



**City of Kingston  
Planning Committee  
Meeting Number 08-2024  
Addendum**

**Thursday, April 4, 2024 at 6:00 p.m.  
Hosted at City Hall in Council Chamber**

---

**11. Correspondence**

a) Correspondence received regarding 2360 Princess Street (File Number D35-001-2024), dated March 20, 2024.

Schedule Pages 1 - 2

b) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated March 28, 2024.

Schedule Pages 3 - 5

c) Correspondence received regarding 2360 Princess Street (File Number D35-001-2024), dated March 31, 2024.

Schedule Pages 6 – 10

d) Correspondence received regarding 2360 Princess Street (File Number D35-001-2024), dated April 2, 2024.

Schedule Pages 11 – 13

e) Correspondence received regarding 61 Hyperion Court (File Number D01-004-2024), dated April 2, 2024.

Schedule Page 14

f) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 3, 2024.

Schedule Pages 15 - 19

g) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 3, 2024.

Schedule Page 20

h) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 3, 2024.

Schedule Pages 21 - 23

i) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 3, 2024.

Schedule Pages 24 - 26

j) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 3, 2024.

Schedule Pages 27 - 30

k) Correspondence received regarding 2360 Princess Street (File Number D35-001-2024), dated April 3, 2024.

Schedule Pages 31 – 32

l) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 4, 2024.

Schedule Page 33

m) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 4, 2024.

Schedule Page 34

n) Correspondence received regarding 4085, 4091 and 4097 Bath Road (File Number D35-014-2021), dated April 4, 2024.

Schedule Page 35

o) Correspondence received regarding 2360 Princess Street (File Number D35-001-2024), dated April 4, 2024.

Schedule Pages 36 – 40

## Clendening, Ian

---

**From:** Clendening, Ian  
**Sent:** March 20, 2024 2:10 PM  
**To:** Ann Amos  
**Subject:** RE: Zoning of 2360 Princess St

Hi Ann, first of all, I want to thank you for your comments and address those questions which you have posed:

1. Will the residents be homeless people, low income and/or refugees? It is not stated in your recent letter the clientele you hope to house in this facility.
  - a. The applicant has indicated in their submission that they intend to provide the new homes as affordable housing, however at this time they have not specified what level of affordability they would achieve. Any person could live in any dwelling regardless whether they are students, refugees, etc, and a Zoning By-law is not empowered to permit a distinction between types of people versus types of uses.
2. Will they be housed in the motel in back of the hotel or in the hotel itself or both facilities? The Travel Lodge borders on our safe and affluent neighbourhood which we wish to maintain.
  - a. The new homes would be located within both buildings occupying those areas formerly used for hotel/motel units.
3. Will the Travel Lodge still be a hotel?
  - a. As outlined above, the proposal changes the hotel/motel to accommodate the new homes.
4. Will the Cavalier Restaurant still be operating?
  - a. The restaurant use would continue to operate as it has.

I can appreciate your concern for a drop in property value and an increase in crime, and I will forward these concerns on to the applicant to highlight the concerns for the proper management of the buildings.

Kindly,

**Ian Clendening (he/him/his)**

Senior Planner  
Planning Services

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



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

---

**From:** Ann Amos [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 20, 2024 1:51 PM  
**To:** Clendening, Ian <iclendening@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Subject:** Zoning of 2360 Princess St

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

Dear Mr. Ian Clendening

We are concerned about the type of housing proposed for the site of 2360 Princess St. These are some of our concerns.

1. Will the residents be homeless people, low income and/or refugees? It is not stated in your recent letter the clientele you hope to house in this facility.
2. Will they be housed in the motel in back of the hotel or in the hotel itself or both facilities? The Travel Lodge borders on our safe and affluent neighbourhood which we wish to maintain.
3. Will the Travel Lodge still be a hotel?
4. Will the Cavalier Restaurant still be operating?

Needless to say, we are worried about a drop in our property value. We are also concerned as seniors, in the possibility of increased crime.

We hope to hear your answers to our four questions at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,  
Ann and Charlie Amos  
239 Sheridan St.  
[REDACTED]

**Re: Collins Creek Development.**

Stephen Kelly [REDACTED]

Sat 3/30/2024 2:21 PM

To: O'Connor,Christine &lt;cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca&gt;

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

Dear Clerk:

An additional comment for your attention.

Councillor Osanic, in her weekend community email, says of the development 'The tree loss that will happen in the woodland is staggering' and 'The aerial overlay of the woods says it all.'

While the pictures do show what the development would look like vs the current state, implying that 'we can have these trees or we can have these houses' is singularly unhelpful. It sends the signal to developers that it's better to clear cut lands before proposing development. Think about that when it comes to the future of the lands immediately to the west of Collins Creek - where far more significant tree growth and trails used by the public exist on private land. Her statements also imply that the quality of quality of trees on the site are critical to the public interest. I see no factual basis for this assertion. If it was the case, the City would be facing far greater issues than this - or any other single infill development - could possibly remedy.

Regards

SK

On Mar 28, 2024, at 22:55, Stephen Kelly [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Committee Clerk:

My name is Stephen Kelly. I reside in the area immediately north of the proposed Collins Creek Development.

I am on record as supporting the proposal. I mention this in passing for those who have not had an opportunity to review the file.

I don't intend to repeat my earlier statement here in sum, this is a quality developer and the development is entirely consistent with decades of suburban development in Kingston. Properly done, inclusive of public oversight, I believe the new community will be a credit to the City. And home to many.

My reason for writing in regards to the April 4th meeting concerns a general notice entitled 'Attention Neighbour' dropped in my mailbox. As with the person who dropped it

off, the document is anonymous. Accordingly, I've concluded that the only means available to me to comment on the points it makes is by way of this committee.

In general, Attention Neighbour repeats the points of criticism made earlier. I'm assuming, since the author seems unmoved, that this is a steady state with regard to development more broadly, and has less to do with the specific proposal or any changes made to it since the committee's earlier consideration(s).

In a related assumption, and based on the points the document makes, I don't think the author is necessarily my 'neighbour' in the immediate sense. Fellow citizen, for sure.

Attention Neighbor references trees, traffic, water quality and private ownership. Too many trees will be cut down, traffic will be awful, the water quality could be harmed and private roads are not good.

I'll be brief.

Trees: Cities need to have plans to protect, preserve and enhance their natural environment. This is where you have a conversation about trees. Developments should reflect these plans but not be rejected because such plans exist.

As a neighbour, I know that the site in question is literally surrounded by development cut out of the forests that once were. And yet, these same neighbourhoods are now known for the tree coverage that emerged from the 1970's and earlier developments. I'm surprised my 'Attention Neighbor' author would somehow not know this. Maybe seeing the forest for the tree is an issue.

Traffic: we have a professionally managed and staffed city that seem reasonably competent in managing traffic. If you've driven in Beijing, for example, you'd give the Kingston staff a raise. As with the trees, vehicular impacts need to be responsibly managed and resolved in the context of the site specifics, but 'too many cars' is another conversation.

