community. Patry's request to amend the Zoning By-laws for the 2312 Princess Street property will compound these affects should a six story, 302 unit apartment building be allowed. It is just too big!

Catherine and Claude Regis
160 Ellesmeer Avenue
Kingston, Ontario K7P 3H6



Clendening, Ian

From: Bob Fulford [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 6, 2022 10:44 AM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment 2312 Princess Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

This note is to file our objection to yet another zoning amendment in order to allow a 6 storey building to be erected adjacent to our community of Walnut Grove. Traffic in this area is already at a maximum with several commercial sites and Princess Street and Andersen as the main access routes.

The City is offering residents young trees to be planted to grow the green canopy and protect the environment and at the same time allowing developers to cut down the mature trees that are already there. It would make sense to do an impact study after the current building has been completed and occupied to determine what effect it will have on traffic & noise pollution before allowing another high density building to be constructed and another presumed 348 vehicles attempting to navigate on these already congested streets.

These decisions should not be based on tax dollars but on the comfort and enjoyment of the residents of this City. We live on Sheridan Street here in Walnut Grove and it is already very difficult and dangerous to access Andersen Street due to high density traffic coming south and north.

Robert & Lynne Fulford
111 Sheridan Street

Sent from my iPad

Clendening, Ian

From: Phyllis Langridge [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 7, 2022 4:00 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Cc: Chapelle, Simon
Subject: 2312 Princess Street (File No. D35-004-2022) from Patry Inc.
Attachments: ED836A18-1C9B-4C4B-A965-B5D08317974A.tiff

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To: The City Planners and all Members of the Planning Committee:

I, Phyllis Langridge, (143 Ellesmeer Ave) am opposed to the proposed Patry Development at 2312 Princess Street.

Although I knew that someday this property would be developed, I believed it would be development suitably for the size of the subject property. The Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws are being challenged by Patry Inc. once again. Changing this property from arterial Commercial/Low density residential to high density residential contradicts the City's own plan. This issue has already been dealt with in the decision given for 2274 Princess St. and the current proposal considerably exceeds the previous decision. This is totally unacceptable for the size of this property.

I would like to register my strong objection to the project due to the size of the building on such a small parcel of land providing such a high population density. Our area will be strained by the addition of 230 units on the larger property to the east (2274 Princess) soon. Building this large building with such high density will further impact this entire neighbourhood immensely (and in particular the homes on the south of Ellesmeer in Walnut Grove which back onto the said property) for the following reasons:

- **Size** - The proximity to our fence line especially when our residential units backing on this property all have living rooms (great rooms) facing the building.
- **Traffic** - The traffic on Princess St is already heavy and with the additional traffic from 2274 Princess it will be further challenged.
- **Noise and lighting** - The impact on the enjoyment of our backyards by the increased noise level of the pool and terraces especially the roof top terraces with loud speakers will be considerable and the nighttime lighting of these areas will be invasive. The lighting of the area is already bad enough with the existing businesses.
- **Overlook** - The overlook into our homes and backyards from the terraces, balconies and windows along the north and east sides of the building is terrible given the proximity to our homes. The balconies reduce the already small distance between the building and our homes and should be eliminated or at least only French balconies.
- **Overshadowing** - The overshadowing that will occur in the winter months will affect our lovely south exposure at a time of year when it is most desirable.
- **Fencing** - Suitable fencing is required to provide increased security, safety and privacy and must be aesthetically suitable.

If the project was restricted to four stories with a suitable setback of the fourth floor, there would be less traffic congestion and impact of overlook and overshadowing. Also, there should be an increased setback from our property line as even the set

back from the heritage house is twice that of the planned 10 meter set back on the north side. How is this restriction more necessary for a business establishment than our homes?

