

Sydenham District Association
Presentation
To
City of Kingston Planning Committee
Meeting July 17,2025

Reference: 92 Napier Street: PC-25-2014

We appreciate the opportunity to make this presentation to the Planning Committee. While this meeting is about the 92 Napier Street application, we think the time has come to raise the housing issue to a strategic level and to focus on practicable ways to have a win-win-win for all involved- full time residents, students and developers. Current and forecast numbers for student population growth in Kingston requires a long term solution that will have Kingston as an example of how to have an inclusive plan with innovative solutions that will improve liveability in our many neighbourhoods.

Sydenham District is a great example of a “liveable” neighbourhood, where residents have easy access to amenities and can “live, work & play.” It is a unique attribute for the City of Kingston: a historical neighbourhood buzzing with life as it attracts a range of demographics. The spread of student housing beyond the proximity of Queen’s campus has been an ongoing issue in Sydenham District and other adjacent Districts for decades, and it has now reached critical proportions. We have experienced a significant loss of family housing in favour of investor rentals and now there are large scale Purpose Built Student Accommodations in established residential neighbourhoods. This impact on neighbourhood liveability is the top of mind issue that residents have communicated to the Sydenham District Association (SDA).

The SDA advocates for improving liveability in the District - for all residents. We support innovation in urban and housing design and recognize the need for planned densification development but believe it can be done without losing the integrity of existing streetscapes, homes and buildings. Students coming to Kingston to attend one of Canada’s top universities should be able to live in quality off campus accommodations. New development can and should be inclusive, creative, innovative while integrating with the core characteristics that make this District an attractive place to live and an important part of Kingston’s past and its future.

As representatives of the residents who have been most impacted by the continued spread of off-campus student housing, we are asking you as our elected representatives to take a pause on this application and to consider the larger issues that are impacting neighbourhoods with this type of development.

This is why we are asking the Planning Committee to consider the larger planning issue affecting neighbourhoods and residents.

1. Two years ago, the SDA supported the up zoning to six-storey developments within the Campus Expansion Area as a reasonable measure to create student neighbourhoods in proximity to campus. The theory behind this being it would lessen rental demand in established areas in the District. As far as we know, only one developer has built in that designated zone. Why? Is it the lack of incentives to build in the designated expansion area? Developers continue to move further away from proximity to campus and are now proposing PBSA type dwellings in established residential neighbourhoods which will result in a loss of residential homes.

- What steps has the City taken to **increase** incentives in the Campus Expansion Area to match the intensity of student growth estimates or keep purpose built student housing in specific areas?
- Has the City assisted any developers in amassing land in the Campus Expansion Area or considered alternatives such as co-op housing developments or non-profit developments for student accommodations?
- Do City planning documents accurately reflect the student population growth needs?
- Has Queen's University been engaged in assessing student growth over the next number of years?
- Does the City know if Queen's University will engage in developing more on campus student accommodation?

2. The proposed development for 92 Napier Street is a purpose built student accommodation – it does nothing to address the housing crisis that the City has declared. While it provides quality accommodation for students, it will house at least 40 students in a configuration that will essentially be a student residence right in the middle of an established neighbourhood.

3. At the March 5th special meeting organized by Councillor Glenn and City staff, approximately 30 neighbours met with City Planning staff and the developer about their concerns and questions concerning the 92 Napier Street development. The neighbours were unanimous in voicing their objection to this development and asked questions such as:

- How can the proposed development be designed in a way to be more in character with the neighbourhood and to be more inclusive and affordable in terms of attracting seniors, young professionals, and families?
- Have any of the concerns raised by residents been addressed or given serious consideration in the on-going discussions with the developer post that meeting date?
- It seems that very little has changed in the design and density of the current proposal leaving residents of the neighbourhood to feel their input has been ignored.

4. We believe the time has come for an innovative growth plan for the District that should have a balanced approach to housing for residents and for students. Quality student accommodations should not come at a cost to residents. Building high density student housing should be done in the designated, incentivized areas along major corridors and inside the Campus Expansion Area, which the city initiated through your own planning process.

