

Oddie,Niall

From: Oddie,Niall
Sent: March 5, 2025 1:43 PM
To: Ago Guastella
Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti; Van Vugt,Niki; SILVIA FAVOT-GUASTELLA
Subject: FW: Inquiry regarding city application - D35-001 – 2025

Good afternoon, Agostino

Please see below for responses to your questions.

I'd like to clarify that your property at 136 Joseph Street is not part of the proposed Official Plan or Zoning By-law amendments, so there would be no changes for your property. You received the notice because your property is located within 120 metres of lands subject to the proposed amendments.

I spoke with Silvia this morning – please let me know if there were any issues with the Zoom registration.

Thanks,
Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259

noddie@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: Ago Guastel [REDACTED]
Sent: March 4, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>
Cc: SILVIA FAVOT-GUASTELLA <[REDACTED]>; Agarwal,Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>; Van Vugt,Niki <nvanvugt@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Re: Inquiry regarding city application - D35-001 – 2025

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

Hi Niall,

Thank you for your detailed response and for outlining the proposed changes near our property at 136 Joseph Street. We appreciate the information and the resources you shared. And, the prompt response!

We do have a few follow-up questions to better understand the potential impact on our property:

- Have there been any assessments on how these zoning changes might affect property values or rental demand in the area?

There have not been any assessments completed on how the proposed amendments may effect property values as property values are heavily dependant on a variety of factors beyond the control of an Official Plan or Zoning By-law. For non-vacant residential properties, property taxes are based on the actual use of the property and not the zoning. These amendments would not directly increase property taxes of properties not subject to the amendments (such as your property at 136 Joseph Street).

The intensification areas have been identified to try and encourage new residential units to be created through infill and redevelopment of these primarily larger, vacant or underutilized lands. We know there is demand for more housing within the City and these amendments are trying to help create additional housing units. The municipality cannot control the tenure of housing (whether future units are intended for rental or ownership).

- You mentioned the holding overlay for servicing and transportation—what improvements are expected before redevelopment can proceed?

The Servicing Study identifies certain areas where combined sewers would need to be separated and certain areas where the potable water infrastructure would need to be increased to accommodate full build out. The Mobility Plan identifies a series of recommendations to the various networks (road, pedestrian, cycling and transit) to accommodate transportation needs in a full build out scenario. The holding overlay requiring transportation and servicing studies would document the requirements associated with an individual development proposal to determine if any servicing improvements are required to accommodate that proposal or if there is existing capacity in the system, and would also identify the potential transportation impacts associated with the individual proposal (traffic generation, entrance locations, etc.) to determine if any mitigation measures are required.

- Will the upcoming public meeting allow flexibility in the proposed plans based on community input, or is it basically set in stone?

We held a Community Meeting for the North King's Town project on December 5, 2024 where the draft amendments and technical studies were presented for public comments. We collected comments, questions and feedback on the materials through December, January and into February as we worked to finalize the materials being presented for Public Meeting on March 6 (tomorrow). The staff report and the presentation tomorrow will recommend that the Planning Committee recommend approval of the applications to Council.

- If/when redevelopment begins, are there any plans to mitigate construction disruptions that could affect current residents?

As noted in my previous response, should development of these intensification areas proceed, additional development applications (such as Site Plan Control) will be required prior to physical construction. The City commonly requests construction management plans through the Site Plan Control process to identify mitigation measures for potential off-site disruptions. The mitigation measures would be specific to the development proposal.

- Has there been any indication of development interest in the two properties I specified (on/near 136 Joseph Street)?

As noted in my previous response, the City is aware of a housing proposal for the lands at 541 Division Street / 157 Joseph Street however no formal development applications have been submitted. The details of development proposals are made public when a formal *Planning Act* application has been submitted (such as Site Plan Control). Active development applications are publicly identified as a blue dot on the following map, which links to our DASH platform to provide details and supporting documents associated with the application (similar to the supporting information associated with the current NKT application D35-001-2025 described below).

<https://www.cityofkingston.ca/planning-and-development/planning-and-development-map/>

We appreciate any additional insights you can provide and would happily schedule a call to discuss these if that's easier. Thanks again for your time!

Best,
Agostino & Silvia

From: Oddie, Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>

Date: Monday, March 3, 2025 at 12:24 PM

To: Ago Guastella [REDACTED]

Cc: SILVIA FAVOT-GUASTELLA [REDACTED] Agarwal, Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>, Van Vugt, Niki <nvanvugt@cityofkingston.ca>

Subject: RE: Inquiry regarding city application - D35-001 – 2025

Good morning Agostino and Silvia,

The North King's Town project has identified opportunities for residential and mixed use intensification and infill redevelopment within the study area, shown on the back of the Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting (generally, south of John Counter Boulevard, east of Division Street, west of the Great Cataraqui River and north of downtown). The intended built form varies between the various intensification areas within the study area, with the two intensification areas closest to your property at 136 Joseph Street being intended for maximum building heights of 4 storeys. The proposed zoning for these intensification areas would allow townhouses, stacked townhouses and apartment buildings, and would also allow neighbourhood commercial uses, such as a convenience store, to provide smaller-scale commercial amenities within walking distance of the surrounding neighbourhood (commercial uses would not be required, but offered as an option to be included within any redevelopments).

We are aware of a housing proposal for the intensification area associated with 541 Division Street and 157 Joseph Street. However, no formal development applications have been submitted.

Before redeveloping either of these intensification areas, additional planning applications would need to be submitted, such as a zoning amendment to remove a holding overlay (which is put in place to ensure sufficient servicing and transportation capacity) and likely a site plan control application (which is used to ensure the functional and safe detailed design of larger properties).

To access the draft Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments and other supporting documents associated with the proposed amendments, please visit our DASH platform:

1. Go to www.cityofkingston.ca/DASH
2. Click on "Go to DASH", which is a large blue button within the "How to Use DASH" section of the website.