(By the way, there is a noticeable increase in west bound traffic in the evening. No doubt people headed home to Amherstview where new developments are also noticeable. More sprawl. Perhaps this is another reason to support infill developments like Collins Creek.)

Water Quality: While much can be said about the importance of managing run off and the like, the presence of otters in the ponds along Centennial Drive this Spring suggests that the City and conservation officials have this down to a bit of an art. I am confident the same attention to detail will apply here.

Private Roads: there are many developments in the City that are serviced by private roads. Have been for decades. And yet, the City persists.

I will close on two points that may assist the City in dealing with the 'trees, traffic and water' issues in the area.

The disposition of the land immediately to the north of the site, across the rail tracks on the east side of Collins Creek, is deserving of attention. Bordered to the north by Lawrence Park, there is enormous potential for recreational and community uses. Perhaps the City could explore an expansion of the park. If you haven't walked the area, please do. But bring rubber boots.

The land immediately on the west side of Collins Creek should be regarded as an area critical to the City's long term. The City and others, including the conservation authorities, need to proactively develop and ultimately adopted the zoning and regulations needed to safeguard the public interests in any future development.

Thank you for your attention.

SK



## Clendening, Ian

---

**From:** Donna Delyea [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** April 3, 2024 12:15 PM  
**To:** Chaves,Paul; Clendening,Ian  
**Cc:** Bar,James  
**Subject:** RE: Notice of Complete Applications & Public Meeting Re: Zoning for the Lasalle Inn -- PC-24-026

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

Thank you for your responses. I would like to suggest that when dealing with matters that involve the location of affordable housing in a residential neighbourhood – that the 120 metre radius be extended. It's not an everyday change is it? I am sure you can appreciate that this will have a much larger impact on the neighbourhood – than a 120 metre radius.

Unfortunately, I am unable to participate in the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting – however, if you will humour me – I have 2 further comments to make:

1. While I appreciate that this facility is becoming available and, to some at any rate, this project seems like a good fit – because it is utilizing pre-existing buildings that will not require exterior work ... I'm wondering just how long it will be before there becomes recognition that these buildings, particularly the motel, aren't in really good shape. When will it become obvious that it will be cheaper to tear down and rebuild – over trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear? And ... when that happens, what happens to those individuals housed there? Or will it just be left to deteriorate?
2. As I look about the neighbourhood, I wonder what part of this neighbourhood lends itself to affordable housing... is it Farm Boy (not to be confused with Food Basics), the 2 car washes, the car dealership, the gas station, Costco, Princess Auto, the over-expensive Shopper's Drugmart, perhaps the doctors' offices that aren't accepting new patients – and the walk-in clinic that only takes current patients, Cooke's fine foods, Rona for their home renovations, Lighting Reflects Design, Starbucks, the high-end clothing store? Admittedly, there is a Timmies and a FreshCo and, yes, a thrift store – but, I can't help but think that the majority of businesses in this area do not lend themselves to people living in affordable housing. Yes there are buses, yes they might have bikes – but aren't they just taking them somewhere else besides here?

I'm not optimistic.

Respectfully submitted,  
Donna Delyea

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

---

**From:** Chaves,Paul <pchaves@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 2, 2024 1:00:10 PM  
**To:** Clendening,Ian <iclendening@cityofkingston.ca>; Donna Delyea [REDACTED] >  
**Cc:** Bar,James <jbar@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Subject:** Re: Notice of Complete Applications & Public Meeting Re: Zoning for the Lasalle Inn -- PC-24-026

Morning Ian,

Thank you for confirming my thoughts regarding Donna's questions.

The one thing I will add, is that no resident has to wait until the end of the meeting. The public, both those in person and virtually, will be given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions of staff and/or the applicant representatives. And to confirm the process, speakers will not be able to have a back and forth conversation with staff/representatives. Speakers will have a limited amount of time to ask all there questions and state their comments. The chair will decide when to stop the public engagement in order to allow staff/representative to answer the questions put forth. And then the Chair will continue with further public engagement, if there is more.

Thank you,

Paul Chaves  
Councillor Loyalist-Catarauqui

Mobile: (613) 331-6995  
Email: pchaves@cityofkingston.ca

My working hours and yours may be different. Please do not feel obligated to reply outside your normal working hours.

Please join my Facebook group: Paul Chaves Councillor District 2 Loyalist-Catarauqui

I have started a District Newsletter. If you are interested in subscribing to the Loyalist-Catarauqui District Newsletter, please follow the following instructions.

Email: pchaves@cityofkingston.ca

Enter in Subject Line: PLEASE ADD TO LOYALIST-CATARAQUI DISTRICT NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTION LIST

Enter in the Body of the email:

Councillor Chaves,

I would like to receive the Loyalist-Catarauqui District Newsletter.

Please, add me to your distribution list.

---

**From:** Clendening, Ian <iclendening@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 2, 2024 11:42 AM  
**To:** Donna Delyea [REDACTED]; Chaves, Paul <pchaves@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Cc:** Bar, James <jbar@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Subject:** RE: Notice of Complete Applications & Public Meeting Re: Zoning for the Lasalle Inn -- PC-24-026

Hi Donna,

First of all I would like to confirm receipt of your comments and questions regarding this application. These comments, and any others received, will form part of the public record and will be placed on an Addendum to the Agenda and for the Planning Committee's consideration.

I would also like to take this opportunity to address several of the items both in respect to the circulation of Notice and the details of the application which you raised in your correspondence.

In regards to circulation the City of Kingston provides Notice of Applications and Public Meetings which exceeds the requirements of the Planning Act, including for this application mailing all property owners within 120 metres of the property, the placement of a large billboard along the street frontage, and information notice in the Kingston Whig-Standard as well as all information available on the [City's DASH portal](#). I would also like to address your concerns that members of our Corporate Management Team were not consulted. While these individuals did not 'sign off' on the Staff Report, I can assure you that the application was circulated to our partners in Fire Services, Utilities Kingston, and others, all of whom aided in the review of this application.

In looking at the location of the address you provided in relationship to the area where notice was mailed out, I note that you are only marginally outside of this area (~155 metres vs. 120 metres). While this is unfortunate, I am happy that you have come to find out about the application through your social networks, and perhaps have since been able to see the notice posting on the property. I would like to confirm that if you wish to participate in the public meeting you do not need to attend to Council as Planning Committee Meetings are held in a hybrid format.

Even if you intend to participate in person, I would still encourage you to request to sign up 'virtually' as this opportunity to participate can be incredibly helpful if circumstances arise which prevent in-person participation. To register, [visit this link](#). The City has also prepared a guide for participating in these types of virtual meetings which can be [found at this link](#).

In regards to your concerns about the property being unkempt, it is my hope that, with the open grassy areas being used by and benefitting residents as opposed to providing marginal utility to hotel/motel guests, that these areas will in fact be better maintained. It is my understanding that the owner would be utilizing the services of a property manager, and of course, the upkeep of these lands would be subject to the City's Property Standards By-law.