We cannot solve the housing needs of the District and nearby districts on a case per case basis. This requires a strategic response and political commitment. We need a plan for how the City will increase incentives for developers to build in designated areas (areas currently student dominated), thereby protecting current residential housing and established neighbourhoods.

Let's start by instituting a time limited moratorium on the practice of severing lands for PBSAs in established residential neighbourhoods until we can agree on long term solutions that enhance liveability and quality of life for all District residents. To not do so comes at a cost- to residents, to young professionals looking to move into the District, and to families who cannot afford to rent as the student rental base is more lucrative. As of right by-laws allow for 10 bedrooms per lot. This is not a question up for discussion. Diversity in housing is also not in question. However, once a PBSA dwelling is built it will be forever a student rental.

The SDA believes we can work together with the City to address the District's housing crisis by engaging residents in thoughtful consultation and shared ideas. The SDA is not against development – it is against bad development. Together, we can ensure the City of Kingston lives up to its claim as an innovative, smart city, built for the future.

July 14, 2025 Sydenham District Association: sdakingston@gmail.com

From: [Armand Ruffo](#)
To: [Didrikson, Amy](#); [Bar, James](#)
Subject: Re: Napier student housing development proposed by Amber Peak; Armand...
Date: July 14, 2025 5:51:25 PM

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

Re: Napier student housing development proposed by Amber Peak; Armand Garnet Ruffo, 85 Napier Street. To be read in my absence.

My family and I moved to Kingston in 2014. We were situated in Ottawa at the time where we were happily living on a family-friendly street close to my employment. I'm mentioning this because despite a good job offer from Queen's University our decision to move to Kingston was not easy. It required us to give up a lot, but after talking to people and doing some research we learned that Kingston was a great place to live, and so we picked up and settled on Napier Street, a beautiful residential neighbourhood.

As an author, I quickly got involved in the cultural life of Kingston and met some great people, and I soon found out that Kingston besides being a beautiful city is also a culturally rich city. My wife also made discoveries and soon made some good friends, and our young son started attending Winston Churchill Public School on Earl Street, and to our benefit he could walk there in five minutes without us worrying for his safety — Winston by the way is just around the corner from the proposed Amber Peak development. Not long after, I was awarded the inaugural Mayor's Arts Award for Creation for my contribution to the cultural life of the city. It was a huge honour, and I truly felt at home.

Counsellors and Planners will note that I have a previous letter on file to address the same Amber Peak proposed development, and so I will not reiterate what I said in that letter. By now it is clear that using the argument of providing housing, Amber Peak's sole objective is to maximize its profit by renting to a transient student population. What I want to say here is that you have heard the opposition from the community. Nobody except for Amber Peak wants this development. Their unconscionable response to community opposition has been to expand their proposal to forty (40) student units, which simply put will destroy the family character of the neighbourhood. I have heard time and again that if the development goes through families will have to move.

Having taught at Queens' University, I can honestly say in all likelihood more than half of the students in the proposed development will have cars and will have to park on the street. The streets will become unsafe for children, and it will become impossible for families to enjoy themselves in the neighbourhood. In addition to the constant traffic, consider the noise level. Consider forty units of students partying on "Home Coming" or "St. Patrick's Day." Not only will families be driven out but so will the historical Lawn Bowling Club. In fact, I have heard from lawn bowling members who have said that they had no idea that Amber Peak focused on student housing; some have even said that in hindsight they believe Amber Peak misrepresented itself.

Now, as the City Planners know, Amber Peak is smart. Even though they have no interest in providing housing for Kingston families, they have met the bare minimum guidelines laid out by the city for new development. Amber Peak knows well enough that the focus on planning is based on physical guidelines and not on social impact no matter how destructive the development may be. And so I ask both City Planners and Counsellors to consider the negative social impact of Amber Peak's proposed development on a family neighbourhood. Please consider it, and do what is right for Kingston. Although Amber Peak may be smart, they clearly lack a social conscience. They do not seem to care about Kingston's citizens, its neighbourhoods, its families, its children who walk to school, who ride their bikes, and who play basketball and hockey on its streets.

