

From: **Ryan Stoness** <[REDACTED]>  
To: **jslevin@cityofkingston.ca** <jslevin@cityofkingston.ca>  
Subject: 391 Barrie  
Date: 25.06.2025 14:24:57 (+02:00)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Good Afternoon,

I am writing in regards to the proposed Zoning By-law amendment for 391 Barrie St. I am a nearby resident ( less than 1 block away) and unfortunately I am writing to demonstrate my lack of support for this proposal. I am generally pro development and have been a supporter of the larger residential units that have been built/being built on busier streets such as Queen and Princess nearby. I cannot support this proposal with the significant # of amendments being required to be approved; specifically lack of parking, overlay, maximum height, dwelling per unit/density and reduced setbacks. With the nearby store, parking in the neighbourhood would be extremely difficult - with many/most smaller properties having limited or no parking spaces already. To be clear, I do support development on this site, but an apartment building this large, on this small amount of space, does not fit the neighborhood.

I look toward recent developments nearby, such as the properties on the end of James (James/Ridea) or half way down Main St, or even I think Pine/Division which have added residential units, but have fit the size/look of the neighbourhood as successful alternatives. These all/most also included parking and/or open spaces and would be considered positive additions to the community.

I cannot help but think, this is a business looking to make money, by building bigger and more and asking to make amendments to bylaws that exist, just to increase profitability of the project... to me it is THESE reasons why rules and bylaws exist.. I would think that they have the ability to design a plan which more closely aligns to the neighbourhood and requires far fewer amendments. I will acknowledge that the space and property is unique, and therefore requires some creativity, but I would think that a plan with fewer units and decreased density would be better considering things like parking, setbacks and greenspace, would be very difficult to achieve.

Overall, honestly and simply here is my feedback. They need to do better. Lets continue to support this neighbourhood being amazing.

Thank-you

From: **Lindsay Stoness** [REDACTED]  
To: **jslevin@cityofkingston.ca** <jslevin@cityofkingston.ca>  
Subject: Concerns Regarding 391 Barrie Street  
Date: 30.06.2025 13:12:10 (+02:00)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

### To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed development at **391 Barrie Street**, particularly in light of the ten requested amendments to the Zoning Bylaw.

McBurney Park is a close-knit, character-rich neighbourhood, and this proposal does not align with its unique identity or community values. The requested amendments seek significant exceptions, none of which appear to enhance the neighbourhood or reflect thoughtful urban planning. Instead, they seem focused on maximizing density and profit, at the expense of the current residents.

One of the most concerning aspects of this development is the **complete lack of on-site parking**. The suggestion that bike parking or transit access can fully offset the need for vehicle parking is unrealistic. Expecting all 22 tenants to forgo vehicles will likely result in additional strain on already limited street parking. This creates ongoing issues for existing residents who rely on street parking and will now face increased competition for these spaces.

Furthermore, the **absence of green space** reinforces the impression that this proposal prioritizes revenue over community well-being. Green space is vital, and its omission undermines the livability and aesthetic character of the neighbourhood.

**Construction-related disruption** is another serious concern. Residents are already contending with road closures and inconvenience due to ongoing development at Queen and Barrie (which is a reasonable building zone). Introducing a large new build in the heart of the neighbourhood will exacerbate these disruptions, and complicate accessibility in and out of the community.

Another major concern is the **proposed height of the building**. At three stories, it will tower over the surrounding homes in this historic neighbourhood, which are primarily one or two stories. This scale is not in keeping with the existing architectural character of McBurney Park and will disrupt the visual streetscape. It may also block sunlight and views for nearby residents, further diminishing the livability and charm of the area.

Although I support the need for increased housing in the city (in proper spaces), this particular proposal feels unnecessary and out of scale with the neighbourhood. The fact that so many bylaw exemptions are required should be a red flag. Rather than contributing positively to the community, this project appears out of step with McBurney Park's character and needs.

If redevelopment of the site is necessary, a smaller-scale project, such as a duplex or a community green space, would be far more appropriate and beneficial to the area.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Regards,

**Lindsay Stoness** PME, BBA  
[REDACTED]



From: **Sarah Williamson** [REDACTED]  
To: **Slevin, Jacob** <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)>  
Subject: Re: Proposed Zoning Change for 391 Barrie St  
Date: 08.07.2025 12:31:07 (+02:00)

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

Hi Jacob,

Thank you for getting back to me so quickly. I do have some questions about the plan itself but if you could also advise what the meeting is usually for that would be great.