Given your concerns about people living in the smaller hotel sized units, these units are intended as bachelor and one-bedroom type units which, while small, are intended to address specific needs in the continuum of housing options. I can also note that several units are planned to be consolidated into larger units and as such the 107 units is an upper bound while each unit will be provided with an independent kitchen and bathroom within each unit.

Finally, in regards to your concern for the consultation process given the big change, I would like to highlight that it is not the City's intent to avoid public discussion on this application. As I trust you can tell from the information above, we actively wish to address community concerns and provide the public with information about the change which is happening within their community and welcome feedback on such. In this instance, the Official Plan Amendment is intended to allow a lower density of residential development than what was otherwise planned for this part of Princess Street given the existing building stock. Similarly, the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment intends to allow for the conversion to a residential use.

If you have any follow up questions, or wish to provide further feedback and comment on this application, I welcome you to respond to this e-mail with such and I would be happy to address.

Kindly,



**Ian Clendening (he/him/his)**

Senior Planner  
Planning Services

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

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

---

**From:** Donna Delyea [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 31, 2024 12:25 AM  
**To:** Chaves,Paul <pchaves@cityofkingston.ca>; Clendening,Ian <iclendening@cityofkingston.ca>  
**Subject:** Notice of Complete Applications & Public Meeting Re: Zoning for the Lasalle Inn -- PC-24-026

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

Hi!

I was quite surprised when a neighbour provided me with a document outlining proposed zoning changes to Lasalle Motor Inn on outer Princess Street. This property is within 2 blocks of my home – and this was the first I had heard of a zoning application. I may be mistaken, but I can't remember seeing anything about this zoning application in any of the many emails I receive from the city – asking my opinion about bench placements in Victoria Park – or lighting, etc. for the breakwater down at Battery Park in downtown Kingston. In fact, other than the person who provided me with a copy of the notice of public meeting – I have yet to meet anyone else in the neighbourhood who knows anything about it – and I walk my dog 5 times a day and talk to a lot of people.

They are planning to turn the existing buildings into 107 affordable housing units. That is a big change for this neighbourhood and I am surprised that information related to this proposed zoning change was not circulated broadly in the immediate vicinity of that property. I was always under the impression that there needed to be consultation prior to such a change. I understand that there is a meeting April 4th. Frankly, expecting people from Cataraqui to go downtown to sit outside of a Planning Committee meeting – waiting for it to end – is a bit unrealistic – especially because – well, no one knows about it. I gather you can also call in – but – again – do you sit on hold until the Planning Committee meeting is over – and .... well, it's hard for people to zoom into a meeting that they don't know about. So, I expect this agenda item will just sail through without a hitch .... because ... nobody knows about it.... Affordable housing – ✓

I realize the City needs affordable housing, but it seems this is being done in the absence of any real consultation process. Will people be living in "apartments" the size of motel rooms? Who will be managing the property? The property is already unkempt and seedy looking – the back end of the property that borders Ellesmeer Ave is packed full of garbage that no one ever deals with – if the property is to be residential – will there be a property manager on site who will ensure that the building(s) and property is maintained and

doesn't just become an eyesore (a bigger eyesore)? I understand no changes are to be made the the exterior – is the building in the rear of the property to be utilized – because it appears to be run down. A motel has staff – is a 107 unit affordable housing complex going to have staff who will ensure that the units and the property are maintained?

It also seems that consultation with the various Corporate Management Team members was "Not Required". So we don't think that we need to consult with transportation, emergency services, community services – when you plunk 107 affordable housing units into a neighbourhood?

Suffice it to say that I have concerns – both with the consultation process – or lack thereof – and about how these units and the property will be managed and maintained in the future. I sincerely hope that you will not be dropping a whole lot of grief on our neighbourhood.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Delyea  
274 Ellesmeer Avenue  
Kingston, ON K7P 3C5  
[REDACTED]

## Clendening, Ian

---

**From:** Mike Gallant [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** April 2, 2024 4:39 PM  
**To:** Clendening, Ian  
**Subject:** Re: Questions - D35-001-2024 - 2360 Princess Street

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

Hello Ian. Thank you for the update and the connection so I can add questions. In speaking with some of the residents on Ellesmeer Ave. there is the obvious concern of the type of housing this could turn into as a potential "low income" housing/rental.

I know when Rona built and backed onto Ellesmeer they put up privacy fencing. Hopefully the meeting Thursday can provide some clarity.

Thank You

On Tue, Apr 2, 2024 at 3:21 PM Clendening, Ian <[iclendening@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:iclendening@cityofkingston.ca)> wrote:

Hi Mike,

As the Planner assigned to this file, I was forwarded your e-mail to the Clerks Department.

It is great to know that you have registered to attend the Public Meeting for this application. I have reached out to the applicant to better answer the type of detail you are looking for in regards to what types of changes to the building façade and grounds they anticipate in the event of approval.

In the mean time, I want to welcome you to reply to this e-mail if you have any other questions about this proposal or wish to provide written comments for consideration.

Kindly,



**Ian Clendening (he/him/his)**

Senior Planner

Planning Services

City of Kingston

Located at: 1211 John Counter Boulevard,

216 Ontario Street Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 extension 3126

[iclendening@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:iclendening@cityofkingston.ca)



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

From: Mike Gallant [REDACTED] >  
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 9:51 AM  
To: O'Connor,Christine <[cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca)>  
Subject: Questions

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

Good morning Christine. I have a couple of questions for Planning Committee - April 4th, 2024 for the property at 2360 Princess Street.

- 1) the existing buildings are older --- are there plans to improve the exterior of these buildings?
- 2) For residents facing the back of the property off Ellesmeer Ave. is there plans for clean up/landscaping and fencing and proper year round maintenance?

I am registered to join the meeting virtually.

Thank You

Mike Gallant





391 Barrie Street  
Kingston ON K7K 3T6  
T: 613-544-7127 F: 613-544-8540  
[www.kingstonmidwives.ca](http://www.kingstonmidwives.ca)

To: Christine O'Connor  
Committee Clerk,  
[cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca)

Dear City of Kingston,

March 29th 2024

On behalf of the Community Midwives of Kingston (CMK), this letter is written in support of the proposed change of designation for 61 Hyperion Court to one that allows for a healthcare office to operate there. This is an urgent matter as we need to submit applications for healthcare grants immediately and our current lease will end this fall.