Personally, I do not see how their proposal can go ahead, and I strongly oppose it. I truly hope that City Planners

and Counsellors feel the same way. Kingston does not need Amber Peak's proposed student development in the heart of a family orientated residential area.

I am sorry that I could not be there to make this presentation myself.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,

Armand Garnet Ruffo

Armand Garnet Ruffo
Professor Emeritus
Queen's University
Kingston, On.

From: [Heather Macfarlane](#)
To: [Didrikson, Amy](#); [Bar, James](#)
Cc: [Glenn, Conny](#)
Subject: Comments in opposition to 92 Napier St. Development
Date: July 14, 2025 6:08:39 PM

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

Dear Amy and James,

Because I have written and spoken on numerous occasions in opposition to the proposed development at 92 Napier I will keep my comments very brief.

This project will tip the scales in the neighbourhood, and will push families out of the downtown core. 2 have already left, and many have said they will follow if the development is passed. With a city centre that is already suffering from the effects of transient populations, this is a troubling scenario. Schools and recreational facilities keep a neighbourhood healthy, and without the population to support them, they will disappear. Healthy cities require year-round community engagement, and this would be another big blow to downtown Kingston.

The planning committee has demonstrated that the proposed development conforms to the new 2025 guidelines set forth by the province and adopted by the city. What it does not seem to have fully considered, however, is the social impact this will have on downtown Kingston families.

Sincerely,

Heather Macfarlane
85 Napier Street.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

[REDACTED]

Mayor of Kingston;
Glenn,Conny;
Cinanni,Vincent;
Amos,Don;
Osanic,Lisa;
Oosterhof,Gary;
Chaves,Paul;
Stephen,Wendy;
Hassan,Jamshed;
Tozzo,Brandon;
McLaren,Jeff;
Ridge,Gregory;
mboehme@cityofkingston.ca;
Didrikson,Amy;
Bar,James;
O'Connor,Christine
City Clerk; Timot

[REDACTED]

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

Dear Mayor Paterson, City of Kingston Councillors and City of Kingston Planning Staff,

My husband and I have lived at 574 Earl Street, at the corner of Earl and Napier, for almost 41 years. We are writing to oppose the proposed rezoning and development of the land at 92 Napier Street. (file D35-006-2024)

First, we'd like to address the rezoning issue. Sydenham District has the least amount of open green space in the City and we and the City should be fighting to preserve any small bit of it that we have. Rezoning this land from open space to residential seems to go against the goal of the City "To support the critical role that Open Space areas play in responding to the diverse recreational and leisure needs of City residents, in sustaining the natural heritage system, and in contributing to cultural landscapes, heritage settings and to the City's quality of life and sense of place" stated in Section 3.8 of the Official Plan. The developer likes to show a map which identifies green spaces surrounding our neighbourhood, however, most of those spaces are accessed only by walking along a busy street or across two busy streets (Johnson and Brock) which are difficult and unsafe to navigate with children and are in Williamsville, not in Sydenham District. Where is the money that Amber Peak would have had to give the City towards parkland space when it built its other student properties? Those funds should be used to maintain the open space on this property. Any shortfall could be provided by the City to create a park/playground, community garden or combination, thereby ensuring to support the critical role that green space plays in the quality of life for everyone.

With respect to the development proposal: Amber Peak's current proposal has been updated from the original proposal discussed at the Community Meeting held on 1 February 2024 at Planning Committee. During that meeting many members of the Community spoke in opposition to the proposed development. And now, more than a year after learning of the opinions of the community, they have amended their original plan to increase the density and make it even more destructive to the long-term health of the neighbourhood. Instead

of working with the neighbourhood to perhaps develop a proposal that would meet everyone's needs they are still asking to rezone this entire open space to residential and they have increased the number of bedrooms in each of the four houses from eight to ten for a total of forty bedrooms. And with rents of at least \$1,000 per bedroom, there is a very good chance that some students will share bedrooms which will increase the density even more. What is proposed is essentially an off-campus residence, not a development of homes that could be used for other demographics.