Another concern I have is that the storm drain that is located in the south west corner of my backyard is about 4' lower than the subject property which has caused issues for the existing fence. This was brought to the attention of the City in the past. City councillor, Simon Chapelle, and City staff visited the site and agreed it was illegal for the ground water to run onto my property. Attempts to contact the owner by all parties went unanswered and were abandoned by the City leaving me with a fence that is stressed and could fail at any time. I have attached a picture of the runoff at its worst and the fence as it leans today. **I am concerned that this fence and runoff issue will not be addressed properly and the City will not do anything to help based on my past experience in dealing with the past developer and the City.** As an aging senior, I feel very vulnerable in the City of Kingston.

Proper fencing at the expense of the developer is necessary along the length of the Walnut Grove property at the very minimum. Also, careful attention to the drainage of the property is necessary.

Unfortunately, I am unable to make verbal comments on the 11th so must rely on this method of communication. I am available to discuss any of these issues at 613-547-4062.

I would like to receive written notification of the decision by the City of Kingston regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment or proposed zoning by-law amendment.

Respectfully,
Phyllis Langridge
143 Ellesmeer Ave







Clendening,Ian

From: lucy pelletier [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 7, 2022 4:20 PM
To: Clendening,Ian
Subject: 2312 Princess St. Patry Inc. - File #D35-004-2022

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To: The City Planners and all Members of the Planning Committee:

I, Lucie Pelletier, (149 Ellesmeer Ave) am opposed to the proposed Patry Development at 2312 Princess Street.

It do not oppose suitable development of the subject property but oppose development of this size on such a small property. The Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws were challenged by Patry Inc. with 2274 Princess but this request far exceeds the limits set for 2274. Changing this property to high density residential contradicts the City's own plan. This is totally unacceptable for this culturally significant area.

I strongly objection to the project because of the size of the building and its high population density. This area will be strained by the addition of 230 units on the larger property to the east (2274 Princess). Building such a large building with such high density will impact this entire neighbourhood immensely (and in particular the homes on the south of Ellesmeer in Walnut Grove which back onto the said property) for the following reasons:

- **Size** - The proximity to our fence line especially when our residential units backing on this property all have living rooms (great rooms) facing the building.
- **Traffic** - The traffic on Princess St is already heavy and with the additional traffic from 2274 Princess it will be further challenged.
- **Noise and lighting** - The impact on the enjoyment of our backyards by the increased noise level of the pool and terraces especially with loud speakers on the rooftop terraces will be considerable and the nighttime lighting of these areas will be invasive as the lighting of the area is already bad enough.
- **Overlook** - The overlook into our homes and backyards from the terraces, balconies and windows along the north and east sides of the building is terrible given the proximity to our homes. The balconies reduce the already small distance between the building and our homes and should be illuminated.

- **Overshadowing** - The overshadowing that will occur in the fall/winter months will affect our lovely south exposure at a time of year when it is most enjoyable.
- **Fencing** - Suitable fencing is required to provide increased security, safety and privacy in a way that is suitably aesthetic.

The project must be restricted to a more suitable size with larger setbacks from property lines especially those backing on residential properties. This would mean less traffic congestion and a lower impact of noise, lighting, overlook and overshadowing. Proper fencing at the expense of the developer is necessary for privacy and security of our homes. Careful attention must be paid to the drainage of the property to reduce the impact on our property as I have a drainage swale running near the back fence of my property.

We are paying high taxes for our adult lifestyle residences and this should be considered by the City of Kingston in dealing with this request.

I would like to receive written notification of the decision by the City of Kingston regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment or proposed zoning by-law amendment.

Respectfully,
Lucie Pelletier
149 Ellesmeer Ave

Clendening, Ian

From: Grant Smith [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 5, 2022 12:12 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment, City File Number D35-004-2022

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I would like to comment on Patry Inc. request to amend the city planning bylaw. As found on the city website the application has minimal information to form a complete opinion. The city notice to area residents indicates an amendment to rezone the property for an increase in height and a reduction in parking, setback and unit size.

Requesting the building not exceed current zoning height rules and / or not exceed Patry Inc. other new building height located east of this property. The additional height would reduce the enjoyment of local residence. The bylaw was in existence before the building plans were started. This is the same for set backs to the property line to provide privacy and additional green space. A high density building only creates more conflicts to the citizens of Kingston.

