

**From:** [Myers, Cheryl](#)  
**To:** [Birdi, Chanti](#); [Slevin, Jacob](#); [Sthamann, Lindsay](#)  
**Cc:** [Planning Outside Email](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Oct. 21 mtg ATTN: Secretary Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment  
**Date:** October 21, 2024 11:40:35 AM

---

Good morning,

Please see email below.

Thank you,  
Cheryl

---

**From:** hannah kaufman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 21, 2024 9:26 AM  
**To:** Planning Outside Email <Planning@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Subject:** re: Oct. 21 mtg ATTN: Secretary Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment

**Caution:** This email is from an external source. Please exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good morning Secretary Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment,

I am writing regarding the Consent and Minor Variance Application for File # D10-02-2-24 & D13-063-2024 (101 Charles St).

I live across the street from this property, at 106 Charles. I have lived here for 32 years.

I have three concerns about this application.

1. Number of Parking Spaces - requirement 1 per lot.

Variance Requested 0 per lot.

I am concerned about increased parking demands/congestion on our block. Parking is already fairly tight off and on most days and nights. Without parking on the property, this variance could potentially add 1-4 cars on the block. There is no possibility of parking behind the property as the right of way does not afford turning space into the rear alley. Changing the parking regulations for the street from one side only to restricted daytime parking for permit holders only would not address late afternoon/evening/overnight congestion. The real consequences to current residents of the street include no available parking for those who already do not have parking, and increased illegal parking which is already a big issue at times. Narrowing results in the narrowing of the driving lanes to only one lane, limiting/blocking the passage of emergency vehicles, access bus and occasionally passenger vehicles.

2. Minimum Setback: requirement 3.85 m. Proposed 1.5 metres.

I feel that building the front of the house out a further 1.5 m will change the character of that row of houses and the character of the street scape in general. It will negate the limestone wall, further changing the character of the row

of adjacent homes and the character of the building itself.

3. Minimum lot area and frontage. Both of these variances reduce the requirements by almost half. I feel that is just too tight for our block.

Overall, I object to this property being split in two vs being kept as a single dwelling. This is already a densely housed street, and this would just be too much. I am a proponent of densification to allow more people to live in the city, which is what attracted me to the area 32 years ago, but I feel this will push the block over its capacity.

I would like to be kept informed of the committee's decision.

Thank you.

Hannah