CMK is a vital healthcare resource and we will be celebrating 30 years of operation in 2024. Our practice cares for over 25% of the pregnant population in Kingston and area each year. Our lease at 391 Barrie St, ends on September 31st 2024. This space is no longer adequate for our 17 midwives and last year we launched an extensive search for a new space. 61 Hyperion Court was the only location that met all of our needs as a practice :

- **Central location**  
Our catchment area extends one hour outside of Kingston in all directions. This building is easily accessible from the 401, by bus (Amherstview to clinic in under one hour), near the third crossing and is walkable for many of our clients who struggle with transportation.
- **Short distance to hospital**  
As we provide pregnancy, labour and postpartum care, there are occasions when emergency transport from our location is needed and/or when a midwife needs to attend a hospital delivery in a timely way. This location is conveniently located near Sir John A MacDonald Blvd and Division St, both of which lead directly to KGH in 8-10 minutes.
- **Ease of Parking/distance from bus stops**  
At our current location parking has increasingly been an issue. With only 6 parking spots, (not designated to our building), permit parking on surrounding streets and an increase in our caseload, our clients are challenged to find parking near our clinic. 61 Hyperion Court has 130+ parking spots available with bus stops within a few metres of the building.
- **Increase in clinic rooms/teaching space**  
At Hyperion Court we were able to design a space that allows for an additional 4 clinic rooms, increased teaching space and community resource areas. We are a teaching practice and take Midwifery, Nursing, Nurse Practitioner and Medical Students from the Midwifery Education Program and Queens Schools of Nursing and Medicine. It is essential to the well being of our community that we are able to educate the next generation of providers and have adequate space to care for parents and babies.

If this change in designation is not approved or is delayed in any way, our practice would be without essential clinic space come September. Our move to Hyperion Court is essential in continuing our ability to be a healthcare solution and meet the needs of the Kingston community. Timely approval will allow us to access needed grant funding. Thank you for expediting this process if at all possible.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kelli Siegwart".

Kelli Siegwart RM  
On behalf of Community Midwives of Kingston

April 3, 2024

City of Kingston – Planning Services  
216 Ontario Street  
Kingston ON K7L 2Z3

Sent via email to cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca  
cc Lisa Osanic losanic@cityofkingston.ca  
cc Amy Didrikson adidrikson@cityofkingston.ca

**Subject:** Proposed Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-Law Amendment (ZBA)  
**City File Number:** D35-014-2021

Dear Planning Committee,

I originally wrote to Planning Services in March 2022 to voice my concerns about the proposed development beside Collins Creek. I also attended a public meeting in June 2022. At that time, I was hopeful that the developer would consider a redesign to address valid concerns that were raised by the public, City Councillors, and other interested parties.

Unfortunately, other than replacing the proposed stormwater pond with additional units and removing parkland, there is little change to the concept plan that was presented two years ago.

The application documents stress a new 50m buffer between Collins Creek and the development, but the distance between residential units and the creek is much smaller than shown in the original plan from 2022 (50m versus more than 100m).

The proposed development site is ecologically important, and I believe that a more meaningful buffer would be beneficial. To summarize:

- The site is part of an important linkage between Lemoine Point, Lake Ontario, and the larger Mile Square Block forest to the north.
- The site itself forms part of the Mile Square Block forest and is significant for that reason.
- Collins Creek has seen increased development pressure in recent years. In its 2023 Watershed Report Card, CRCA gave the Collins Creek watershed a rating of D for forest conditions. This is the worst rating for any watershed in the Cataraqui region.

I've outlined some of my more specific concerns under the headings below:

## **Conflict with City of Kingston Environmental Commitments**

I'd like to point to three specific items:

1. In 2019, the City of Kingston became the first city in Ontario to declare a climate emergency.
2. Under s. 2.8.2 of the Official Plan, the City of Kingston has set a goal of achieving a 30 percent minimum forest coverage in the urban area by 2025 and maintaining forest cover outside the urban boundary. The city has not yet met this goal.
3. On March 19<sup>th</sup> 2024, City Council committed to signing the Montreal Pledge in support of biodiversity.

Given that the proposed development will reduce both forest coverage and biodiversity, this application does not appear to align with the city's environmental policies.

## **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

A company called Ecological Services completed the Environmental Impact Assessment. The following statement appears on their website:

### **What if I do not like your recommendations?**

Our services are provided to our clients, and we will not share your information with others unless specifically directed to do so. In general, however, our reports should not contain unexpected surprises. If we have concerns, our goal is to work with clients to achieve re-designs, apply mitigation measures, and/or compensation measures, such that the final application proposal has no significant environmental impacts and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (which governs much of the development in Ontario).

I'm reminded that the client in this case is the developer. The developer selected this consultant and is presumably paying their invoices. This is the process in Ontario. Although I'm sure the consultant owes a duty of care to the environment, they have been hired to find a way to make this development happen based on their interpretation of the provincial policies.

Reading through the EIA, I see very few instances where the consultant has recommended redesign, mitigation, or compensation to better protect the environment. The only obvious example of redesign is with respect to the stormwater pond and the 50m buffer (which CRCA pushed for).

The consultant argues that the woodland located on the site is not "significant" according to the Natural Heritage Reference Manual, but the woodland appears to meet the criteria for significance based on both water protection and proximity to fish habitat. CRCA felt that the woodland was significant based on size and linkages as reflected in their initial Sept 29th 2022 comments on the EIA. A woodland only needs to meet one of the criteria to be considered significant, and this woodland arguably meets four criteria.

As the city is aware, a hearing is currently ongoing at the Ontario Land Tribunal with respect to another development (the Tannery). The EIA for that proposed development was also completed by Ecological Services.

Grant Kauffman, an expert witness, was critical of Ecological Services' work on the Tannery project and in particular their methodology for demonstrating "no negative impacts" to significant natural heritage features, which is relevant for purposes of the Provincial Policy Statement.

Under s. 2.1.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement, development and site alteration shall not be permitted in significant woodlands in this region unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

There are differences between this situation and the Tannery, but the concept of "no negative impacts" is still relevant.

I understand that CRCA performed a review of the EIA, but I have concerns about the effect of Bill 23 on their input. I think a full peer review of the EIA is important.

Although a third-party expert would be much better suited than me to critique the EIA, I did notice a few potential issues that the city may wish to review:

- Black Ash is listed in the tree inventory. Black Ash is a Species at Risk (Endangered) according to the Provincial Government. This species is not mentioned in the EIA.
- Monarch butterflies (species of special concern in Ontario) have been observed in large numbers on lands adjacent to the proposed development site. Monarchs are not mentioned in the EIA.
- With respect to fish, the EIA states that many of these species are "tolerant of marginal water conditions". It does not appear that the consultant has done any fish sampling of their own or any quantitative analysis of the effect this development may have on water quality or conditions in Collins Creek – including, for example, during the spring melt. On that basis, it's unclear to me how the consultant can demonstrate no negative impact.
- There does not appear to be any detail as to how the consultant ruled out the presence of snake hibernaculum.

Is the City of Kingston willing to hire a third-party expert such as Mr. Kauffman to review the EIA to ensure proper protection for the environment?

### **Stormwater Management**

At the last public hearing, the developer was adamant that a pond was necessary for proper management of stormwater. When faced with pushback from the CRCA and the possibility of scaling back the development to meet minimum setback distances, the developer removed the

pond. The pond has since been replaced with more units, which I cannot imagine was CRCA's intent.