The building layout appears to have been designed to upset current residences. It is jambed into an odd shape property. The design talks about 3 stories high before set backs start. This appears intended to modify local residence as the upper floor set back starts at a minimal distance. Requesting no upper floors but at a minimum better set backs.

Walnut Grove owns the property on the east end of this new development. Concern the new building residence will use the property as a short cut to the existing Tim Hortons. Requesting the builder install a fence to prevent this from happening.

Thank you

Grant Smith

Clendening, Ian

From: harry toy [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 5, 2022 11:34 AM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: 2312 princess street development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

From;
Harry toy
165 ellesmeer ave.
Kingston, on. K7P3H6

August 5, 2022

To;
Planning Services
City of Kingston
216 Ontario St.
Kingston, On K7L2Z3

RE: 2312 Princess Street (FileNo. D35-004-2022) from Patry Inc.

Dear Planning Committee

My wife and I are residents at 165 Ellesmeer Ave. which directly abuts the north side of the above proposal by Patry Inc. at 2312 Princess St.

I would like to register my strong objection to the project due to the detrimental effect it will have on our standard of living.

This proposed development would change the existing Official Plan and Zoning from Arterial Commercial and low density residential to high density residential, which contradicts the city's plan.

The proposed building is too large, too high (6 stories) for the property . It is even larger than the unit under construction at 2274 Princess St., which is on a larger property.

One of the reason we chose to spend our retirement days in this community was due to the quiet, low density residential nature of not only our own subdivision but of all the surrounding area.

This proposed development would completely destroy this atmosphere.

Please consider the negative impact this development will have on our enjoyment of our residence and deny the proposed amendment to the current zoning.

Please provide written notification of the decision by the City of Kingston re: any proposed Official Plan Amendment or proposed zoning by-law amendments.

Regards,
Harry Toy
165 Ellesmeer Ave
Kingston, On., k7P3H6

Sent from my iPad

Clendening, Ian

From: M Jones [REDACTED] >
Sent: August 4, 2022 7:33 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Subject: 2312 Princess Street (File No. D35-004-2022)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Marc Jones
155 Ellesmeer Ave
Kingston, ON
K7P3H6

August 04, 2022

Planning Services
City of Kingston
Kingston, ON

Dear Planning Committee:

I am writing regarding the proposed development at 2312 Princess Street (File No. D35-004-2022).

I think everyone knew something would eventually be built at this location. However many residents feel the proposed plan does not fit the size of the property or show any respect to existing property owners nearby.

Location of building

A big concern of mine is the building of a 6 story apartment 32 metres from Ellesmeer Ave's back fence. It might block the sun out completely during certain times of the year. Having a building so close by would significantly affect property values of Ellesmeer Ave that we should be compensated for through a significant drop in property taxes. The building should be pushed to at least 60 meters from the back lots of Ellesmeer Ave properties.

Fencing

The development at the other apartment just down the road by the same developer appears like it may eventually cause the backyard fences to start collapsing for those units behind the development. The developer for 2312 should put up a new fence at least 8 ft high behind the apartment and Ellesmeer Ave units.

Size of building

The apartment should be much smaller than 6 stories, perhaps 4 stories at most and left as a low density zone, not changed to high density.

Noise/nuisance

The proposal also has an outdoor pool. This should be moved to a rooftop or indoor pool to limit noise caused by 300 units that might have access to the pool.

Garbage Locations

If there are garbage dumpsters outside, I'd request they be kept away from the property lines. The garbage from this apartment should not become a burden to everyone else around

Traffic

The intersection at Princess St and Sydenham Rd road is already a disaster for traffic. Nobody needs a traffic study to tell them that. Vehicles can be lined up from the traffic lights at Sydenham Rd to the top of the overpass on Princess above the train tracks. The last thing this area of Kingston needs is 242 more units at 2274 Princess and 302 more at 2312 Princess.

I would like written notification of the decision by the City of Kingston regarding any proposed Official Plan Amendment or proposed zoning bylaw amendments.