3. Type in the application number from the Notice ("D35-001-2025") in the search bar located in the top right-hand corner of the page.
4. Click on the "Record Info" drop-down menu
5. Select "Supporting Information"

A good place to start might be the document titled "1a. Summary of Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments", which provides a high-level summary. More detailed information on the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments can be found within the draft by-laws (documents 1i, 1j, 1k) or a more user-friendly version of these documents being "1g. Proposed Official Plan Modifications - Tracked Changes" and "1h. Proposed Zoning By-law Modifications".

If you'd prefer to arrange a phone call to further discuss, please feel free to give me a call at the extension below.

Thanks
Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259

noddie@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: Ago Guastella [REDACTED]
Sent: March 2, 2025 5:58 PM
To: Oddie, Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>
Cc: SILVIA FAVOT-GUASTELLA [REDACTED]
Subject: Inquiry regarding city application - D 35-001 – 2025

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

Subject: Inquiry Regarding Proposed City Plan Amendments Near 136 Joseph St.

Dear Mr. Oddie,

I recently received a notice titled - NOTICE OF A COMPLETE APPLICATION AND STATUTORY PUBLIC MEETING, regarding the City of Kingston is proposed

amendments to the "official plan" (As it's referred to in the letter) and the upcoming statutory public meeting. I understand that some of the areas affected are directly across the street from a rental property my wife and I own at 136 Joseph St.

I wanted to reach out to see if you could provide any insight into what these amendments might mean for us as property owners. Specifically, we would appreciate any information you might have on the planned developments on Joseph Street and how they might impact us and the surrounding neighborhood.

Any details you can offer would be greatly appreciated. Please let me know if there is a convenient time to discuss this further.

Thank you for your time and understanding.

Regards,

Agostino and Silvia.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Oddie,Niall

From: Oddie,Niall
Sent: February 27, 2025 8:31 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: RE: D35-001-2025

Good morning, Phillip

Your property at 531 Albert Street is not affected by any of the changes. This property is located ~475 metres west of the proposed amendments.

Your property at 127 Colborne Street is not included within the proposed Zoning By-law amendment but is included within the lands subject to the proposed Official Plan amendment – specifically, your lands are included within the proposed expansion to the St. Lawrence Ward Heritage Character Area. This is not a heritage designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. The proposed policies associated with the St. Lawrence Ward Heritage Character Area are provided on page 9/35 of the document “1g. Proposed Official Plan Modifications – Tracked Changes” and would generally discourage demolition of buildings within this area, encourage adaptive re-use of buildings, identify the potential for urban design studies or heritage impact assessments for Planning Act applications (such as rezoning applications for development proposals), and identify the area as a future heritage conservation district study area.

To access the above-noted document and other supporting documents associated with the proposed amendments, please visit our DASH platform:

1. Go to www.cityofkingston.ca/DASH
2. Click on "Go to DASH", which is a large blue button within the "How to Use DASH" section of the website.
3. Type in the application number from the Notice ("D35-001-2025") in the search bar located in the top right-hand corner of the page.
4. Click on the "Record Info" drop-down menu
5. Select "Supporting Information"

A good place to start might be the document titled "1a. Summary of Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments", which provides a high-level summary. More detailed information on the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments can be found within the draft by-laws (documents 1i, 1j, 1k) or a more user-friendly version of these documents being "1g. Proposed Official Plan Modifications - Tracked Changes" and "1h. Proposed Zoning By-law Modifications".

Please feel free to give me a call to discuss the above or if you have any other questions.

Thanks
Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259
noddie@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: Phillip Davies [REDACTED]
Sent: February 26, 2025 3:12 PM
To: Oddie, Niall noddie@cityofkingston.ca
Subject: D35-001-2025

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

Hello

We are having a very hard time determining if our house is directly affected and designation We own two houses 1. 127 Colburn St.
2. 531 Albert St.

Are either of these houses affected by the proposal amendments?
If either is impacted or both, what is the possible impact for us as homeowners.?
Thanks very much Phillip Davies [REDACTED]

Oddie,Niall

From: Oddie,Niall
Sent: March 4, 2025 2:40 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti; Park,Tim; Osanic,Lisa; Oosterhof,Gary; Cinanni,Vincent
Subject: RE: North King's Town parkland

Good afternoon Vicki,

We typically prepare the agenda package correspondence by noon on the Wednesday preceding the Planning Committee meeting; your correspondence will be included in the addendum.

We recognize the importance of parkland and recreational opportunities within communities. While the NKT project has not identified the location of specific new parks, this does not mean that the NKT project has not considered future parkland and recreational opportunities for existing and future residents. As mentioned in my previous response below, parkland will be secured through the development application process in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act* and the City's Parkland Conveyance By-law. We have not identified the locations of the parklands within the intensification areas at this time as the location and orientation of the park space needs to be considered in relation to the development application, servicing requirements, grade changes, etc., which are determined through detailed design of the development applications. This approach helps to ensure that the new parkland is located where new residents will be located. Further, many of the intensification areas within NKT are anticipated to be brownfields and will require remediation prior to a sensitive use (which includes parkland) can be established. There can be land use limitations associated with the remediation process, which would not be known until the time of a development application.

The service level of 4 hectares per 1,000 residents identified in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) is applied across 'Park Service Areas' within the City and not to individual development applications. Exhibit 6 within the PRMP provides the calculated service levels for each park service area, the boundaries of which are displayed in Exhibit 8. For context, the majority of the NKT intensification areas are located within park service area #8, with the remainder being located within #11. Park service area #8 currently has a higher service level than other areas of the City. While park service area #11 is below the target, and it is important to obtain more parkland through development applications to increase the service level, improvements to existing park amenities to allow for a higher capacity can help bridge a service level gap while development builds out over time.

We have not prepared an inventory of the parks and their facilities within an 800-metre walking distance of each intensification area. However, we can confirm that each intensification area is located within an 800-metre walking distance of multiple parks, and each intensification area is located within a 400-metre walking distance of at least one existing park. This would be further improved through the use of the Parkland Conveyance By-law at the time of future development applications. Pages 82 – 95 of the (pdf) PRMP illustrate the existing facilities, parkland and amenities within the NKT area.