Despite the removal of the pond, stormwater will still be directed into Collins Creek. The system to accomplish this is proposed to be managed by a private owner rather than the city.

The level of construction and maintenance that would be required both within and outside of the 50m buffer to handle stormwater does not appear to be well detailed in the documents. I hope the city is paying close attention to this issue.

### **Archeological Impact**

The property contains an historic mill raceway that was used in the early 1800s to direct water from a pond north of the development to mills along Bath Road. The application documents stress a 5m buffer around the mill raceway, but the most recent concept plan appears to show that only a small portion of the mill raceway on the property will be retained.

Has the city confirmed if **all** the mill raceway is being protected or only a small portion at the southern boundary of the property as shown on the concept plan?

I understand that stage 1-3 archaeological assessments have been completed or will be completed. Unfortunately, since these documents have not been made public, it is unclear what, if anything, archaeologists have uncovered. Archaeological assessments are important for this development given the historic and pre-contact archaeological potential of these sites. An indigenous burial site was found in Collins Bay less than 1km east of the development.

Has the city confirmed that the archaeological assessments looked at more than just the mill race?

### **Traffic Safety**

Collins Bay has poor bus service and is not within easy walking distance of grocery stores and other necessities. Residents of this proposed development will need personal vehicles as demonstrated by the significant number of parking spaces on site.

A Traffic Impact Study has been completed, but Collins Bay residents that I have spoken with are understandably skeptical of the report's findings. It does not appear that the traffic report properly considered the rail crossing at Collins Bay Road. Traffic is frequently backed up at that intersection due to freight trains. In addition, vehicles with boat trailers entering or exiting the nearby boat launch may cause traffic delays or safety issues in summer.

All traffic will enter and exit the development through a single intersection at Bath/Station St. The developer does not appear to be adding any additional turn lanes or traffic lights to help with traffic issues.

Does the city intend to improve bus service to Collins Bay? Express bus service would provide an alternative to driving and help to alleviate traffic concerns.

The developer's job is to fit in as many units as they can and to make as much profit as they can. We can't blame them for that.

This zoning change is a big ask from the developer, and I think the city needs to take a more active role rather than simply accepting the proposed design. Kingston has an opportunity here to balance the immediate need for housing with longer-term city planning.

I hope the city will consider protecting more of this land by implementing a meaningful setback between development and Collins Creek and by committing to set aside conservation land in this region.

Sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Nick Stefano

A black rectangular redaction box covering contact information.

RE: PC 24 001

Karen Stos [REDACTED]

Wed 4/3/2024 3:05 PM

To: O'Connor,Christine <cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca>

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

Dear Christine,

I am writing to you to protest the proposed development of the area along Collin's Creek.

On March 19/24, City Council agreed to become a signatory to the Montreal Biodiversity Pledge. Does this not indicate that Kingston will eliminate threats to biodiversity?

We must protect biodiversity in all its forms! If not now, when? We have to work harder to stop the juggernaut of wild space destruction.


Collin's Creek is an established area of biodiversity with heat-zone protection. It should be cherished and protected.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.  
Please include in official records.

Yours truly,

Karen Stos  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my home on Native land

**RE: City File Number: D35 014 2021, Public Meeting on April 4, 2024.**Jason Harris 

Wed 4/3/2024 3:21 PM

To: O'Connor,Christine &lt;cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca&gt;; Didrikson,Amy &lt;adidrikson@cityofkingston.ca&gt;

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

Dear Planning Committee,

I do not envy your position's requirement to balance complex environmental, social, and economic issues. However, I am heartened by the efforts of those who have laid a solid foundation to provide balance between the competing interests of all interested parties in our community. The resulting federal, provincial, and municipal regulations, plans, and policy aren't perfect, and, in many cases, they conflict in a way that reflects the tensions in the electorate.

Collectively, we resolve these tensions through public consultation where all interested parties can voice their support, concerns, or dissent based on facts and expert opinions founded in both quantitative and qualitative analysis in the context of our regulations, plans, and policy.

This process requires professionals (like planners, engineers, ecologists, etc.) to act in accordance with the regulations, ethics, and guidelines of their governing bodies (when applicable), to explicitly state the shortcomings and biases in their analysis and for their data and analysis to be made available to all interested parties in the public consultation process in timely manner.

The [OECD Background Document on Public Consultation](#) states that (adapted for decision making) the public consultation process is intended to increase the level of transparency and it can improve decision quality by:

- Bringing into the discussion the expertise, perspectives, and ideas for alternative actions of those directly affected;
- Helping decision makers to balance opposing interests;
- Identifying unintended effects and practical problems. Using pre-notification it is possible to foresee more easily the consequences of some planned policies, becoming one of the most productive ways to identify administrative burdens;
- Providing a quality check on the administration's assessment of costs and benefits;
- Identifying interactions between regulations from various parts of government;

Together regulations, plans, and policy and processes should provide the oversight and guardrails that guide your decisions. However, it would be an understatement to say that the requisite information, data, and analysis by both the proponent and the planning department is deficient with respect to this file (D35-014-2021) and that these deficiencies undermine (deliberately or not) the public consultation process.



Deficiencies include (but are not limited to):

- DASH records are incomplete, non-existent, or shared with the public on a timeline that prevents meaningful public organization, engagement, or both (e.g. CRCA comments about the 50 m buffer being posted just 6 business days before the public meeting when they had been available for more than 10 months to both the proponent and planning department);
- Accepting professional reports from the proponent that do not conform to the professional/regulatory standards set out by their organizations (e.g. stormwater engineering reports that are devoid of an engineering stamp and the responsible member's identity or a suitable "draft" watermark)
- Accepting reports from the proponent who are authored by consultants who may be in a conflict of interest or have the potential to appear to be in conflict of interest (e.g. the proponent's ecological firm is retained by the city to perform development reviews)
- Accepting reports from the proponent who are authored by consultants whose methods, analysis, and judgment have been questioned by expert testimony in official provincial proceedings (e.g. Expert testimony at the Tannery hearings is critical of Ecological Services' work with respect to its lack of quantitative assessment and analysis, improper interpretation of policy and industry standards, and faulty conclusions).
- Lack of public documentation, transparency, or both relating to the City of Kingston's design requirements (e.g. the City of Kingston's Subdivision Development Guidelines & Technical Standards for Appendix 1F: Design Standards – Stormwater Management are missing making it impossible to evaluate the proponent's application against these standards)
- Lack of public documentation, transparency or both relating to the City of Kingston's development review process(es) (e.g. Documents outlining the City of Kingston's Revision Request & Response process, providing Guidelines For Preparing A Planning Rationale, and Site Plan Control Guidelines are all missing and have been so for quite some time - <https://www.cityofkingston.ca/business/planning-and-development/development-review-process/guidelines>)
- Lack of public documentation relating to the staff's quantitative and qualitative analysis against regulation, policy, and plans and reasonable justification for deviations against those documents (which include but are not limited to):
  - Ontario's Provincial Policy Statement
  - The Ontario Natural Heritage Reference Manual
  - The City of Kingston's Official Plan specifically with respect to:
    - All parts listed in Section 2.1.1 – Sustainable Development for Urban Areas
    - Adjacent lands in Section 6.1.8
    - Land use and natural heritage designations specified in the schedules attached to the Official Plan
  - Design Guidelines for Residential lots

I understand that other members of the public will voice their concerns about the loss of or disruption to our natural heritage resources, the absence of species at risk findings, that are known/verified to exist, in the proponent's environmental assessment(s), traffic congestion, noise, privatization of roads and sewer systems etc. and I share their concerns. Below, I will provide a high-level overview as an example of issues associated with just one topic. The overview identifies obvious issues with the proponent's consultant's Stormwater Management Requirements report (dated January 19, 2024) and comments made by that consultant in response to inquiries about its report(s).