Marc Jones
155 Ellesmeer Ave
Kingston
K7P3H6

Diane Anderson
161 Ellesmeere Ave.
Kingston ON
K7P 3H6

August 4, 2022

RE: 2312 Princess Street (File No. D35-004-2022) from Patry Inc.

Dear City of Kingston Planning Committee:

I live in one of the houses that backs on to this proposed development. The size(height), design and total number of units overlooking my property will seriously impact the use of my property both inside and outside as most of my living space faces the north side of the proposed building.

The land currently is zoned for arterial commercial and low-density Residential housing. I object to it being re-zoned to high density Residential.

I am not against that this land be developed but it should be developed with a building(s) more suitable to the location of the lot. Together with the development being constructed on 2274 Princess St the amount of people and vehicles will severely impact the traffic flows in this area. There will be even more back ups and fender benders along Princess St. from Sydenham and Andersen. The amount of traffic along Andersen has increased significantly over the last few years with the addition of new houses at the north end and the lights installed at Catarauqui Woods and Sydenham St. People are now using Andersen to access the 401 via Sydenham and thereby avoiding the intersection of Sydenham and Princess. As well when there is an accident on the 401 locally many of the transport truck/trailers detour on to this stretch of Princess St. rather than using the indicated EDR.

Changes to the proposed building that should be considered:

1. Reducing the height from 6 stories to a maximum of 4 stories. According to the shadow study, the proposed building will shadow my house all day in the late fall and winter. Most of my living space with large windows face south. My living room/dining room, my master bedroom and my recreation room. The sunlight is important to me, without it my heating bills will significantly increase, and my overall mental health will be impacted.
2. The building should be setback more from the north side of the lot. I feel there will be a significant increase in noise produced by the proposed building. My house lines up directly with the proposed swimming pool. The terraces will overlook my property and they are planning to install loudspeakers?
3. A 10-foot wall or fence should be installed along the north border. I understand that a 10-foot fence is being build at the development at 2274 Princess St. A row of evergreen trees should also be planted inside this fence to help block the noise that will be coming from the new development. This would also be environmentally friendly and provide an area that would be suitable for birds to utilize. We currently have a good variety and numbers of birds in the area. Robins, nuthatches, blue jays, cardinals, chickadees, doves etc.
4. Re-locate the pool to either the east or south side (Princess St.) of the building. Re-locate the terraces as well.

5. Use of the strip of land between the north wall of the building and the fence should be kept to a minimum. No vehicular traffic and no garbage dumpster. The emptying of these dumpster creates a large amount of noise and attracts wildlife such a raccoons, rats and mice, which are currently a problem in the area.
6. Reduce the number of units overall. The number of units for this development is greater than the number of units being built at 2274 Princess St., yet the lot is smaller.

Please take into consideration that just north of the proposed development is an area of senior housing. Significantly increasing the population density adjacent to us will affect us greatly. Vehicular (including bicycles) and pedestrian (including dogs) traffic will increase. Our vulnerability to break-ins will increase as well. Our area will be used for walks and as a shortcut to access Sydenham as there is a walkway thru the old Sydenham United Church cemetery. I also hope the increased traffic will not impede emergency vehicles from speedy access to our area.

Please send me the decisions made by the City of Kingston on the proposed Official Plan Amendment or the proposed zoning by-law amendment by email or by regular mail.

Regards,

Diane Anderson

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Clendening, Ian

From: Dalton Sproule <[REDACTED]>
Sent: August 4, 2022 12:52 PM
To: Clendening, Ian
Cc: Dalton Sproule; Kas; Chapelle, Simon; Osanic, Lisa
Subject: City File Number D35-004-2022 (Official Objection)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Please consider this our official objection to the proposed official plan amendment and zoning by-law amendment for 2312 Princess Street.

We own and reside at 103 Sheridan St in the Walnut Grove community and object to any further development of Apartment buildings in the near vicinity. As you are well aware the city just made amendments to the zoning by-laws to accommodate another very large apartment building of 240 or so units.