The *Planning Act* and the City's Parkland Conveyance By-law both enable parkland requirements to be fulfilled by land, cash-in-lieu payments, or a combination of both. It is important to highlight that the developer does not get to decide which method parkland is fulfilled – the City's by-law (clause 19) is clear, "The City may, **in its sole discretion**, require the payment of money in lieu of, or in combination with, a conveyance of parkland where...". At the time of a development application, the City will decide how best to fulfill the parkland requirement associated with that development application and proposed use. Where the City elects to accept cash-in-lieu payments as full or partial parkland dedication, the payment would be based on a current market appraisal to ensure the cash-in-lieu payments keep pace with rising land values.

The NKT project is a fundamentally different planning exercise than a secondary plan for greenfield lands. The Cataraqui West Secondary Plan was prepared for a relatively limited number of parcels owned by a limited number of landowners, who worked in collaboration with each other and the City to prepare a collective plan for the lands. The parks that were identified in that plan were still secured through the parkland dedication process. Conversely, NKT focuses on encouraging redevelopment and intensification of existing developed lands involving multiple property owners and we have no way of knowing which order the parcels would be redeveloped in (or if at all). It would be premature to identify the location of future parks until we have a better sense of which parcels will be developed.

Thanks
Niall



Niall Oddie M.Pl, MCIP, RPP (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 3259
noddie@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: [REDACTED]
Sent: March 4, 2025 1:30 PM
To: Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: FW: North King's Town parkland

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

Hello Niall:

Could you please let me know if I will receive answers to the email below by Thursday noon? Any information you can provide in advance of the Planning Committee meeting would be helpful.

Also, by when did my email have to make it to you to be included in the Planning Committee agenda?

Thank you.

Vicki

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 1:05 PM
To: 'Oddie,Niall' <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>

Cc: 'Agarwal,Sukriti' <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>; 'Osanic,Lisa' <losanic@cityofkingston.ca>; 'Oosterhof,Gary' <goosterhof@cityofkingston.ca>; 'Cinanni,Vincent' <vcinanni@cityofkingston.ca>

Subject: RE: North King's Town parkland

Hello Niall:

I have been giving more thought to the failure of the North King's Town planning proposal to identify new and necessary park spaces within the proposed areas of intensification.

I remain very concerned about the lack of foresight about where parkland is needed for a possible 13,000 new residents.

We know that parkland is important to community health – mental and physical.

We know that the Provincial Policy Statement says (section 3.9.1(b) that “Healthy, active, and inclusive communities should be promoted by “planning and providing for the needs of persons of all ages and abilities in the distribution of a full range of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, **parklands, public spaces, open space areas**, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources.”

We know that the City's Official Plan says in sections 2.6.5(d) (new mid-rise developments) and 2.6.5(c) (new high-rise developments) that these new developments should generally be located “**within walking distance of parkland, open space, and community facilities.**”

We know that the City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan sets service standards for parkland in the City:

- “To continue providing “a high and **equitable** level of parkland for new residents, the service level target should be maintained at **4.0 hectares per 1,000 new residents.**” (page 45)
- The service standard in the Master Plan is: “In the urban area, walking distance within **800 metres** (10-minute walk) from residential areas should also be considered for active parkland distribution, to provide the greatest degree of accessibility to parkland.” (page 44)

We also know that instead of providing parkland as required by the Planning Act, a developer may pay **cash-in-lieu of parkland**. This money is set aside by the City where it does not gain interest and does not keep up with rising land acquisition costs over time. And where it leaves the provision of appropriate park space to the City to acquire after the fact.

Williamsville comes to mind with the City having to buy land at 2024 prices to establish parkland after development has occurred without parkland. Certainly, a lesson to learn from the Williamsville experience is that leaving parkland until later is a **costly mistake with significant impact on the City's financial resources**.

Looking at the existing city policies, there should be an additional **52 hectares of parkland** to accommodate the intensification. This is even more important given that the vast majority of the units will be in mid or high-rise buildings with limited access to outdoor green space within the building area. Suggesting that Belle Park is the local park is not reasonable for people living at Montreal and Counter or even closer to the green space.

I believe it is an **unfair burden to future City Councils and to residents** to wait to see where parkland for new residents is needed.

What are the planning reasons to not plan for parks now?

Planning for park space was part of the secondary plan for Cat West – see OP policies 10.D.6.1 to 10.D.6.6 which identified the location of the 6.5 hectare main park and 3 parkettes of 0.4 hectares each were shown conceptually in the plan.

Has the City identified which existing parks are within 800 m and what they offer to the full range of park users - from toddlers to seniors, and everyone in between? Has the City considered how to meet the service standard in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan? Could you please share this information with me before the Planning Committee meeting next week?

Thank you.

With my best regards and sincere concerns,

Vicki

From: Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, January 8, 2025 3:21 PM

Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>; Osanic,Lisa <losanic@cityofkingston.ca>; Oosterhof,Gary <goosterhof@cityofkingston.ca>; Cinanni,Vincent <vcinanni@cityofkingston.ca>

Subject: RE: North King's Town

Good afternoon Vicki,

Please see below for responses to your questions. Sukriti or I would be happy to discuss any further questions or comments that you may have.

We would appreciate comments on the draft materials by January 10, 2025 so that we can ensure they are considered in any revisions before the formal applications are submitted, however comments are accepted until Council makes a decision on the applications.

Thanks
Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259

noddie@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.

Sent: January 7, 2025 9:14 PM

To: Agarwal,Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>

Cc: Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>; Osanic,Lisa <losanic@cityofkingston.ca>; Oosterhof,Gary <goosterhof@cityofkingston.ca>; Cinanni,Vincent <vcinanni@cityofkingston.ca>

Subject: North King's Town Secondary Planueen

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

Hello Sukriti:

Happy New Year!

I am trying to understand some things about the North King's Town Secondary Plan that was presented to Planning Committee on December 5, 2024.

Here are my questions.