Any clarification you can provide would be greatly appreciated if I am mistaken on what any of the amendments mean.

I included below the project description as I found online through the City of Kingston site:

#### Zoning ByLaw Amendment (ZBA)

Zoning By-Law Amendment application to permit the conversion of existing 1-storey medical office building into a 3-storey residential apartment building, containing 9 residential units with a total of 22 bedrooms. The building would be developed with balconies and rooftop amenity area. No vehicular parking is being proposed for this site, however 8 long-term and 1 short-term bike spaces are to be included. The property is located on a triangular lot bound by Barrie St., Ordinance St., and York St., with the existing building occupying approximately 84% of the lot. Previous feedback for the proposal was provided as part of a Pre-Application (D00-154-2024). The applicant is requesting to amend the Zoning By-Law to apply a URM3 Zone to the property, along with a site-specific Exception Overlay. The amendments requested by the applicant include: eliminating vehicular parking requirements, reducing minimum lot area and frontage, permitting additional maximum height, eliminating minimum landscaped area, removing maximum building depth, increasing maximum dwelling units per lot and maximum density, permitting intrusion into setbacks, increasing permitted horizontal balcony length and removing required balcony setback. Encroachment agreements are requested for staircases, eaves, and balconies. Hydro service along Barrie Street is proposed to be upgraded with a new service running underground.

My questions and concerns come from the proposed amendments, I've listed them below.

#### 1) Amendment to "Eliminate Vehicular Parking Requirements"

My understanding is that the developer is requesting that the current bylaw for parking requirements for an apartment complex of this size be waived.

However, the plan mentions 8 long term and 1 short term bike space. While I do not disagree about driving bike space, it is impractical for the area of the development to have no parking for residents. The plan is proposing 9 units, who are likely on average to have 1 car each. That is an additional 9 spaces that are required and acknowledgment of these being two bedroom units, guest spaces so lets say 10 for argument sake. Current residents of the area struggle due to timed parking restrictions and available spaces. For example, Barrie street right outside that development, you cannot park between 10-11 am and 2-3 pm. And this is without getting into the winter parking ban. Therefore it is impractical for the developer to continue without a resolution of parking for its tenants. Please correct me if I am wrong about what this means.

#### 2) Eliminating minimum landscaped area

My understanding is that the developer is requesting to eliminate the small landscaped area that surrounds the current building. However, I also saw in the plans that the developer does not plan on removing the large tree in the lot (found under application information) - my general understanding from other points in the plan is that the developer is also requesting an amendment to the size of the building - which would make sense for the size of the building he is planning - but clearly that large tree is not going to be able to stay. So you can see where my confusion comes from, if the developer says they won't be removing the tree but wants to increase the size of the building and eliminate the landscaping - then something is missing because those two plans do not work together.

3) I am also concerned with the community impact of construction. As you are likely aware, McBurney Park is very very close, it is used to host community events year round, used by residents of all ages, as well as the local school during the school term. The area of Barrie street is already affected by the construction at Barrie and queen that blocks our through traffic. My concern lies in how access to this community spot will be blocked during construction. From what I can see, there doesn't seem to be consideration for this in the plan.

4) Utilities - I can see in the proposal that the developer is proposing plans for hydro updates for Barrie Street. But there does not seem to be any consideration for water and waste management.

I understand I have thrown a lot at you. I am happy to discuss. In general, I do not disagree with housing/developments for residential needs in Kingston - but I do strongly believe it must be executed well and the space available used correctly rather than trying to "make something work".

Thank you for taking the time,  
Sarah Williamson

On Tue, Jul 8, 2025 at 11:24 AM Slevin, Jacob <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)> wrote:

Good morning Sarah,

Thanks for reaching out about the proposed zoning change for 391 Barrie Street.

I am the Planner assigned to review this application, so I would be happy to assist with any questions you may have. Were you curious about the details of the proposal, the upcoming meeting, or any other questions regarding the application?

Best,



**Jacob Slevin (he/him/his)**

Planner  
Planning Services  
Growth & Development

City of Kingston  
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard  
216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3  
613-546-4291, ext. 2176  
[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)

---

**From:** Myers, Cheryl <[cmyers@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:cmyers@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:59 AM  
**To:** Slevin, Jacob <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Cc:** Planning Outside Email <[Planning@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:Planning@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Zoning Change for 391 Barrie St

Hi Jacob,

Would this be for you?