- The report submitted by Josselyn Engineering Inc. is not aligned with requirements set out by Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO) document - [Use of Professional Engineer's Seal](#). Specifically, Section 7.1.3 states, "With limited exceptions, practitioners must seal all completed engineering documents for which they are assuming professional responsibility where the document is not considered "draft." it goes on to say that "From the definitions in section 53(1) of Regulation 941, seals must be affixed to any drawing, specification, plan, report, design, model, or other document whether in print, electronic, or any other medium, that contains engineering content, and that does not meet any of the criteria for not requiring a seal." It is troublesome that the engineer of record has not identified themselves in this report and affixed their seal or appropriately designated the document as a "draft". Nor has the engineer affixed their seal to any of the engineering deliverables (e.g. plans, calculations, or models) attached to report as Appendices to their report. The City of Kingston staff who interact with these documents should be knowledgeable enough to reject documents that are not compliant with Ontario regulations as part

of any application. This basic screening criterion needs to be enforced to protect the public's interests.

- The report does not clearly reference regulations, standards, or technical specifications for important aspects of Stormwater Management like water quality.
- The report does not provide an analysis of the risks associated with the uncertainty that remains given assumptions about the proposed development as they stand today (e.g. what are the range off possible outcomes given the lack of a geotechnical report) or propose mitigations should those findings present challenges that aren't feasible given the preliminary concept.
- The report does not address the obvious redirection of site run-off. Specifically, Figure 1 in the report shows the presence of the millrace that will redirect any surface runoff to its east to the creek just to the north-west of 4101 Bath Road. Instead, the proposed plan redirects a majority of the site's runoff over the millrace to a location hundreds of meters upstream that does not currently receive this flow rate, salt or chemical additives for snow or ice mitigation or solids of any kind from roadways (see Figure 2).
- The proponent's reports do not discuss the negative impacts to the proposed 50 m EPA designated land buffer of this redirection of stormwater or impacts to adjacent private properties and it does not provide any concept for installing the appropriate culverts or piping from the development through the buffer and to the creek. For example, will the proposed 50 m EPA buffer be severed from east to west or disrupted at the creek by construction activity related to the installation of this stormwater system?
- Josselyn Engineering does not address or is dismissive of some of the serious deficiencies raised by the MTO (see Comment No. 25 in Tracker - Bayview Farm (3rd Round).pdf dated February 23, 2024 (resubmission date). Specifically, the MTO states that, "Please note that underground storage chambers maintenance and operation responsibilities by means of private SWM measures are hard to enforce as per the proposed design." Josselyn Engineering states that, "It is proposed that the site plan agreement, as well as the condominium documents, require annual maintenance and reporting. With respect to the impacts to the Highway or downstream properties, the discharge from the system would be limited by the size of the storm pipe, which would then limit any potential flooding to the subject property, which would then lead to an immediate response by the homeowners." The solution here appears to be exactly what the MTO is concerned about and relies on reactive measures by both the development's future residents. This approach relies on administrative controls that are known to be ineffective in engineering design. Josselyn engineering has not addressed or discussed controls such as elimination, substitution, or engineering controls that are more effective at mitigating potential risk and are industry standard.

I acknowledge and appreciate that some documentation is still at a conceptual level. However, there are fundamental environmental, social, and economic issues that remain unaddressed and processes that are being subverted in advance of the public meeting. Furthermore, as stated above, the public has not been provided adequate information about the proposed development and critical documents lack key information or specificity. The proponent and city planning staff are proposing deviations from municipal regulations, plans, and policy without justification and recommending the permanent destruction of a large portion of an already distressed ecosystem and filling in of a historically significant millrace.

1. What about the proposed development signals to this committee that the development merits such consideration?
2. What about this development is innovative and offsets or mitigates the stress that it will impose on the natural ecosystems that surround it or the public infrastructure?
3. What aspects of this development solve the affordable housing crisis, or other goals values set out by the city in its regulation, plans and policy?
4. How would approving this development align with the City's declaration of a Climate Emergency (and resultant emergency plans) or the City's (11-Yea and 0-Nay) support for signing the Montréal Pledge – Cities United in Action for Biodiversity?
5. Finally, what public financial risk would the planning committee be assuming on behalf of Kingston's citizens by approving this private residential complex?

Regards,  
Jason Harris




---

**From:** O'Connor,Christine <cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca>

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 3, 2024 2:38 PM

## PC 24 001 4085 Bath Road

Vicki Schmolka [REDACTED]

Wed 4/3/2024 6:18 AM

To: O'Connor,Christine <cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca>

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

Could you please include this email as correspondence to Planning Committee regarding this Thursday's meeting?

Thank you.

Dear Planning Committee:

Once again you are faced with a difficult decision coming to you with a positive staff report. I know this puts pressure on you to vote "yes" even with your lingering doubts. I encourage you to do your duty as councillors and judge for yourselves whether or not this development application merits your approval.

First, has City Council ever endorsed the development of private subdivisions as a policy? Or, are applications like 4085 Bath Road being approved on a one-off basis?

At first glance, private condominium subdivisions, as opposed to condo apartment towers, seem advantageous to the city. The city does not have to worry about sewer connections, road and park maintenance, street lighting etc. In "exchange" the developer is allowed to put in narrower streets, limited sidewalks, etc. The park is up to the condo owners and may never be fully implemented. The development, being on private property, is a gated community, maybe without the gate.

I live in River Park, a condo subdivision of 144 units. The road stormwater drains are in the centre of the road (instead of the sides) and showing early signs of deterioration. The required visitor parking was reduced to allow owners/renters to park their cars. We have to hire private security to stop people from parking on the street, service vehicles have nowhere to stop when doing work on a home. Garages are not big enough to house a car, recycling bins, or bicycles. Very few people park in their garages and many have turned their front lawn into a second, hard surface parking area affecting stormwater runoff and the look of the neighbourhood. The small distance between the town homes means that after a snow storm there is nowhere for people to shovel out their sidewalk. The pile of snow can reach shoulder height and the small area for snow storage can become too high requiring dump trucks to haul away the snow at a cost of \$5000 per time to the condo corporation.

Finding people to take on the task of sitting on the condo board is difficult. It is a lot of headaches without any reward.