Urban design

The staff report (PC-25-001) mentions built form policies that can be used to minimize the impact of highrise buildings. I thought the city has no jurisdiction to impose design guidelines. How will the city be able to “ensure these buildings are appropriately designed?” (page 15) What measures do planning staff have in mind?

Changes to the *Planning Act* have reduced the City's ability to regulate exterior design of buildings through the Site Plan Control process (materiality, landscaping, etc.) however we retain the ability to regulate built form through the use of building setbacks, stepbacks, lot coverage, floor plate sizes, building length, articulation, etc. which can all be enforced through zoning regulations.

Also, could you please point to a reliable reference (scholarly analysis) that explains how a podium and tower design works to “reduce the visual mass of a building?” (page 20, section 10H.2.24) That does not seem to be the perception people have, for example, of the Homestead Tower on Queen Street between Ontario and King Streets.

The City does not have access to academic journals to complete a scholarly analysis, however the design concepts around podiums and towers are widely discussed in various design guidelines implemented by other large municipalities within Ontario, such as:

- Toronto: <https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/96ea-cityplanning-tall-buildings-may2013-final-AODA.pdf>
- Ottawa: https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/default/files/design_guide_tall_bldgs_en.pdf
- Milton: <https://www.milton.ca/en/business-and-development/resources/Tall-Building-Guidelines.pdf>
- Hamilton: <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/2022-11/pedpolicies-tall-buildings-guidelines.pdf>
- Burlington: <https://www.burlington.ca/en/building-and-renovating/resources/Urban-Design-Guidelines/Tall%20Building%20Guidelines.pdf>

Outer Station

Page 33 recognizes the cultural value of the Outer Station and the paragraph concludes – “As such, the CHS considered how appropriate future use might occur, including the potential for adaptive reuse or moving structures within the site.” [underlining added] How will moving the train station buildings preserve their cultural heritage significance? (section 10H.3.2)

Section 5.3 of the Cultural Heritage Study provides recommendations for conservation and development for Sub-Area #2, which includes the Depot/Outer Station lands, with Section 5.3.2 providing a series of recommendations mainly focused on the Outer Station lands themselves, including the following:

“The City shall encourage adaptive re-use of the existing built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscape attributes in their original locations on site. In the absence of any feasible alternative to redevelopment, and as a last resort instead of demolition, the City may consider relocation of built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscape attributes to locations within the property provided that it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City that the cultural heritage values of the heritage attributes will be conserved and that relocation would enhance public access to the cultural heritage resources (off-site relocation is not acceptable).”

It is acknowledged that the Outer Station buildings are in (and have been for quite some time) a deteriorated state and conservation will require significant expenditure. Redevelopment of the lands may be a feasible method of supporting such a significant expenditure, however the placement of the buildings within the site may constrain redevelopment. As a last resort, relocating the buildings within the Outer Station site may be a feasible option to facilitate the redevelopment needed to fund restoration of the buildings.

Electricity Capacity

“There were no specific upgrades identified for the electrical or natural gas networks at this time,’ (page 4) and then on page 34 “It is anticipated that significant upgrades to the electrical infrastructure within NKT and surrounding network will be required to accommodate the full build-out of NKT.” Do I understand correctly that the studies have not been done to determine electricity needs and that developments are going to be approved on a first come, first served basis until the need for an upgrade is reached?

The Servicing Study was completed by J.L. Richards and reviewed by Utilities Kingston. Each of the utilities (wastewater, potable water, stormwater, electrical and natural gas) within NKT were analyzed to assess the impacts of the potential growth within NKT and provide recommendations for necessary modifications. Modelling was completed by Utilities Kingston for the wastewater and potable water networks and determined where specific upgrades within NKT would be required to support a full-build out scenario. Utilities Kingston did not complete the same modelling for the natural gas or electrical utilities as these networks function as a scale beyond the NKT study area and require more specific phasing information to determine where upgrades will be required.

Development within the identified intensification areas will be subject to a holding symbol and required to provide servicing reports to confirm adequate servicing capacity.

Parkland

Both Councillors Osanic and Oosterhof raised the issue of parkland during the December 5th meeting. The staff answer was that based on the Williamsville experience, people wanted more sidewalks, wider sidewalks, vegetation planters, and trees. This may be an accurate summary for the student-development centred Williamsville. For the Montreal Street/ Counter Boulevard it can be assumed that much of the housing will be for families, especially young families.

Don't people in intensely developed neighbourhoods need nearby park space, not just parkettes than add to the pedestrian experience? (10H.2.11, 10H.2.42)

How does the lack of parkland close to the intensification area match Principle # 1 – “To create a welcoming and inclusive setting for people to gather, recreate, work, and live?” Is there a policy calculation cities use to determine the amount of parkland relative to population? (beyond the 5% or cash-in-lieu requirement in the Planning Act)

Is staff saying that people living in the area can use the paths to get to Belle Park for their parkland and recreation? Is the area at the footing of the Waaban Crossing appropriate park space? Where are the plans for parks (not parkettes) for people to use around Counter and Montreal Streets?

I note too that the city has already spent well over \$1 million for small parkette spaces in Williamsville. Is there a way to identify the park space area in the Secondary Plan for North Kingston's intensification areas? What spaces are identified for people to gather and recreate around Montreal and Counter Street that do not require crossing either street – the majority of the buildings are on the west side of Montreal Street.

New development will be required to provide parkland in accordance with the City's parkland dedication by-law and *Planning Act* requirements. We have not identified the locations of the parklands within the intensification areas at this time as the location and orientation of the park space needs to be considered in relation to the development application, servicing requirements, grade changes, etc. which are determined through detailed design of the development applications. The City further utilizes the Parks and Recreation Master Plan to determine if additional parkland, outside of the development process, is necessary to support neighbourhoods and includes consideration of population density within the surrounding areas.