Thank you,  
Cheryl

---

**From:** Sarah Williamson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** July 8, 2025 9:13 AM  
**To:** Planning Outside Email <[Planning@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:Planning@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Zoning Change for 391 Barrie St

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Good morning,

I am unsure if this is the right place but I am wanting to find out more information about the proposed changes to the property listed above. There is a meeting scheduled on July 17th for a proposed Zoning Change to allow a medical office to be converted to a multi-story, multi-unit complex.

Please let me know if you can assist.

Thank you,

Sarah Williamson

From: **Jill Bryant** [REDACTED]  
To: **Slevin, Jacob** <jslevin@cityofkingston.ca>  
Subject: Proposal for 391 Barrie at York and Ordnance: In Opposition  
Date: 11.07.2025 13:00:27 (+02:00)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Mr. Slevin,

For the past 16 years, I have enjoyed living in my home and raising my family at 9 York Street, directly across from the building that was occupied by the Community Midwives of Kingston. I write to share my very serious concerns about the proposal to build a three-storey, multi-tenant apartment building at 391 Barrie Street. I write in complete opposition to this proposal.

**This small, unique triangle of land is not a good location for such a high-density apartment building.** There is very little land space. The logistics of demolition and construction on this cramped, wedge-shaped lot would be a nightmare, hugely impacting residents in the surrounding area with blocked-off driveways, closed streets, excessive noise, large-scale machinery, stress to plants and trees, dust and mud.

**A multi-tenant apartment would fundamentally change the nature of this quiet strip of the neighbourhood, destroying the current look and feel of the area.** In selecting suitable properties for affordable housing in Kingston, sites must be well-researched. The size and scale should be in keeping with the parcel of land. Zoning by-laws should not be discarded and changed with no pause to consider the negative impacts on the local community. Sites need to have adequate green space around the structure for the residents, and not obliterate nature, favouring concrete and increasing the risk of flooding. Without adhering to minimum lot area and frontage requirements, there are bound to be frequent obstructions of the sidewalk and surrounding roads (with people, with snow, ice, and possibly floodwaters)—and conflicts with neighbours. Already, in winter, York Street becomes very narrow. Where would they pile the snow?

The current small green space and well-tended gardens that add beauty, ensure drainage of rainwater, and some tranquil breathing space for pedestrians will be obliterated, favouring space for the concrete structure.

**I am opposed to the multiple zoning by-law amendments for this proposed development.** The proposed amendments for such a development are numerous and wildly unreasonable—reducing the minimum lot area, permitting additional height, eliminating minimum landscaped area, etc. Zoning is in place to give property owners assurances and protections, not as mere suggestions that can be discarded at the whim of a developer. Calling it a “three-storey” structure is a misnomer because equipment, such as HVAC, etc. on the roof, would extend the height even further.

When I decided to buy my house 16 years ago, I considered the zoning by-laws and the types of houses around. I was comfortable with the zoning by-laws and with having a single-storey health care space across the street. I am not at all comfortable with discarding numerous current by-laws and erecting a three-plus-storey structure with balconies and rooftop amenities.

**The proposed development would drastically reduce my ability to enjoy outdoor and indoor spaces on my own property.** Street noise will increase, diminishing my ability to work. The sunlight that nurtures my front garden will be compromised so that my existing plants and much-admired, 40-year-old magnolia tree could no longer thrive. I suspect a shade study would reveal an obliteration of sunlight in my back garden as well. I suspect my rooftop solar panels installed for hot water heating will be rendered useless because of the increased shade. In the cold days of February, the sun beams that currently slant through the front windows, warming the floors, will cease to appear. My house will be colder and darker. It will be overlooked by apartment windows and balconies, all the way up to the study in my loft, reducing my privacy significantly.

**Garbage and litter are likely to accumulate.** I am disheartened to know that David Kay, the new property owner, developer, and applicant, has a poor reputation for upkeep of his current properties, such as 720 Princess Street. I don't have faith that he will take better care of this property.