Why does this matter?

It matters because tightly designed neighbourhood can result in conflicts and costs.

It matters because a condo failure can end up being the City's headache. For example, in the case of 4085 Bath Road, stormwater management is really important and will have an impact on Collins Bay water quality. I believe that the City is better positioned to take on this important maintenance responsibility than a condo board.

Could planning staff please tell City Councillors and the public the items which do not meet city requirements were this a subdivision whose roads and infrastructure (water, sewer, lighting, sidewalks, roads, etc.) were to be taken over by the City as normally happens? What role does building inspection have for a private condominium construction?

If you have doubts about how all this might end up costing all city taxpayers, ask someone with corporate memory about the Cana subdivision.

Does the City want to take over responsibility for condo subdivisions that do not meet standards applied in other developments?

Aside from this overall concern, I would like to add my voice to those who oppose the destruction of a Significant Woodland. This is against Official Plan policy and should not be permitted.

Saying "no" which you have a right, and a responsibility, to do would send a clear message that Kingston is serious about protecting its remaining tree canopy and its biodiversity and climate change commitments. It is critically important.

Finally, please reassure yourselves:

- that the stormwater management plans are sound
- that the garage space is adequate for vehicles and for garbage cans (this is adjacent to a wilderness area)
- that there is space for snow that is cleared from the streets, sidewalks, and paths to people's doors
- that there is adequate visitor parking
- that street trees will have space to grow
- that the closest bus stop is within 300 m of the housing (an Official Plan policy)
- that there is an appropriate park space for all ages of children
- that the private property area is fenced so that residents don't encroach into the natural area
- that there is a 50 m buffer from Collins Creek, which I understand is recommended by the Conservation Authority
- that there is a traffic light to allow people in and out of the subdivision safely (see Ascot Lane at the Waaban Crossing for an example)
- that this development meets City standards required in new subdivisions.

You do not have to vote "yes" to poor planning that is not in the public interest.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Vicki

Vicki Schmolka



## **To the Planning Committee – April 4<sup>th</sup> – Regarding PC -24-001**

International Bird Day is April 2<sup>nd</sup> and National Wildlife Week begins April 8<sup>th</sup>. They should inspire us to reflect on how we envision our city in the future.

On 19 March City Council agreed to become a signatory to the Montreal Biodiversity Pledge, promising to:

- 1 Reduce threats to biodiversity.
- 2 Share benefits of biodiversity.
- 3 Create solutions through cross-cultural governance, management and education.

For example, zoning bylaw and OP amendments must be directed towards Kingston protecting biodiversity in all its forms. We cannot continue to allow the destruction of the few areas of wildness left.

These areas provide homes for wildlife, especially in undisturbed sites already protected by zoning bylaws. Areas designated significant or contributory woodlands and provincially significant wetlands make our city a place that truly values and protects the benefits that wild areas provide. These include shade (heat-zone protection), water absorption and retention (flood protection), and carbon sequestration (climate-crisis mitigation).

Our city proclaimed a climate emergency in 2019. We must carefully plan how we develop Kingston's urban and rural regions so that biodiversity is maintained - and preferably enhanced - in our work towards mitigating climate change.

You will be discussing the fate of a 7-hectare mature woodland (over 500 trees) at the mouth of Collin's Creek. This forest is part of the Collin's Creek watershed - an intact nature corridor, and an important component of our natural heritage system (identified in the 2005 Natural Heritage Study), extending from Lake Ontario to north of the 401. The proposed development, if approved, would set a concerning precedent, as much of this ecologically significant natural corridor is owned by developers.

In our view the proposed development ignores the dangers that face all of us and, more fundamentally, future generations. It requires the destruction of a significant and contributory woodland and the reduction of a riparian border along Collin's Creek. The creek is an established area of biodiversity and heat-zone protection — both of which are integral components of climate mitigation.

Planning must be driven by the knowledge that development at all costs cannot continue in the manner in which it has been done in the past. It must be driven by climate concern and not by the profits of a developer. Staying the developer-first course will inevitably contribute to the climate emergency.

Just because a developer has purchased a property, already designated a biodiversity-rich area, is not a good reason to allow it to be degraded by rezoning it.

**No Clearcuts Kingston asks you to say no to the destruction of the significant and supporting contributory woodlands.**

We also urge you to ask the Planning Department to require developers to submit a 'Biodiversity Inventory' with their applications. This must be performed in late spring/early summer so that all life forms that use the site over the year are accounted for.

Some concerns for you to consider:

**1. How does this proposal address the fact that affordable housing is the most required type in Ontario?**

This proposal only adds to Kingston's condominium pool, already well supplied.

**2. Is active transportation readily and safely available to the potential residents?**

Cycling along Bath Rd west of Collin's Bay Road is confined to a narrow and dangerous paved shoulder. This will not be conducive to active transportation of the potentially hundreds of new residents.

**3. The Tree Inventory is not complete.**

Not a single conifer is listed. The following image, taken in spring 2022, and on the City's GIS maps, clearly shows many conifers including native White Pines and Red Cedars. Just like human populations, woodlands are made up of every age and health of trees. They all provide benefits to support many different species of other plants, animals and birds. Even the well-known chickadee and Downy woodpecker require nest holes, usually in dead trees, for their nests. Many ephemeral woodland plants, including the trillium, only survive in shaded woodlands.





**4. The requested zoning and OP amendments will remove a biodiversity-rich area.**

The woodland on this property is designated 'contributory' (light green) and 'significant' (dark green). The red line indicates the eastern limit of 'valley land' designation. The thick grey line shows the 'riparian corridor'.





The proposed housing acts like a knife thrust into the Collins Creek ecosystem, this knife should be reduced in length. Cutting 30 meters off the length will not reduce the number of dwelling units significantly.

**5. The City's GIS map, shown in (4), does not represent the actual geography of the site.**

The western edge of the property bordering Collin's Creek is a sheer cliff roughly 10 meters in height. There is essentially no riparian zone.

The next image, taken March 31<sup>st</sup>, shows the forest above the western edge bordering Collin's Creek.



**6. There is substantial empirical evidence from archeologists and local indigenous and settler people that this site was likely used by indigenous groups as a fishing ground and habitation.**

We ask that a thorough archeological analysis of the property be completed prior to any development on the site.

Thank you for considering our objections to this proposal.

No Clearcuts Kingston Inc.

## Clendening,Ian

---

**From:** David Snyder [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** April 3, 2024 5:02 PM  
**To:** Clendening,Ian  
**Subject:** LaSalle hotel

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

Thanks for not including the neighborhood in your plans to change the hotel into another bad decision by kingston city planning.

You people just aren't getting it. While it might give a room instead of a tent.. it's not good planning just because the hotel has changed ownership and it seems an easy solution.

Doesn't fit into the area at all

Bus service.. car wash.. expensive retail.. and it certainly doesn't fit with the cataraqui north subdivision as mentioned.

I'm sure it will pass council as it makes them look like they've solved their problems. Think it through please

The Extencicare problems just moved to another area..