<https://www.cityofkingston.ca/council-and-city-administration/plans-reports-and-studies/parks-and-recreation-master-plan/>

The Montreal Street and John Counter Boulevard intersection is in proximity to Belle Park, which has an approved master plan to guide the redevelopment and programming within the park. Further, the City has been working to secure additional segments of the Waterfront Trail along the Great Cataraqui River south of the Waaban Crossing, which contributes to recreation opportunities within this area. The lands on the immediate north and south sides of the Waaban Crossing are City-owned lands and will be designated Open Space through the proposed Official Plan amendments, however detailed plans for these lands are not yet available.

Residents are also able to use the Newmarket Lane Parkette along the shoreline of the Great Cataraqui River. I also understand that several of the buildings around this intersection have programmed outdoor amenity space for their residents, such as picnic tables and climbing gyms for children.

Parking

Given the reduction in parking spaces requirements, could the secondary plan require the majority of building parking to be underground? Otherwise, won't this level of intensification create an asphalt wasteland that holds heat in summer and is contrary to the city's sustainability goals?

The proposed policies encourage underground and structured parking, but would permit surface parking in the rear or interior side yards as well. We know through previous work that underground parking garages are costly to construct and can challenge the financial feasibility of a project or increase unit costs to recover the increased construction costs. This approach has been selected to help reduce construction costs, which can assist with housing affordability. Further, we heard through consultations with the development community that underground parking garages may be prohibited within brownfield locations, depending on the type of contamination encountered (e.g. groundwater contamination).

Proposed Section 10G.2.39 encourage the surface parking areas to include planting strips, landscaped traffic islands to define smaller parking courts, which help to create opportunities for shade, infiltration and surfaces with higher albedo to reflect sunlight and reduce heat build up. The zoning by-law would also regulate lot coverage and landscape open space requirements. The zoning by-law also established parking maximums, which serve to reduce the amount of asphalt included within development applications.

Active transportation

Doesn't the Official Plan include transit as a form of active transportation? The answer to a question at the December 5th meeting about the active transportation corridor proposed for Bay Street to Montreal Street (page 7) said "active transportation corridor" referred to pedestrians and cyclists. How does the proposed zoning make this explicit? Doesn't it need to specify that buses are not considered an active transportation mode in the context of the Wellington Street Extension?

(Added by By-Law Number 2017-57, OPA Number 50)

Active Transportation

Means human-powered travel, including but not limited to, walking, cycling, inline skating and accessible travel with the use of mobility aids, including motorized wheelchairs and other power-assisted devices moving at a comparable speed.

(Added by By-Law Number 2017-57, OPA Number 50)

Additional Residential Unit

The definition of 'Active Transportation' within the Official Plan does not include transit – it means "human-powered travel". The City's Active Transportation Master Plan includes a similar definition that also omits transit. Buses need to operate on a road and a road is not being constructed through these lands.

The proposed amendments remove the southern portion of the WSE from the Schedule 4 – Roads of the Official Plan, while being retained on Schedule 5 - Major Pathways.

20-storey building location

Does the zoning to allow 20-storey buildings have a limit on the total number? If I am reading the proposed Schedule J correctly, they could be along Montreal Street near Railway. Is staff foreseeing a possibility of three 20-storey buildings or more?

The proposed Official Plan policies would enable building heights up to 20 storeys in the area north of the Montreal Street, Rideau Street and Railway Street intersection through a minor variance application. The zoning for this area is proposed for the MU3 zone, which permits building heights of up to 15 storeys as of right; the minor variance application could be used to increase up to 20 storeys in accordance with the proposed Official Plan policies.

The proposed zoning currently does not establish a maximum number of towers that could be constructed within the zones that permit high-rise development, but does limit development through density, setbacks, tower separation distances, lot coverage, etc.

Thank you for your answers to these questions.

I understand that the public has until January 10th to provide comments on the December 5th staff report and I hope to provide some comments by then.

Vicki

Vicki Schmolka

Oddie,Niall

From: Van Vugt,Niki
Sent: March 5, 2025 12:21 PM
To: 'tracyandtimlyon'; Oddie,Niall
Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti; Ridge,Gregory; Cinanni,Vincent
Subject: RE: North King's Town Project - Recommendation Report
Attachments: Report Number 24-058.pdf

Good afternoon,

Hope you are having a nice week and thank you for your email.

> 106 Main Street - what is the allowance for densification? How many storeys will be permitted?

Please note that the property at 106 Main Street will be included in the proposed expansion of the existing St. Lawrence Ward Heritage Character Area as part of the proposed Official Plan Amendment tied to the North King's Town project but is not identified as an intensification area or subject to any zoning changes. As such, the property will remain as an Urban Residential 5 (UR5) Zone on Schedule 1 of the Kingston Zoning By-Law 2022-62.

For your awareness, the proposed expansion of the St. Lawrence Ward Heritage Character Area is not a heritage designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. You would not be required to obtain a heritage permit to make small changes to your property. However, the standard processes of building permits and zoning requirements would continue to apply if physical construction were being proposed.

The proposed policies associated with the St. Lawrence Ward Heritage Character Area are provided on page 9/35 of the document "1g. Proposed Official Plan Modifications – Tracked Changes" and would generally discourage demolition of buildings within this area, encourage adaptive re-use of buildings, identify the potential for urban design studies or heritage impact assessments for Planning Act applications (such as rezoning applications for development proposals), and identify the area as a future heritage conservation district study area. The intention is to help conserve the character of the area by providing policies to be used when development applications are submitted to change how land is used or receive approval to construct a different form of building than permitted through the zoning by-law. There will continue to be changes that property owners can undertake to their properties, such as those that comply with current zoning regulations.

To review the above-referenced document and various other supporting documents, please visit our DASH platform:

1. Go to www.cityofkingston.ca/DASH
2. Click on "Go to DASH", which is a large blue button within the "How to Use DASH" section of the website.
3. Type in the application number from the Notice ("D35-001-2025") in the search bar located in the top right-hand corner of the page.
4. Click on the "Record Info" drop-down menu
5. Select "Supporting Information"

A good place to start might be the document titled "1a. Summary of Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments", which provides a high-level summary. More detailed information on the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments can be found within the draft by-laws (documents 1i, 1j, 1k) or a more user-friendly version of these documents being "1g. Proposed Official Plan Modifications - Tracked Changes" and "1h. Proposed Zoning By-law Modifications".