Making additional changes to allow for another over sized building of 302 units, will over populate the neighborhood, crowding store's, buses, parks and intersections. Allowing this amendment should be denied especially until the already approved unit being built has been established and further studies of the effects of that can be analyzed.

This shouldn't be all about making money for a contactor and gaining tax revenue for the city, it should be about building a community that fits with the surroundings and amenities.

Therefore we're asking the planning department to deny approving any amendments. Our for fathers or previous planners put regulations in place for a reason, please respect their ideals.

Dalton Sproule
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Linda Kemp
Sent: August 3, 2022 11:32 AM
To: Fawcett,Elizabeth <EFAWCETT@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: 2312 Princess Street (File D35-004-2022) Patry Inc

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To: Planning Committee

We live at 167 Ellesmeer Ave, which directly abuts the north side of the proposed new development by Patry Inc. at 2312 Princess St. We would like to state our strong objections to a number of issues with regard to this proposal.

1. The size and density of the proposed building is too large for the parcel of land. The Official Plan currently allows Arterial Commercial and low density Residential. We were aware of this when we purchased our home five years ago. The developer at that time builds lovely bungalows and we thought this would be compatible with the surrounding residences. Patry Inc. then purchased this property and is planning to build a large and intrusive apartment complex which will directly affect those living on the north side of the building. The City must rein in these developers and finally say “no” to the requests to have the Official Plan amended to such a large extent. What is the use of an Official Plan if a developer can come along and ask for unreasonable amendments without taking into account adjacent residences.
2. The building will be too close to our property line and the building is too high. Our living space in our home is at the back, i.e. living room, dining room, master bedroom, plus our backyard decks. Looking at a brick wall from our living room window will not be a pleasant view and sitting on our deck with people looking down on us will adversely affect the enjoyment of our property.
3. The footprint of the building does not take into account the residences on the north side. The pool area will be disruptive to the enjoyment of backyards and the extra lighting required around the pool area and around the perimeter of the building will cause light pollution to those close by. The current street lights and the high intensity lights on the Rona property already light up our house at night. I can't imagine what it will be like with additional lighting. The noise (and possibly music) on the north side of the building will be another disruption.
4. Shadowing: It is completely unacceptable for our homes to be in partial or complete shadow from November to January. We will be in complete shadow during the month of December, during the bleakest part of the winter. As previously stated our living is done in the back portion of our homes and this shadowing will adversely affect our living conditions.
5. The blasting and the dust generated by this for two levels of underground parking will disrupt our lives for months. The other building at 2274 Princess Street required about two months of blasting, which was loud and there was a lot of vibration. Perhaps if the building is smaller with fewer units then only one level of parking would be required or if the building is smaller then some of the parking could be surface parking.
6. We, the residents, of Ellesmeer Avenue would like to see a new fence installed by the

developer. The blasting, digging, and removal of trees along the fence line will do irreparable damage to the existing fence, which is close to 20 years old. A new, higher, fence (at least 10 feet) would be reasonable.

7. We didn't see any access roads on the map for emergency vehicles, such as fire trucks, etc. Is this not a requirement?

These are our major concerns about this proposal and hope that the Planning Committee will take them into consideration.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terry and Linda Kemp
167 Ellesmeer Ave.

Mary O'Brien
163 Ellesmeer Avenue
Kingston, ON K7P 3H6

August 2, 2022

Planning Services
City of Kingston
216 Ontario St.
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

RE: 2312 Princess Street (File No. D35-004-2022) from Patry Inc.

Dear Planning Committee:

As two residents of a home directly abutting the north side of the above proposal by Patry Inc. (File No. D35-004-2022) at 2312 Princess Street, we would like to register our strong objections to the project due to the highly detrimental impact this 6-storey building would have on the enjoyment of our residence.

Before offering specific points, we want to first underline that this property (2312 Princess St.) was purchased by Patry Inc. knowing full well what the City's Official Plan entailed and what that parcel of property was zoned for. His continuous requests for exceptions without any convincing and clear consideration for land use compatibility within the existing neighbourhoods is, in our estimation, very troublesome at the very least. Like many others, we have to ask "What is the OPA for if developers can have it changed by influencing the Planning Dept. at the City?"