**Kingston has many other sites that would better suit such a development.** Yes, we need affordable housing in Kingston, but not at this small, unique, oddly angled site, and certainly not at this scale. To choose sites for housing, locations must be well-researched and considered carefully, keeping environmental consideration at the forefront. Using the argument that increasing population density

means it's sustainable is irresponsible greenwashing.

Let's use our valued slivers of downtown space in thoughtful ways that respect zoning by-laws, consider current residents, and have a positive and enduring impact on our very special, treasured McBurney Park neighbourhood.

Yours sincerely,

Jill Bryant

---

9 York St.  
Kingston, ON  
K7K 1P4



--

**Jill Bryant** (she/her)  
Children's Book Author & Editor  
Kingston, Ontario



From: **Kevin Merritt** [REDACTED]  
To: **jslevin@cityofkingston.ca** <jslevin@cityofkingston.ca>  
Subject: 391 Barrie st. Concerns  
Date: 14.07.2025 18:29:02 (+02:00)

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

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

Hi,

I am a resident of the area and am concerned with the scale of the proposed development in the neighbourhood.

I find street parking in my area already more and more congested with the addition of more homes in the area being converted to multi unit apartments and the daily needs of the property management office.

Adding 22 bedrooms to the area will certainly create an environment where the parking needs will certainly make this problem worse for residents around the building.

I don't know if I have a say in any part of this proposal. But I feel that this concern is being unrealistically presented in the proposal as the language assumes residents will not need the offsite parking or there are reasonable off site solutions.

Kevin Merritt.

Sent from my iPhone

July 15, 2025

Dear Jacob Slevin,

I would like to see the development of 391 Barrie Street limited to a **two-story building** with basement apartments, **no top floor recreational space, real Juliet balconies limited to two feet in width, no outdoor garbage receptacles.**

Personally, this proposed three-story building is **visually intrusive and disruptive to the existing character and charm of our neighborhood**, particularly on this stretch of York Street, which is dominated by single-family homes, none exceeding a building height of thirty feet. The proposed building does not fit the aesthetic of this street. The new building would dominate all the homes and business that surround it.

A **two-story building** would be more appropriate and would be far less disruptive to the charm reflected in the area surrounding this building. A two-story building would not become a dominant feature but could blend nicely with its surroundings. I have taken pride and care in restoring the outside of my home, located at 3 York St. to the comfort of my childhood memory. This whole block of York Street reflects pride of ownership. Whatever gets approved, I hope David Kay considers investing in the streetscape and visual impact his building will have on our beloved neighbourhood.

The proposed building site at 391 Barrie Street is a **micro footprint** considering the desire of the builder to squeeze twenty-two individuals into the space. Twenty-two people could potentially come with twenty-two life partners. Now the occupancy is at forty-four persons. Overcrowded living conditions can potentially lead to an increase in social friction and a decline in community cohesion.

The proposal seems to have grossly overstated there would be no **increase to traffic or noise** in the neighbourhood. That cannot be the truth. Logic dictates that increased population density will naturally create more noise pollution, generate additional waste, and contribute to more cars, exacerbating traffic congestion and parking shortages on a busy single lane roadway with already limited existing on-street parking.

**General urban activity** around the building will be significantly increased on all sides. We are waiting to experience the natural consequences in our neighbourhood from the high rise currently being erected at the corner of Queen and Barrie Street.

**Garbage disposal behind the chimney** near the entrance is not acceptable. I directly oppose garbage that is collected and stored outside of the building anywhere on the site. If garbage needs to be accommodated outside the building it should be limited to recycling only and it requires being disguised. This site has no discreet locations for additional garbage storage as the entirety of the building is visible from street view on all sides. No-one in the neighbourhood wants to look at or smell the garbage of 22-44 plus people.

**The proposed recreational space** on the top floor will result in increased noise/activity and be disruptive to the existing peace and privacy we get to appreciate today. Why is outdoor space on the fourth floor being requested when there is a park only steps away, and as stated in the proposal the site is walking distance to cultural centres, recreational centres, parks etc. No other three-story build has a recreational space on its top story. There are no buildings nearby to break up that noise from traveling the distance.

Regarding **the balcony**, a Juliet Balcony is less than two feet wide. The proposed balcony is 1.6 meter which is just over five feet wide. It makes sense to limit these balconies to two feet or less in keeping with the Juliet Balcony described by this builder to be **a design feature only**.