> Belle Park - what do staff respectfully disagree with? Do staff prefer to allow for overlook? There are now few places in Kingston to escape from densification, indeed from buildings in general. As one of those, Belle Park should be preserved from overlook.

The placement of taller buildings adjacent to, or near, amenities or transit opportunities such as commercial areas or centres, on the periphery of neighbourhoods, near parkland or open spaces, and on arterial roads is a design consideration that has been included in existing municipal policy under locational criteria for mid and high-rise development in the City of Kingston Official Plan (see Sections 2.6.6. and 2.6.7.) and municipal guidelines such Design Guidelines for Residential Lots.

Considering the nature of Belle Park, being a public park that is heavily wooded, land use compatibility matters such as a loss of privacy due to intrusive overlook would not be as significant of a factor versus privately owned land. In addition, improved perceptions of safety can occur by locating mid and high-rise buildings in intensification areas as it enables a sense of comfort and identity, for local residents and visitors.

As noted in the recommendation report, future development applications will need to ensure that the appropriate studies and assessments, such as shadow and wind studies, are performed to demonstrate that land use compatibility matters are appropriately addressed. As such, overlook on Belle Park is not a substantial planning concern from a land use compatibility perspective.

> Rideau St designated as arterial? Will traffic calming be removed? Will the speed limit increase?

The recommendation report provides a high level summary on the overall network recommendations which includes the reclassification of Rideau Street **from** an Arterial Road (from Montreal Street to River Street) and a Local Road (from River Street to Barrack Street) **to** a Collector Road, which more accurately reflects its current and planned function. There are no proposed changes to the existing traffic calming measures at this time along Rideau Street.

The NKT Mobility Plan identifies that currently, all roads in NKT have a statutory unposted speed limit of 50 km/h, except the section of Patrick Street between Stephen Street and Pine Street, the section of Sydenham Street between Queen Street and Ordnance Street, the section of Rideau Street between Barrack Street and 200 metres north of Cataraquei Street, and the section of Cowdy Street between Stephen Street and Pine Street, which are all 40 km/h. These correspond with existing or former school frontages in the area. The City has committed to reducing neighbourhood street limits to 40 km/h through gateway signage by the end of 2026 to be implemented via other mechanisms separate from the North King's Town work (see page 62 of the NKT Mobility Plan). More information around the Neighbourhood Area Speed Limits work can be found [here](#) and the attached Report Number 24-058. This approach is aligned with the Council's Strategic Priorities, recommendations from the School Pedestrian Safety Working Group, and the City's Road Safety Plan.

Please let us know if you have any additional questions. We are happy to chat further on any of the above.

Sincerely,

Niki



Niki Van Vugt (she/her/hers)

Intermediate Planner

Planning Services, Growth & Development

City of Kingston

Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard

216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 extension 3253

nvanvugt@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.

Want more information from Planning Services? [Sign up for our email newsletter!](#) Select "Planning Project Updates" when you sign up.

From: tracyandtimlyon [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2025 6:55 AM

To: Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>

Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>; Van Vugt,Niki <nvanvugt@cityofkingston.ca>; Ridge,Gregory <gridge@cityofkingston.ca>; Cinanni,Vincent <vcinanni@cityofkingston.ca>

Subject: Re: North King's Town Project - Recommendation Report

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

Niall, my concerns with these updates are:

> 106 Main Street - what is the allowance for densification? How many storeys will be permitted?

> Belle Park - what do staff respectfully disagree with? Do staff prefer to allow for overlook? There are now few places in Kingston to escape from densification, indeed from buildings in general. As one of those, Belle Park should be preserved from overlook.

> Rideau St designated as arterial? Will traffic calming be removed? Will the speed limit increase?

Tim

On Tue, Mar 4, 2025, 05:33 Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Further to my February 13, 2025 email, the City-initiated Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments (City File Number D35-001-2025) to implement the North King’s Town project are proceeding to a Public Meeting on **Thursday, March 6, 2025**. As detailed in the attached notice, the meeting will be offered in a hybrid format – in person at Council Chambers, City Hall (216 Ontario Street), or virtually with advanced registration.

In addition to the supporting information available on the [Development and Services Hub \(DASH\)](#), a copy of the staff report, Report Number PC-25-008, is available on the Planning Committee agenda package for the March 6, 2025 meeting through the following link:

<https://events.cityofkingston.ca/council/detail/2025-03-06-1800-Planning-Committee>

To access the supporting information available on [DASH](#), please use the following steps:

1. Use the search bar near the top right-hand corner to search for application “D35-001-2025”.
2. Select “Record Info”
3. Select “Supporting Information” from the drop-down menu.

Should you have any questions or wish to be removed from this mailing list, please feel free to contact the undersigned or Sukriti Agarwal, Manager Policy Planning (copied).

Thanks

Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (he/him/his)

Senior Planner

Planning Services

City of Kingston



Located at: [1211 John Counter Boulevard](#)

[216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3](https://www.cityofkingston.ca/216-Ontario-Street-Kingston-ON-K7L-2Z3)

613-546-4291 extension 3259

noddie@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.

Oddie,Niall

From: Oddie,Niall
Sent: March 6, 2025 11:07 AM
To: greg samuel
Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti; Van Vugt,Niki
Subject: RE: North King's Town - Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting

Hi Greg,

I've inserted responses to your questions below.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thanks
Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259

noddie@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: greg samuel [REDACTED]
Sent: March 6, 2025 8:27 AM
To: Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Re: North King's Town - Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting

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

Thanks so much.

Couple of questions. I am sifting through material but not easy for me.

Is there any green space allocated in the plan?

NKT has not identified the location of specific new parks, but the City will be able to secure parkland when development applications are submitted in accordance with the *Planning Act* and the City's Parkland Conveyance By-law. We have not identified the locations of the parklands within the intensification areas at this time as the location and orientation of the park space needs to be considered in relation to the development application, servicing requirements, grade changes, etc., which are determined through detailed design of the development

applications. This approach helps to ensure that the new parkland is located where new residents will be located. Further, many of the intensification areas within NKT are anticipated to be brownfields and will require remediation prior to a sensitive use (which includes parkland) can be established. There can be land use limitations associated with the remediation process, which would not be known until the time of a development application.