When purchased, we were aware of the current zoning and foresaw any future construction on that vacant lot as falling into the parameters of those restraints (Arterial Commercial and low density Residential). We are not prepared to support the amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws to allow for such an intrusive, possibly untenably noisy and definitely obstructive structure to be erected.

More specifically, in regard to the proposal for 2312 Princess St.:

Put most simply, the proposal's land use compatibility is at an alarming low level. And, as the Official Plan references, consideration for the right to the peaceful enjoyment of surrounding residences must be given. (See Official Plan – Land Use Compatibility Matters 2.7.3 and Functional Needs 2.7.6). Frankly, the Patry plan, as stated, provides for a vastly inflated density in population, creating a myriad of problems for existing home owners like ourselves.

Our main concerns are as follows:

1. The size is too large. And the **height (6 storeys) is too tall**. This is higher than his current property under construction at 2274 Princess St. (4 storeys) which also abuts similar houses to ours on our street. A 6 storey building would increasingly dwarf the row of consistent bungalows on Ellesmeer Avenue.

There is an inherent unfairness for Patry to use the height of existing buildings (eg. Knightsbridge at 7 storeys, Lasalle Hotel at 4 storeys and the Braebury property at 2395 Princess at 4 storeys) as justification for proposing this 6 storey building as none of these properties closely abut existing residences.

2. It is a **much larger building on a smaller piece of land** than his nearby build currently under construction (2274 Princess St. is 1.72 hectares and 2312 Princess is 1.45 hectares).

3. **Shadowing** will be big problems for us. During the entire month of December (and parts of months on either side) we will have absolutely NO SUNLIGHT coming into the entire south side of our house. Please note that 81% of our entire sunlight into our homes comes through the windows at the back of our house (south side). Out of 10 rooms in our entire home, 6 of them are completely on that south wall.

Most people who do not live here do not realize the innate design of the majority of the houses on Ellesmeer Ave.. The design involves the majority of rooms used most frequently (livingroom, diningroom, bedroom and some kitchens), and possible recreation room and bedroom in finished basements all rely on that south wall of windows for sunlight. In most houses, only a guest bedroom with bathroom and a main entrance door and hallway are located on the north side of our houses. This is something that homeowners on this street cannot change to compensate for light lost due to a tall, obstructing building.

Overlook and noise – The proposal has the building much too close to our property line. It needs to be moved south by at least the amount that 2274 Princess St. was moved (an additional 2 metres). Any balconies on the north side of the new build should be Juliet ones (or none at all) to mitigate noise and disruption to the enjoyment of our backyard. It is noted that any artist's renderings of what that north wall would look like as Ellesmeer residents looked out their back windows seems to be averted in the proposal.

The **large pool area**, with no wall on the north to stop noise from travelling into our backyards is completely unacceptable to us. How that can be compatible with many peoples' backyards just metres away from their property line is quite beyond us. Additionally, mention of possible **amplified music** and **loud speakers** on terraces is also a totally unacceptable intrusion into the quiet enjoyment of our backyard. It would be advantageous if the "U" shape of the pool area could be flipped 180 degrees and face Princess St., not the backyards of multiple residences. Noise from the pool area would then most likely not be as evident. While we recognize preserving the heritage property at the corner is of importance, why is the pool noise directed at us instead of an already noisy Princess St. and a vacant heritage property?

We also are concerned about the actual noise from the individual air conditioning units to be attached outdoors to each unit.

4. **Two levels of underground parking** would mean a longer period of very disrupting noise and startling vibration while construction is underway. (We jumped in our seats during the blasts from the construction at his 2274 Princess St. property!) With a smaller number of units (ie. fewer storeys), perhaps one level of underground parking would suffice.
5. **Fencing** – Like the site at 2274 Princess St., we would like to have, as a minimum, an attractive taller fence built (8 feet min.) by Patry Inc. and the removal of the standing one done and paid for by his company as well. And, not unlike the 2274 Princess St. property, having a fence along the east end of the Patry property would ensure that foot traffic would not be possible across into property owned by Walnut Grove (Block 11 and Block 12).