We understand and agree that more affordable housing is needed in Kingston and that reasonable infilling and intensification is necessary, however, this housing is purpose-built housing directed at students. From Amber Peak's website: "**Amber Peak** offers student rentals in **Kingston**. All our rentals are in the heart of the university district, an energetic area full of queens students." This property is not in the heart of the university district. It is in the heart of a diverse neighbourhood of families, singles, seniors and students. The proposed apartments have either one or four bedrooms, and the developer has confirmed that at least \$1,000 per month per bedroom will be charged. This pricing is prohibitive for many and will not help solve the crisis of the availability of affordable housing. Of those interested in urban, as opposed to suburban or rural living, few will be attracted to a four-bedroom apartment designed specifically for students that costs \$4,000 per month. If they build single family homes or townhomes and they happen to end up being occupied by students that's one thing, but once a lot is used for a purpose built multi-unit development it's economically unfeasible for it to become suitable for other demographics. There has been a great deal of housing aimed at students built over the past few years on Princess Street, which is designated as a Corridor and is a more appropriate location.

The City needs to consider the long-term consequences of approving this development. It is quite likely that the Lawn Bowling Club will not exist in the remaining space for many more years, which will mean that the remaining parcel of land will come up for sale. After setting a precedent with this development, there would be no chance that another huge development like this would not be approved which could mean up to 120 bedrooms on one side of that small city street. Even with 40 bedrooms there is a good chance that there will be increased parties, noise, and garbage which will increase the workload of police and by-law officers, as well as the likelihood that families who currently live in the neighbourhood will move out. Already, one family, with two young children, who lived in the block of Earl Street that backs onto the property has sold their family home. A home directly across from the proposed development has recently sold. Our fear is that this house has also been sold to a developer who will propose a similar ten bedroom structure or even request that the land be severed in order to build two ten bedroom buildings. Other families are talking about leaving the neighbourhood should this proposal be approved. This development will affect the stability of this neighbourhood and of the future of Winston Churchill Public School.

Each of the four buildings has only two parking spaces, however, everyone who lives in this area knows that a good percentage of students arrive in Kingston with a vehicle that needs to be parked somewhere. It's unrealistic and unreasonable to think that eight parking spots for a minimum of forty residents will be close to enough. This means that cars will be jockeying for space on Napier and Earl Streets which have, understandably, parking restrictions. Traffic will increase substantially in this quiet neighbourhood, not only with new resident vehicles, but also with delivery and service vehicles. This area currently has reduced speed limits because of children walking to and from Winston Churchill School. The parking spaces are in the rear of the buildings which will limit the backyard enjoyment of families on Willingdon Avenue.

Many of the parents of the families in this neighbourhood work at Queen's, the hospital or other downtown locations and walk or bike to work. Should they move to other areas in Kingston because of projects such as this, they will have to commute, likely in cars, to the downtown which will increase traffic and parking issues.

We are not averse to having students in our neighbourhood. Of the 16 homes on our block of Earl between Napier and MacDonnell, six are now occupied by students. However, each home is a separate entity and has four to six students. What is proposed is essentially an off-campus student residence, not a development of homes that happen to be occupied by students.

A development such as this should be done in the designated incentivized intensification areas along major corridors and inside the Campus Expansion Area, which the City initiated through their own planning

process. We urge the Planning Committee and City Council to deny the developer's proposal.

Sincerely,

Tim and Janet Bryant

[REDACTED]

Didrikson,Amy; B

City Clerk; Caroly

Some people who received this message 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 Councillors Didrikson, Bar, and O'Connor,

I am writing with strong objections to the 92 Napier St. Rezoning and Severance Application. There are countless reasons why this is not a good idea, and one that could devastate the character of the Sydenham Ward neighbourhood to the point that it no longer remains sustainable as a blended family, professional, and student neighbourhood. Having lived off and on in the Sydenham Ward for 22 years, I have been saddened to see its transformation from a well-balanced blend of respectful students, professionals, and families, to one where the "tipping point" seems to have been reached whereby students are dominating the character and culture of this historic neighbourhood and driving families and professionals out for reasons of cost, noise, litter in the streets, and excessive traffic. Of course I understand the need for more student housing and this can and should absolutely be done in currently designated areas; these were designated in this way after a great deal of careful thought and planning.