What parcels are zoned for 10 stories or higher? I have looked at the massing diagrams, but hard to tell. Building heights are generally described within the proposed Official Plan (e.g. Section 10H.3). The proposed zoning by-law amendment then establishes maximum building heights based on the proposed Official Plan amendment – the building heights are contained within the regulations for each proposed zone, or in certain instances, as part of proposed exceptions.


The intersection of John Counter Boulevard and Montreal Street is proposed for maximum building heights of 12 storeys, which is similar in height to the existing apartment buildings.

Selected parcels at the intersection of Montreal Street, Rideau Street and Railway street are proposed for maximum building heights of 15 storeys, which may be increased to 20 storeys through a minor variance application (the proposed Official Plan amendment contains criteria that would need to be satisfied – e.g. Section 10H.3.3).

The other intensification areas would be either 4 storeys or 6 storeys in height and specified in the proposed zoning amendment.

Lands to be rezoned from former zone to:

- Neighbourhood Commercial (CN)
- Mixed Zone 1 (MU1)
- Mixed Zone 2 (MU2)
- Mixed Zone 3 (MU3)
- Urban Multi-Residential Zone 8 (URM8)
- Urban Multi-Residential Zone 11 (URM11)
- Development Reserve (DR)



Is the land where the integrated care hub now sitting being rezoned?

Yes, the parcel located at 661 Montreal Street is proposed to be rezoned to MU1, which would permit mixed use developments of up to 6 storeys in height.

What are the proposed setbacks from the street on Montreal?

Setbacks are regulated by the zoning by-law and can vary between zones. The front setbacks associated with the variety of zones proposed along Montreal Street are summarized below:

- MU1 – 3 metres
- MU2 – 3 metres
- MU3 – 3 metres
- CN – CN zone does not have a specified front setback. The properties would also be subject to the UR5 zone, which essentially establishes the front setback to be the average of the two adjacent buildings. This portion of Montreal Street is old, with most of the buildings being constructed in close proximity to the front lot line. This area is not intended as an intensification area and the existing buildings are intended to remain – the CN zone applied here provides flexibility to establish smaller scale commercial uses, if owners wish (no required).

Thank you

Greg Samuel
225 Park st



From: Oddie, Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>
Sent: March 6, 2025 8:20 AM
To: 'greg samuel' 
Subject: RE: North King's Town - Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting

Hi Greg,

The blue text shown in ~~strikethrough~~ is proposed to be removed.

The blue text shown in underline is proposed to be added.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thanks

Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259

noddie@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: greg samuel [REDACTED]
Sent: March 6, 2025 8:15 AM
To: Oddie, Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Re: North King's Town - Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting

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

Hello Niall Oddie:

Regarding North Kings Town plan, the dash material.

In 1g, are the blue lines meant to be crossed out, or are those additions.

Thank you

Greg Samuel

225 Park St.

From: Oddie, Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>

Sent: February 13, 2025 2:27 PM

Cc: Agarwal, Sukriti <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca>; Van Vugt, Niki <nvanvugt@cityofkingston.ca>

Subject: North King's Town - Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting

Good afternoon,

You are receiving this email because our records indicate you previously expressed interest in receiving updates on the North King's Town Project (NKT).

We would like to thank everyone who has participated in the previous open houses, workshops and other engagements over the past several years and, more recently, through the Community Meeting held on December 5, 2024.

The City of Kingston has initiated Official Plan and Zoning By-Law amendments to implement the North King's Town Project (City File Number D35-001-2025). The Public Meeting has been scheduled for **Thursday, March 6, 2025**. As detailed in the attached notice, the meeting will be offered in a hybrid format - in person at Council Chambers, City Hall (216 Ontario Street), or virtually with advanced registration.

Additional information, including supporting documents for the application, can be viewed by accessing the [Development and Services Hub \(DASH\)](#). Use the search function near the top right-hand corner for application number D35-001-2025 and then select "Supporting Information" from the "Records Info" drop-down menu.

Should you have any questions or wish to be removed from this mailing list, please feel free to contact the undersigned or Sukriti Agarwal, Manager Policy Planning (copied).

Thanks

Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259

noddie@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.

Oddie,Niall

From: Oddie,Niall
Sent: March 6, 2025 11:27 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Agarwal,Sukriti; Van Vugt,Niki
Subject: RE: North King's Town Policy Plan

Good morning, Nancy

Responses to your questions have been inserted below.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Thanks
Niall



Niall Oddie M.PI, MCIP, RPP (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 3259

noddie@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 CRAIG [REDACTED]
Sent: March 5, 2025 3:51 PM
To: Oddie,Niall <noddie@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: North King's Town Policy Plan

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

Hello Mr. Oddie,

I am writing with some questions/comments in regards to the North King's Town policy plan.

I am concerned in particular about the following things:

1. The lack of designated open green space on the identified development lands: While I agree with the need for more housing, ensuring adequate green space in this district is a must and should

not be tied to just the development proposals that come forward. Relying on the 2 documents you refer to (City's Parkland Dedication By-law and Planning Act requirements and Parks and Recreation Master Plan) seem woefully inadequate, especially given the present proposal before Council of the soccer stadium on the Memorial Centre grounds, when there is already a shortage of green space in Williamsville. I feel the reference to parkettes, border strips, community gardens and type of trees to plant is inadequate for the breadth of this development policy proposal. The other "green" areas noted as future goals also do not seem adequate and none of these noted provides a large open green space to address the loss of lands and the increased population.

I would like to see a designated substantial land parcel as green space somewhere in these development lands to ensure the aim of meeting the stated goal to promote healthy, active and inclusive communities.