This is a building with maximum density (over-populated) on a micro footprint, where storage will be at a premium and “balconies” could quickly become dumping grounds. If the builder truly does not intend to extend the living area into the outdoors there is no requirement for a balcony wider than 0.60meters. These balconies could have decorative rails and then they truly would be the design ‘features’ that David Kay proposes.

I have questions as well.....

- I want to understand the disruption to services in the community as the new build takes place. I work from home.
- On Monday night, where would 391 Barrie Street put the garbage and recycling out? Will each apartment put garbage out on a different street?
- What does snow removal in this location look like?
- Will there be a sidewalk maintained on Ordnance, Barrie and York Street surrounding the building?
- I buy extra insurance on the sewer pipes and water lines coming into my house as recommended to me by Utilities Kingston. When I inquired with them why this was necessary, they pointed to the aging infrastructure in the area in which I live. What guarantees the safety of these services?

Thank you for your consideration to my concerns.

The neighbour at 3 York Street,

Kate Jackson

From: **Katie Fizzell** [REDACTED]  
To: **Slevin, Jacob** <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)>  
Subject: Re: Community Meeting - 391 Barrie St  
Date: 15.07.2025 09:57:18 (+02:00)

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

Hi Jacob,

I didn't realize questions had to be submitted in advance, so thanks for reaching out - I do support increasing density in the downtown core, but here are some of the questions we have in relation to this proposed project:

- 1. What are the normal parking requirements for this size of unit, and what is the precedent for an exception in this neighbourhood?** Seems like most of the larger units have at least some parking spaces. Is there opportunity for people to find permanent parking through the city lots around us or are those waitlisted? I already find we have a lot of people parking on the wrong side of Barrie Street (including up on the sidewalk in front of our house) due to the Axon Property Management (426 Barrie) building across the street from us.
- 2. Height** - is there a requirement for the developer to share a shadow diagram? I am concerned that the increased height will negatively impact the magnolia tree on the front lawn of 9 York Street.
- 3. Target listing price of the units** - We are curious if these are being marketed as higher end units and/or as student rentals, or if they will be priced more accessibility to help with alleviate housing needs of lower income individuals or families.
- 4. Garbage, Recycling, Green Bins** - will they provide covered garbage, recycling, and green bin containers to be used for weekly pick up? A few of the apartment buildings around us do not use green bins - and so their garbage goes out in black bags (which includes foodwaste due to the lack of green bins) and the seagulls and racoons tear it up each week and the street is left a mess, with no apartment management seeming to come and clean it up.
- 5. Green Space** - do they have more diagrams/renderings to show just how much of the green space will be lost - are they proposing to expand the current footprint (not they want to eliminate minimum landscape area, remove max, building depth)
- 6. Rooftop Amenity** - there is some concern in the neighbourhood that this could cause increased noise and potential for waste to be thrown over to the street - curious if they will have rules, restricted hours etc. to manage this
- 7. Hyrdo** - Just wanting to confirm that the plan is only to upgrade to underground service along the property of 391 Barrie. If there is any proposal to extend the underground service north along Barrie Street, we would like to know where any proposed hydro boxes will be located.

I have a board meeting at the same time as this meeting so my husband, Miles Wilson, will be attending using the Zoom link provided.

Do you know if the meeting will be recorded or how I can access a transcript/record after?

Best,  
Katie

On Mon, Jul 14, 2025 at 3:07 PM Slevin, Jacob <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)> wrote:  
Good afternoon Katie,

Regarding the Community Meeting for 391 Barrie Street this Thursday, I just wanted to confirm whether you had any written questions or comments you wanted to add to the record of the meeting?

Thanks,



**Jacob Slevin (he/him/his)**

Planner  
Planning Services  
Growth & Development

City of Kingston  
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard  
216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291, ext. 2176  
[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)



---

**From:** Slevin, Jacob <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 27, 2025 9:53 AM  
**To:** Katie Fizzell [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Community Meeting - 391 Barrie St

Good morning Katie,

The applicant for this proposal is planning to work with Kingston Hydro to remove the hydro powerlines along Barrie Street and to replace this above-ground electrical infrastructure with a new underground service. This is because there are limits to how close the edge of a building can be to powerlines, so this would have been a problem given that the applicant is proposing to add two storeys to the building at 391 Barrie Street. The proposed solution is to move this electrical infrastructure to move underground so that there are no safety concerns based on the distance of the building wall from the powerlines.