This particular site at 92 Napier Street is also one of the few remaining green spaces in a town that is losing green space at an alarming rate. We now have countless studies showing the necessity of green spaces for residents' mental health and physical well-being--as well as to support local ecologies and wildlife--and yet Kingston has been building on our green spaces downtown at a dangerous rate. I do not believe we can sustain any more of this with positive results for the whole community and town. 92 Napier Street should be carefully preserved as a green space; perhaps purchased by the city as a park, for example?

We live in a historically significant city with some of the finest 19th-century and early 20th-century architecture in Canada (or North America). I sincerely hope that we can all work together to preserve this rare beauty and heritage while also preserving green space and enhancing 21st-century living. If developed this green space would be gone forever at a terrible cost. There are other places developers can build student housing in a respectful, low-rise manner.

Thank you for your reflection and consideration.

All the best,

Gabrielle McIntire

—
Gabrielle McIntire
Professor
Department of English Language and Literature

[REDACTED]
Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 3N6

<https://www.queensu.ca/english/people/gabrielle-mcintire>

 Queen's University Logo

Ranked in top ten Globally
2024 Times Higher Education Impact Ranking

From: [Daryl Tremain](#)
To: [Didrikson,Amy](#); [Bar,James](#)
Cc: [Glenn,Conny](#)
Subject: 92 Napier
Date: July 15, 2025 3:28:54 PM

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

James and Amy,

I understand from Savvas Frantzekos, who met with you last week, that you feel you have no choice but to recommend the proposed development by Amber Peak at 92 Napier Street. I understand that when a proposal meets certain criteria that it is almost automatic for you to recommend it.

I hope that there is a role for you to also make comments with your official recommendation. If so, I hope you can express to the Planning Committee and to Council that there is strong opposition to this development from the neighbourhood, and not just the residents of Napier Street, due to the following reasons:

1) The proposed housing is student-focused, not family-focused. It is not designed to be dual-use. It is designed for students and will add 40 students to that block of Napier, completely changing the character of the block and the neighbourhood as a result. This may seem overly dramatic, but I use the following image to provide a clear idea of how the neighbourhood is already changing (with even just the proposal): *it is like dropping a bomb* on the land in question, on our neighbourhood. Densification is desired and encouraged. The quality of that densification is what is in question.

2) When the Lawn Bowling Club sold the property to Amber Peak, it was under the impression from the developer that it was planning to build residential housing for families. As in homes, not mini-student residences. *The Club is disappointed in the betrayal of this intention by Amber Peak.*

3) Students have expressed being upset in neighbourhoods where even smaller but similar developments have gone in, like in the lowest block of Beverly, saying that they feel they are intruders in a family neighbourhood. *Some students are expressing that they do not want developers to build such out-of-place buildings in their names.*

Please support us in our drive to preserve the family character of this dwindling piece of real-estate off of Earl Street. When I moved here 35 years ago, Frontenac and Albert Streets were still mixed: students and families. We have now lost Frontenac, Albert, Collingwood, Victoria, Toronto, and parts of MacDonnell.

Every block of a street lost means fewer children for the school, more -- and less appropriate -- traffic, parties, garbage, loss of property values, driving out of other families (two of which have already sold.)

Please do whatever you are empowered to do to make these points in your report, in the Planning Meeting, and to Council.

Thank you,

Daryl Tremain

162 College Street
Kingston, K7L 4L8

Some people who received this message 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:

Amy Didrikson, James Bar, Christine O'Connor, and other councillors and planning committee members:

I have just become aware of this proposal at 92 Napier St:

"The applicant is proposing amendments to re-designate the lands from an Open Space land use designation to a Residential land use designation in the Official Plan and to re-zone the lands from a General Open Space zone (OS2) zone to an Urban Residential 5 (UR5) zone of the Kingston Zoning By-law to enable four lots for residential development. The amendments also include removing the Fourth Urban Residential Unit Holding Overlay, that applies to the area in Zoning Schedule D3 of the Kingston Zoning By-Law, to enable four dwelling units in a house on each lot. The proposal would result in a total of 16 new dwelling units and a total of 40 bedrooms across the four proposed lots."