These are the main objections we have to the proposal as it relates to the immediate impact it will have on living in our own home.

We would like to hereby request in writing that we receive the decision of the City re: the above proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

Respectfully yours,

Mary O'Brien and Grant MacDonald (163 Ellesmeer Avenue)

Clendening,Ian

From: Andy Nancy Berga <[REDACTED]>
Sent: August 3, 2022 3:09 PM
To: Clendening,Ian
Subject: RE:2312 Princess Street (file No. D34-004-2022) Patry Inc.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Andy and Nancy Berga
159 Ellesmeer Avenue
Kingston ON K7P3H6

We are residents of a home which will abutt the north side of the proposed development by Patry Inc. We would like to strongly object to this proposal as it will have a high detrimental effect on the enjoyment and of our retirement in our residences

This proposal has Patry Inc. trying to change the zoning from Arterial Commercial and Low Density Residential to High Density Residential which contradicts the City's Plan.

CONCERNS

! The size is too large and the height is too high (6 Stories) We would propose 4 stories as 2274 Princess which also abuts Ellesmeer Ave. and has similar bungalows

This is a much larger building than 2274 Princess which is on a much larger lot.

2.Traffic. With 242 units at 2274 and 302 at 3212 Princess there will be more traffic on Princess and also on Anderson which will impact our safety and impair our ability to access arterial streets. A shift in the plans to 200 units with a lower profile would eliminate some of the traffic problems at both entrances.

3.Fencing We would ask Patry Inc to put up a new 8 to 10 foot fence for security , safety and aesthetics.

4. Noise. We seniors who live on Ellesmeer Ave, which is pretty well all of us, are aware of a pool in the amenities area is in close proximity to our living area which faces south would impact our enjoyment of our homes. We propose the pool be placed on the Princess street side. We are also concerned about air conditioner noise and placement of the dumpsters which are noisy when emptied. This could be mitigated by having them emptied later in the day.

5. Shadowing. As 6 of our 7 large windows of our house face south, the building would obscure the light and take away sunlight and enjoyment. Fewer stories and a smaller footprint would allow fewer shadows.


6. Footprint We propose the building be moved at least another 4 Metres from our property line. We would also like to see the fewest number of windows facing north and also terraces move to the south.

We would also ask for a written notification of the decision by the City of Kingston

Thank you,

Regards

Andy and Nancy Berga
159 Ellesmeer Ave. K7P3H6



RECEIVED

JUL 28 2022

PLANNING DIVISION
CITY OF KINGSTON

Mr. Ian Clendening,
Senior Planner
City of Kingston
1121 John Counter Boulevard
Kingston, Ontario K7K 6C7

July 21st, 2022

Dear Mr. Clendening,

Re: 2312 Princess Street, Kingston, Ontario
City File: D35-004-2022

The Walnut Grove Estates Community Association, as owners of property adjacent to the proposed development at 2312 Princess Street, City of Kingston, must formally express its opinions and requests to the City Planners and to all members of the Planning Committee concerning the current application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment by Patry Inc.

The Association has in the recent past, addressed a similar application in respect to the development at 2274 Princess Street and with some degree of success made City Planners and Councillors aware of the many issues that could have adversely affected the surrounding community. These areas of serious concern, raised in detail, are not that different from those currently being seen in the initial planning documents submitted in support of the 2312 Princess St. amendment application.

It is not the responsibility of this Association or the community at large to critique or challenge the architectural documentation or the detailed engineering reports and studies supporting the application but simply to raise awareness of concerns surrounding fundamental project objectives and design principles that shape the form and function of the proposed development. In this case, as it was with 2274 Princess St., the fundamental objectionable principle that controls most aspects of the proposed design is the requested amendment to increase significantly the allowable building density.