The applicants are not proposing to expand the footprint of the building itself, although some amounts of green space may be reduced due to the introduction of new walkways and window wells for the basement units.

If you would like to convey your comments regarding the landscaped open space requirement reduction to the applicant, you are welcome to attend the upcoming Community Meeting (in-person or virtually) or to send written comments to be added to the public record.

If you have any written comments you would like to share at the meeting, you are welcome to send them to me and I can ensure that they will be sent to the Planning Committee for consideration by the applicant and Committee members.

Best,



**Jacob Slevin (he/him/his)**

Planner  
Planning Services  
Growth & Development

City of Kingston  
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard  
216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3  
613-546-4291, ext. 2176  
[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)

---

**From:** Katie Fizzell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:55 PM  
**To:** Slevin, Jacob <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: Community Meeting - 391 Barrie St

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

Thanks Jacob, I appreciate the prompt feedback. The reason I asked about the hydro is that the last sentence of the letter we received states "Hydro service along Barrie Street is proposed to be upgraded with a new underground service" - so it sounds like that's no longer part of the proposal.

I think my main concern from reading the plans (and this is all very new to me) is the request to eliminate minimum landscaped area - there is currently a grass/garden buffer around the building, and it would be a shame to lose that - are they proposing to build out right to the edge of the property? Is there precedent for this exception? I'm all for increasing density, but I think preserving that small amount of green space is important - aesthetically and environmentally.

Best,  
Katie

On Tue, Jun 24, 2025 at 1:48 PM Slevin, Jacob <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)> wrote:  
Good afternoon Katie,

My name is Jacob Slevin, and I am the Planner assigned to this file. Christine is available to help you with virtually registering for the meeting, but if you have any questions about the actual development proposal, please feel free to contact me!

Regarding the underground Hydro Service, I followed up with UK staff earlier on this topic and they confirmed for me that there are no plans to install any ground-level electrical boxes for this development.

I do not expect that any staff from Utilities Kingston will attend the Community Meeting. Typically these are just attended by the applicant and City Planning staff. However, if you do have any other questions about any technical details of the proposal, I am happy to follow up on your behalf and get back to you.

Best,



**Jacob Slevin (he/him/his)**

Planner  
Planning Services  
Growth & Development

City of Kingston  
Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard  
216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3  
613-546-4291, ext. 2176  
[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)

---

**From:** O'Connor,Christine <[cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 11:12 AM  
**To:** Slevin,Jacob <[jslevin@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:jslevin@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Subject:** Fw: Community Meeting - 391 Barrie St

FYI

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 20, 2025 8:48 PM  
**To:** O'Connor,Christine <[cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca)>  
**Subject:** Community Meeting - 391 Barrie St

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

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

Hi Christine,

I'd like to attend the community meeting about the proposed 391 Barrie St development on July 17th virtually.

I'm not sure if you can answer this, but will Utilities Kingston be there to answer questions about the proposed underground hydro service? I'd specifically want to know where they plan to locate any ground level electrical boxes.

Thank you,  
Katie Fizzell  
421 Barrie St.

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Echo Perry-Cumberland** <[REDACTED]>  
To: **jslevin@cityofkingston.ca** <jslevin@cityofkingston.ca>  
Subject: Re: Planning Application – 391 Barrie Street  
Date: 16.07.2025 06:19:24 (+02:00)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

File No. D35-003-2024

I am writing in support of the proposed development at 391 Barrie Street.

This application represents an appropriate form of residential intensification in an established neighbourhood with full municipal servicing, access to active transportation infrastructure, and proximity to public transit. The proposed scale, three storeys, is compatible with surrounding development and maintains the low-to-mid-rise character of the area. It aligns well with the Provincial Policy Statement, City of Kingston Official Plan, and broader intensification goals outlined in the City's vision for 15-minute neighbourhoods.

The proposed unit mix of predominantly one- and two-bedroom units addresses a clear and growing need in the local housing market. Kingston continues to face significant housing supply constraints across all forms and tenures. Adding appropriately scaled multi-unit housing in walkable, central locations is essential to both economic and social sustainability.

This site, formerly envisioned for commercial development, has proven challenging in terms of market viability. A well-executed residential proposal, as currently proposed, is a practical and timely alternative that makes productive use of an underutilized site while respecting the surrounding built form.