I live in this area and I have to ask you, PLEASE, do NOT pass this change. This is far too many dwellings for this space and will irretrievably change the nature of the neighbourhood. I value our students and understand there is a need for housing but please consider other areas. It seems very successful and reasonable to build along Princess St. as so many big buildings are going up and that seems to work and have the appropriate infrastructure and not the impact on family residential neighbourhoods. (I would suggest that the city should have more say on the cost of this housing to students as I have heard it is very expensive, but that is another issue). This is far too many buildings and units for this plot of land and puts far too much pressure on the neighbourhood. I ask you to please consider long term implications. The planning committee has the choice of whether to rezone and whether to sever the plots. Building high density student housing should be done in the designated, incentivized areas along major corridors and inside the Campus Expansion Area, which the City initiated through their own planning process. Please do not start a pattern of initiating high density student housing wherever a lot comes up in family areas.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions about my feedback.

Regards,

Sandra Morden

168 Willingdon Ave
[REDACTED]

Eva Bencze [REDACTED]

Didrikson,Amy;

City Clerk

Some people who received this message 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: Amy Didrikson

James Bar

Christine O'Connor

Re: 92 Napier Street

Feedback for July 17, 2025 Meeting

I am unable to attend this meeting in person, but I would like to go on record to oppose the application to sever the lot and build student housing.

This property should not be considered for high density student housing. The City's own planning indicates that certain designated areas are appropriate for the construction of specific housing for Queen's students.

This is **not** the case on Napier Street. It is part of a family friendly neighbourhood with a popular and desirable public school in its midst.

Allowing for a subdivision with 4 rental properties, each with 10 bedrooms will have an extremely detrimental impact on the neighbourhood. It would create a little ghetto of 40 or more students living on the equivalent of 2 housing lots. Moreover, **there will be noise, traffic and parking issues which will have a significant impact on the homes on Napier Street and the lands abutting this property.**

These homes are, for the most part, owned by their occupants. There is pride of ownership; properties are well cared for. There is a strong sense of community among residents. It seems unlikely that students would even feel as if they belonged to the neighbourhood; the architectural style of 4 narrow, tall houses would not blend in at all with the neighbourhood; there would be little student interaction with the neighbours - which often does occur when homes are rented on streets with families owning homes and living there.

My concern is that if this development is approved, it will cause a negative transformation to the current neighbourhood. In all likelihood, homeowners directly impacted by the student homes will move elsewhere. Property values may go down. The neighbourhood will be eroded.

It makes no sense to sever these lots, especially since they are zoned as Open Space... the Mayor has stated that green space is important to neighbourhoods.

If the city deems that the property should rezoned as residential, there should be 2 lots and the opportunity for other developers to build homes that are more suitable to the neighbourhood.

In short, I am opposed to this application. It appears to favour **only** the applicant Amber Peak, who would gain substantially from the project financially. **Everyone else** in the neighbourhood would lose. Green

space would be the optimal choice, but if it is decided that the parcel of land should be zoned as residential, I implore you to consider a more reasonable plan, in keeping with the current lot sizes.

Sincerely,

Eva Bencze
617 Earl Street
Kingston



Ethel Kozliner [REDACTED]

O'Connor,Christi

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

Dear Christine and Amy,

We hope you are both having a good summer.

My husband and I will not be able to attend the meeting regarding development at 92 Napier Street, however, we would like our concerns noted:

1. The proposed scale of the development would significantly and detrimentally impact the nature of the neighbourhood for local residents. The needs of so many new residents on the street could overwhelm local capacity and infrastructure. Such a large development does not seem to be a good fit within the area.
2. The densification proposed on Napier Street is clearly for student housing in a residential neighbourhood. This takes advantage of a new policy that Ontario presented as having the intention of providing housing for new homeowners, newcomers and seniors wishing to stay in their local community. This would set a dangerous and undesirable precedent.
3. The scale of the proposed development will have a significant impact on local green space. This is also a tremendous concern.