The site specific allowable density passed by Council earlier this year on the recommendation of the Planning Committee for 2274 Princess St. was 74sqm of lot area/dwelling unit. This was a decrease from the 80sq m of lot/dwelling unit prescribed in the Residential Type 5 Zoning area. The current requested density

amendment for this site is 48sqm of lot area/dwelling unit. This is a requested adjustment of staggering 40% reduction in land area requirement to accommodate the 302 unit mix being proposed.


Noting that the initial request for reduction in lot size requirements at 2274 Princess St. was 71sqm/dwelling unit and approved at 74sqm /dwelling unit it is difficult to understand how an adjacent proposed development could be viewed differently. Applying the 71sqm of lot size to the available land at 2312 Princess St., the maximum number of dwelling units would equate to a maximum of 196 units or 106 units less than proposed.

The Association and the community group of concerned citizens known as RAID spent a great deal of time and effort in indentifying and demonstrating the shortfalls of the 2274 Princess St. development, while not trying to reject development outright. It is hoped that a similar approach might be found when dealing with this current proposed development. However the sheer enormity of the density issue and the impact it potentially would cause on the community cannot be understated and must be addressed before other issues such as traffic, security, noise, setbacks, screening, sight lines, privacy, etc. can be debated.

An agreement frequently used in support of the 2274 Princess St. development was that it was consistent with the City's objectives in providing affordable housing or as the developer indicated providing housing that was more affordable due to the size of dwelling units being offered. The Association recognizes the needs for more housing and generally is supportive of the City's initiatives in this regard. However when the approach to satisfying housing shortages is not in balance or even close to compliance with the most recent comparable example of high density housing then it must be challenged.

The Association therefore requests that the City Planners and all members of the Planning Committee critically and diligently resolve the density issue before contemplating and debating subsequent planning issues.

With due respect for your consideration,



Bonnie Yhard
Chair

Walnut Grove Estates Community Association

Clendening,Ian

From: nancy lovell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: July 28, 2022 7:51 PM
To: Clendening,Ian
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning 2312 Princess Street

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Planning Committee Members,

As a homeowner for over 12 years, (153 Ellesmeer Ave) backing onto the proposed Patry Apartment Development Project at the above said address, I have serious concerns and object to the direction this project is moving .

Prior to purchasing my property, I looked extensively at the ownership and zoning of the said vacant land. Residential with low rise up to a max 2-3 story, that might include a commercial property like a bank, school, small plaza business was the said zoning. Arterial commercial and Residential. This seemed to be in keeping with the Residential area to the north, and I this found acceptable.

Now the proposed six story apartment not only presents a serious density issue in our neighborhood but also towers over our properties.

Princess/ Anderson is an extremely busy traffic corner now. With an additional 302 unit building(with more persons per household) this will seriously increase traffic flow on both streets, presenting serious safety and noise concerns just for starters.

Additionally, the lovely wooded area to our east has already been stripped bare in recent months, leaving zero greenspace and increasing the density. Two high rise buildings are not welcomed. This rezone proposal certainly appears to be neglectful in maintaining eco friendly zones which cities of the future claim to tout, Kingston included. Why are we stripping bare of vegetation an already said zone, which instead should be an opportunity for user friendly greenspace with appropriate housing if that's a goal. This new proposal is certainly not in keeping with the neighborhood and I find it interesting that city officials can so easily rezone such.

I am also very interested in the actual building design and how Patry Development has chosen to situate the building on the property. Can it be provided for interest? As a homeowner, I do not wish to have a large building towering over my back garden blocking my sun and view, and subsequently have to stare into homeowners balconies. It may sound selfish but I wonder if, as members of the said building/ planning committee you would accept the same in your backyard? If this is an approach to the so called housing issue in town it really is an bandaid on a much larger issue.

Surely if an apartment is the only option then half the size(max 3 stories) (original zoning height) with appropriate space from our fence line is what should be maintained.

I would also like to suggest the builder be required to provide greenspace, in the development, maybe including a berm of evergreen trees along the Ellesmeer Ave fence line.

In closing I am registering my complete disapproval of allowing for the rezoning of this track of land and increasing the living density of this project.

With kindest regards,

Nancy Lovell
153 Ellesmeer Ave

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)