Concerns about parking are understandable, but must be weighed against the City's strategic priorities, which include reducing dependence on private vehicles and encouraging transit-supportive, compact development. The location is well-served by existing transit routes and active transportation options. Reduced parking minimums in this context are not only appropriate but necessary to meet broader policy objectives.

In summary, this is a thoughtful and context-sensitive proposal that responds to urgent housing needs, utilizes existing infrastructure efficiently, and reinforces key planning objectives. I support the application and respectfully encourage its approval.

Sincerely,  
Echo Perry-Cumberland

--

Echo Perry-Cumberland

*Sales Representative*

***Leasing, Listing, and Relationships That Last***

Rogers & Trainor Commercial Realty Inc. Brokerage  
20 Gore Street - Suite 102, Kingston, ON K7L 2L1

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[echopc@rtcr.com](mailto:echopc@rtcr.com) | [www.rtcr.com](http://www.rtcr.com)

Facebook - [SoldbyEcho](#)

IG @soldbyecho

From: Chris O'Connor [REDACTED]  
To: jslevin@cityofkingston.ca <jslevin@cityofkingston.ca>  
Subject: Letter of Support for the Housing Initiative at the Midwife's Building located at 391 Barrie Street  
Date: 16.07.2025 23:44:08 (-0400)

You don't often get email from horsestar.com@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

July 16, 2025

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in full support of Dave Kay's proposal to repurpose the former midwife's building into affordable, respectful, and accessible housing units — something our city desperately needs.

I've known Dave for nearly 20 years, and in that time, I've witnessed his consistent kindness, generosity, and commitment to both community and global service. From helping friends and neighbours here at home to his work abroad with CanAssist. Dave is someone who gives back without hesitation.

Also, as a nearby resident, I believe this project would be a positive and much-needed addition to our area. The inclusion of accessible units demonstrates thoughtfulness and awareness of the real needs in our city, and I have no doubt that Dave will approach this project with care, integrity, and respect for the community.

I sincerely hope you will consider this proposal with enthusiasm and approve it so that it can move forward quickly.

If there are any questions or concerns I can help address, please don't hesitate to contact me by email, [REDACTED]

Yours truly,  
Chris O'Connor

--  
[REDACTED]

From: **Adam Candon** <[REDACTED]>  
To: **Slevin, Jacob** <jslevin@cityofkingston.ca>  
Subject: Support for Barrie project  
Date: 16.07.2025 12:45:54 (+02:00)

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

Hey Jacob, I hope you're doing well. I see that there's a proposal for new development on Barry Street. I just wanted to send you an email letting you know I'm in support as this is a good location for in-fill

**ADAM CANDON**

**RE/MAX RISE EXECUTIVES INC.**

*Sales Representative*

[REDACTED]

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE**

Information contained in this e-mail (including any attachments) is confidential and may be subject to solicitor-client privilege. Disclosure to any person other than the intended recipient does not constitute waiver of privilege. If you receive this message in error, or are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, distribution or copying of this e-mail (including any attachments) of any kind is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify RE/MAX RISE Executives, Brokerage immediately by telephone (613.546.4208) or by return e-mail, and then delete this e-mail and any copies thereof from your computer system and records.

**Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.**

July 17, 2025

Re: Proposed zoning by-law amendment – 391 Barrie Street

Dear Mr. Slevin,

I am writing to express my concerns and my opposition to the proposed multi-dwelling unit at 391 Barrie St. While I understand and support the need for development, I do not believe this is the appropriate location or design for such a project.

Not only is there a request for an amendment to apply for an Urban Multi-Residential Zone to the property; there are numerous exceptions to zoning by-laws that this proposal is requesting which include:

1. Eliminating vehicular parking requirements
2. Reducing minimum lot area and frontage
3. Permitting additional maximum height
4. Eliminating minimum Landscape area
5. Removing maximum building depth
6. Increasing maximum permitted dwelling units per lot
7. Increasing maximum residential density
8. Permitting reduced setbacks
9. Increasing permitted balcony length
10. Removing required balcony setback

This is a long list of exceptions to the zoning by-laws — by-laws which are put in place by the city to maintain standards. This is concerning. What our community needs are developments that respect the environment — buildings with green spaces that blend with the existing neighborhood and that comply with the zoning by-laws.