NKT has not identified the location of specific new parks, but the City will be able to secure parkland when development applications are submitted in accordance with the *Planning Act* and the City's Parkland Conveyance By-law. We have not identified the locations of the parklands within the intensification areas at this time as the location and orientation of the park space needs to be considered in relation to the development application, servicing requirements, grade changes, etc., which are determined through detailed design of the development applications. This approach helps to ensure that the new parkland is located where new residents will be located. Further, many of the intensification areas within NKT are anticipated to be brownfields and will require remediation prior to a sensitive use (which includes parkland) can be established. There can be land use limitations associated with the remediation process, which would not be known until the time of a development application.

We will forward your comments regarding the Memorial Centre to staff involved with that proposal for consideration.


2. Is there a difference between the terms "intensification" and "infill" and if so, can you please explain this?

Section 1 of the Official Plan defines both terms:

Infill: Refers to the development of a vacant or underutilized lot, or a consolidated number of lots. Infill development encourages intensification and sustainability.

Intensification: The development of a property, site or area at a higher density than currently exists through: a. the re-use of brownfield sites; b. the development of vacant and/or underutilized lots within previously developed areas; c. infill development; and, d. the expansion or conversion of existing buildings.

Proposed Schedule NKT-1 (shown below), which identifies the North King's Town Specific Policy Areas, identifies individual areas of intensification as "Infill Sites", whereas broader areas of intensification that apply to multiple properties are identified as either "Montreal Street and John Counter Boulevard" or "Montreal Street, Railway Street and Rideau Street".



3. The exact plans for the 541 Division Street and 157 Joseph Street parcel and concerns about height and set-backs: It states in the report

“This property was identified as an intensification area on Schedule NKT-1 and proposed zoning of URM11 with a site-specific exception. The owner of these lands has requested that the same development permissions be applied to the abutting parcel at 157 Joseph Street. These two parcels are considered ‘one lot for zoning purposes’ which means they Report to Planning Committee March 6, 2025 Report Number PC-25-008 Page 42 of 44 would be redeveloped together in a cohesive manner. A number of site-specific exceptions have been included to reflect a development concept for these lands.”

This designation of URM11 also refers to allowances related to the previous designation of UR5. I find this section very confusing to understand. It seems it would allow for development of a 4 to 15 story apt. building (with a possible increase to 20 stories if a variance was requested) with commercial on the main level. But then exhibit J E193, seems to contradict my reading of the URM11 section. Can you please clear up my confusion?

The URM11 zone permits a maximum building height of 4 storeys. The Exception E193 modifies the permitted uses for that property and adjusts some of the zoning regulations (such as setbacks).

Section 10H.3.3 of the proposed Official Plan amendment notes that building heights of generally 15 storeys are contemplated in proximity to the Montreal Street, Rideau Street and Railway Street intersection – these building heights have been reflected within the proposed MU2 zone. The proposed Official Plan amendment indicates that minor variances could be used to generally increase maximum building height in this area to 20 storeys, provided a variety of criteria can be satisfied.

- a. Can you explain more clearly and succinctly what is possible on this parcel?

The URM11 zone permits an apartment, dwelling unit in a mixed use building, townhouses and stacked townhouses. Neighbourhood commercial uses are permitted on the ground floor, but not required. Maximum building height is 4 storeys. The E193 exception would add a special needs facility and wellness clinic as additional permitted uses for the lands. Setbacks and other zoning regulations would be as per the URM11 zone and the E193 exception.

- b. Can you tell me what the “site-specific exceptions” that have been approved are?

No exceptions have been approved. The proposed exceptions are contained within E193, which can be reviewed within Exhibits B or J of Report PC-25-008.

- c. Can you tell me if there is already a proposal before Planning/the City by the owner of this property?

We are aware of a housing proposal for the lands at 541 Division Street / 157 Joseph Street however no formal development applications have been submitted. The details of development proposals are made public when a formal *Planning Act* application has been submitted (such as Site Plan Control). Active development applications are publicly identified as a blue dot on the following map, which links to our DASH platform to provide details and supporting documents associated with the application (similar to the supporting information associated with the current NKT application D35-001-2025 described below).

<https://www.cityofkingston.ca/planning-and-development/planning-and-development-map/>

- d. If nothing is presently before Planning/the City, can you tell me if someone has expressed interest to do so once these changes are accepted? (there is a reference to speaking with “interested parties” in other sections of the report)

Please see the above response.

Needless to say, I hope any building will fit the low-rise nature of the immediate area of Division and Joseph Street, a point of consideration for all other areas in the plan, and would like Planning/the City to ensure a tall building will not be allowed on this parcel, regardless of the previous UR5 designation. I would also hope that appropriate set-backs would be part of the design, not allowing any building to be built right to the sidewalk/street, as was allowed for so many of the new buildings on Princess St. in Williamsville. I would hope the same for any other parcels with this new designation of URM11.

As noted, the maximum building height for 541 Division would be 4 storeys. The UR5 zone is a low-rise residential zone and permits a maximum of 3 storeys. The front setback is proposed to be 3 metres.

4. The fire hydrant on the corner of Division and Joseph: It is important this be retained.

The proposed amendments do not apply to the existing fire hydrant.

5. The loss of green space, the increased population and traffic due to this policy plan: Given the reality of these 3 impacts due to this policy proposal and the already approved intensification changes for the allowance of secondary suites and more in certain areas, I would ask this planning committee, all members of council, and the mayor speak/vote against the proposed private soccer stadium on the Memorial Centre grounds and instead move to protecting those lands as green space for today's residents and all future generations of residents.

The NKT project is separate from the Memorial Centre proposal. As noted above, your comments will be provided staff involved in those discussions.

The Planning Committee and Council needs to see the broader picture of the needs of the 3 abutting districts (North King's Town, Kingscourt-Rideau, and Williamsville) already in short supply of green space. While I understand the need for more housing, the intensification impacts, especially of traffic and loss of green space, means this area of Kingston risks becoming a far too congested place for enjoyable living. The existing green spaces need to be protected and new green developments need to go hand in hand with these intensification plans.

I look forward to hearing back from you for clarification of these matters.

Thank you very much,

Nancy Craig