We know that the City of Kingston values public engagement and hearing the voices of its residents. We also value students and recognize that they need housing too. By creating structures and living conditions that please both residents and students, the community will be a much more positive place in which to live and grow together. Please find densification solutions that do not breed frustration and resentment and result in highly trained local people leaving the neighbourhood and city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Ethel Kozliner and Phillip Isotalo

Ted Hsu

O'Connor,Christin

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

Hello Christine, please accept this submission to the planning committee for thus evenings discussion regarding 92 Napier St. Thank you!

July 16, 2025

To the Planning Committee,

Re: Proposed Development on 92 Napier Street

As you are no doubt aware, the unrelenting expansion of a segregated student neighbourhood in the vicinity of Queen's University, at the expense of a mixed, demographically diverse neighbourhood, has been a longstanding weakness of existing land use policies. The Ontario government recently made a policy change in that regard (see below).

Less widely recognized, but of provincial and national significance, is constrained housing availability for early-career researchers and their families, which negatively impacts Queen's University's research and development capacity. Affordable, family-appropriate housing within close proximity to campus is one key determinant of Queen's ability to attract and retain research talent.

Please consider this alternative to the current development proposal:

Rather than constructing units with 4-4-1-1 bedroom configurations, consider 3-3-2-2 units, which are more suitable for families. Moreover, avoiding the severance of the lot and simply having two buildings, would result in a parking ratio more in line with that of An Clachan, a purpose-built multi-unit complex which does house young researchers with families.

Designing housing exclusively for student occupancy, as would likely occur with severed lots accommodating 40 bedrooms and with minimal parking, would expand the student-dominated land use pattern further westward. This would exacerbate the loss of neighbourhood diversity and contribute to displacement pressures on non-student residents, continuing the unfortunate trend of the past few decades.

When it comes to student housing, I urge the City of Kingston to take advantage of new provincial legislation which provides an exemption to the planning act for student housing projects on lands owned by Queen's. This came from a provincial housing bill last year (Bill 185). The relevant section of the amended Planning Act is 62.0.2:

Undertakings of post-secondary institutions

62.0.2 (1) Except as otherwise prescribed, an undertaking of a post-secondary institution described in subsection (2) for the objects of the institution is not subject to this Act or to section 113 or 114 of the City of Toronto Act, 2006.

Same

(2) Subsection (1) applies to the following post-secondary institutions:

1. Publicly-assisted universities, as defined in section 1 of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities Act, except as otherwise prescribed.

According to public statements by the Ontario government, this exemption applies to student housing projects on land owned by institutions such as Queen's. **Capitalizing on this provincial policy opening provides an important opportunity for strategic densification by directing purpose-built, dense student accommodations onto Queen's owned sites, rather than allowing existing mixed residential areas to be taken over.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Ted Hsu, MPP

Lisa Morriss-

O'Connor,Christin

David Andrews <j

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

Thank you Christine!

I have registered. I do have some questions regarding the infiltration of high density student residences in what has been a "settled family neighbourhood" for over 40+ years. I have lived in the same place for that length of time, and others have lived her longer.

1. Since 40 bedrooms could end up holding 160 adult students, how will the numbers of "residents" be controlled? This could have a profound impact on location and services.
2. At least one such building: 39 Ellerbeck, after significant disruption during its construction in a family neighbourhood which had many citizen objections to bylaw violations, has already been for sale at least twice, since its completion several years ago. Then what designation?
3. With May to May rentals, who governs the selection of people subletting the units during the summer months? This has proved to be a huge problem in the past. I personally remember when an emergency unit had to remove a drug dealer. His "clients" continued to visit the location, even a year later looking for him.
4. I made many phone calls and sent emails out regarding verification that archaeological and historical surveys for this area were completed. Queen's Archives said they didn't have them. The Kingston Lawn Bowling Club and the Kingston Tennis Clubs are both on former Queen's property. Since neither club has had intensive or heavy construction for example to include major plumbing/living quarters, such surveys may not have been considered necessary. But for these 4 X 10 bedroom units, this would seem to be an essential consideration. Even 40 adult students in that small space - how many Napier St. family homes have 10 full-time adult residences? Worse, potentially 160 adult students in 4 houses?

Sincerely yours, Lisa Morriss-Andrews