This location, especially with its proximity to McBurney Park, could serve as an ideal space for family-oriented housing with fewer floors, or better yet, a community space that all residents can enjoy. McBurney Park contributes greatly to the sense of community we all cherish in this neighbourhood. My daughter, who recently visited from Toronto with my young grandchildren, commented on how rare it is to find an urban park that has such a vibrant sense of community.

I urge each council member to take a moment to visit this area and experience McBurney Park for yourself. Spend just 10 minutes sitting on a bench in the park and see firsthand how much it means to the residents of our community. The park is an urban oasis where people walk, socialize, and enjoy the outdoors. This is made possible, in part, by the absence of a parking lot that encourages pedestrian access. This proposal, steps away from McBurney park, will drastically change the character of the area.

McBurney Park is a rare and valuable asset, and I ask that you preserve the sense of connection and belonging it provides for all of us by adhering to the zoning by-laws.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary and Neil Glenn

5 York Street

Re 391 Barrie St. Proposal for redevelopment

Dear Mr. Slevin,

I write to express my concerns with the proposal for extensive bylaw amendments to allow construction of an uncharacteristically dense housing development at 391 Barrie St. Although I fully recognize and appreciate the need for affordable housing in Kingston and beyond, it is abundantly clear that this proposal is not for housing that is affordable, but for housing that is exploitative. The applicant is asking the city to waive its own bylaws on: how many rooms can be fit into each unit, how many units can be jammed into a property, and how many people can live on a tiny plot of land with no room for parking (no room even for a park bench!) and no room at all for green space.

Personally, I have very serious concerns with increased noise levels (particularly with the proposed rooftop bbq area), with significantly increased traffic and parking density only a few feet from a popular playground, with shade compromising my own garden and with apartments now overlooking my family's bedrooms. But above and beyond all that, I would say the following.

The proposed building is entirely out of character for the neighbourhood of McBurney Park, where families, students, and working people have lived together for decades, building community. If we try to compare the proposed building to established units in the neighbourhood, the closest parallel will be a number of three-story multi-unit apartment buildings that went up in the area a few decades ago. These house families, working individuals, students, new Canadians, and more in apartments that are small but functional, and that respect the needs of their renters: galley or other small kitchens, a reasonable living space, closets, decent bedrooms, and room for a car to park and a couple of bicycles for each apartment to lock up on site. They have occupational densities on the order of the following:

**41 York St:** 4 storeys, 8 units with a total of **15 beds** on a plot of land approximately **560 m<sup>2</sup>**

**422 Barrie St:** 3 storeys, 9 units with a total of **12 beds** on a plot approximately **650 m<sup>2</sup>**

**51 Balaclava St:** 3 storeys, 12 units with a total of **20 beds** on a plot approximately **700 m<sup>2</sup>**

**34 Sydenham St:** 3 storeys, 6 units with a total of **10 beds** on a plot approximately **580 m<sup>2</sup>**

**For 391 Barrie**, the developer is proposing: 3 storeys with **22 beds** on a plot of only **275 m<sup>2</sup>**. This would mean cramming very nearly **four times the number of beds per lot size** into 391 Barrie St when compared to the neighbourhood's existing affordable housing. This proposal is clearly looking

to exploit maximum rent from the smallest conceivable space, at a density that the city has already determined, in its bylaws, to be plainly undesirable.

Furthermore, the complete lack of parking for this proposal, where 22 bedrooms will surely equal something on the order of 30 or 35 tenants for the unit at any given time, is also alarming and should not be approved. While I fully agree that building communities with reduced dependency on cars is a fantastic goal, In Kingston we are certainly nowhere near the point today where 30 to 35 people can be expected to own, rent, or lease zero cars. We must be realistic here that this proposal will create a parking and traffic nightmare for the neighbourhood, right beside a park full of playing children. Remember also the increased DoorDash and similar traffic. The fact that the developer also has little room envisaged for bicycle parking says even more about the lack of concern for the needs of the inhabitants and the neighbourhood. When a developer has to compromise so many bylaws simply to accommodate maximum billable units, they are not looking to provide a community service of affordable, livable housing. They are looking to exploit the property and its tenants for maximum profit. Such a proposal is completely out of keeping with the values and growth potential for this precious neighbourhood in the heart of the city.

Daryn Lehoux  
9 York St.  
Kingston, K7K 1P4