## La Salle hotel

David Snyder [REDACTED]

Wed 4/3/2024 4:05 PM

To: O'Connor,Christine <cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca>

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

Our councilor has shared your email regarding the changes planned for the la Salle hotel on princess street. Finding out one day ahead of the planned meeting from a neighbors email isn't very impressive on the city's part.

Another example of city's planning department.. pushing decisions along rather quickly.

Sounds rather similar to the extendicare property.

Hopefully this is something that will be thought through very carefully..

I'm sure you will listen to all opinions expressed..

Thanks for your time

## Clendening, Ian

---

**From:** Kelly Gill [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** April 4, 2024 1:50 PM  
**To:** Clendening, Ian  
**Subject:** 2360 Princess St

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

Hello Mr Clendening,

My husband and I would like to be present at the meeting today.

We are concerned about increased traffic as well as the re-zoning that might affect future planning.

Also we would like to know what is meant by 'relief from bike facilities'.

Are there any plans for any fencing and tree planting to enhance the area along Ellesmeer and Augusta?

Will all of the existing trees will be left on the property?

Is this development considered a low rental?

Are there any plans to change the driveway location to the hotel/motel ?

Thank you,

Kelly & Tony Gill

Sent from my iPad

## Concern regarding tree loss

Robert Gibson [REDACTED]

Thu 4/4/2024 8:32 AM

To:O'Connor,Christine <cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca>

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

Dear Christine O'Connor,

Please include this correspondence in official records regarding PC -24 -001.

I am concerned about proposals from report PC -24 -001. First, I believe the increased density in the proposal is a good sign while I would like it to go further it is an improvement from the original proposal. Secondly, I am concerned about the loss of forest spaces in an article I wrote in Arthur newspaper called a "Case for Parks in a Pandemic" I quoted Phil Beard, General Manager of the Maitland Valley Conservation Authority, who said "...it doesn't matter where you are, safeguarding nature is one of the most important things we can do to reduce the future infectious disease outbreaks from wildlife." As part of this proposal is to remove a significant amount of trees I believe that this is a concern over broad landscapes. The city of Kingston signed onto the Montreal Biodiversity Pledge by not protecting forests and wetlands this proposal goes against the idea of the pledge. The city of Kingston is also meeting its housing targets and has other areas to build that don't result in clear cuts if fourplexes and infilling are both allowed and encouraged. I also do not support the privatization of open spaces because they are linked to improvements in mental health as well as physical activity. In another article I wrote called municipal parks and COVID-19 I quoted the World Health Organization which says that 1.5 ha of park space for 1000 people is ideal. The elimination of forest cover also heats up the surrounding environment which can cause health issues in heat waves. In addition, there is an increased risk of flooding as a result of a loss of trees or inadequate buffer sizes.

I hope that this committee will reconsider this proposal in light of signing the Montreal Pledge and potential health implications from a loss of biodiversity.

Thankyou for your time

Sincerely,

Robert Gibson

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Fwd: April 4 Planning Committee Meeting comments for meeting Revised Comments**

Cathy G [REDACTED]

Thu 4/4/2024 12:06 PM

To: O'Connor,Christine &lt;cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca&gt;

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Cathy G** <[cathygrant001@gmail.com](mailto:cathygrant001@gmail.com)>**\*\*Revised\*\***

To the Members of the Kingston Planning Committee,

I am writing to implore the Planning Committee to consider the proposed development at 4085 Bath Rd. If this development is allowed to proceed as is it will decimate over 500 mature trees and the eco system(s) within the City's west end. Surely there a way for the builder to review the proposed plan to minimize the loss of so many trees.

The builder's diagram shows a lovely representation of the housing development which will actually take several decades to achieve if all vegetation is bulldozed to make way for these residences. Climate change is showing us everyday that every piece of nature is precious. When will we begin to listen?

I do not live in this neighbourhood so I have no vested financial interest in any positive or negative outcomes of this project. I do however live in Kingston and I am devastated on what will result in the loss of another forest in the City and the possible impact of the loss of trees, the woodland creatures and any unforeseen impact to Collins Creek.

Please do not make your decision lightly and remember that you are the voice of those who have no voice and therefore cannot be heard.

Sincerely

Cathy Grant

## Clendening, Ian

---

**From:** Mike Gallant [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** April 4, 2024 8:04 AM  
**To:** Clendening, Ian  
**Subject:** Re: RE: Questions - D35-001-2024 - 2360 Princess Street  
**Attachments:** IMG\_7781.jpg; IMG\_7782.jpg; IMG\_7784.jpg

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

Good morning Ian. I am not sure of the process or limitations on the new property owners. I don't believe the city wants to have a property at 2360 Princess that looks like the attached.

I obviously don't know what it will be or look like when completed. As they stated --

- a. **There are no immediate plans to redo the exterior of the buildings, as this would have significant financial impacts to the affordability of the units and viability of the development.**

Thank You

On Wed, Apr 3, 2024 at 2:45 PM Clendening, Ian <[iclendening@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:iclendening@cityofkingston.ca)> wrote:

Hi Mike,

I have provided the responses below which I received from the applicant,

1. The existing buildings are older --- are there plans to improve the exterior of these buildings?
  - a. **There are no immediate plans to redo the exterior of the buildings, as this would have significant financial impacts to the affordability of the units and viability of the development.**
1. For residents facing the back of the property off Ellesmeer Ave. is there plans for clean up/landscaping and fencing and proper year round maintenance?
  - a. **No changes to the existing landscaping are proposed, however the ownership group has on-site maintenance teams that will ensure the property remains clean and well-maintained year-round.**

I hope these answer your questions. If you would like to provide written comment I welcome you to do so, of course you are also welcome to attend the meeting either in person or virtually. If you intend to speak to the application while attending virtually, you will need to request to participate at which can be done [through this link](#). As part of a transparent public planning process comments form a part of the public record.

Kindly,

From: Clendening, Ian  
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 3:22 PM  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Questions - D35-001-2024 - 2360 Princess Street

Hi Mike,

As the Planner assigned to this file, I was forwarded your e-mail to the Clerks Department.

It is great to know that you have registered to attend the Public Meeting for this application. I have reached out to the applicant to better answer the type of detail you are looking for in regards to what types of changes to the building façade and grounds they anticipate in the event of approval.

In the mean time, I want to welcome you to reply to this e-  
this proposal or wish to provide written comments for consideration.

From: Mike Gallant [REDACTED] >  
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 9:51 AM  
To: O'Connor, Christine <[cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca)>  
Subject: Questions

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

Good morning Christine. I have a couple of questions for Planning Committee - April 4th, 2024 for the property at 2360 Princess Street.

- 1) the existing buildings are older --- are there plans to improve the exterior of these buildings?
- 2) For residents facing the back of the property off Ellesmeer Ave. is there plans for clean up/landscaping and fencing and proper year round maintenance?

3

I am registered to join the meeting virtually.

Thank You

Mike Gallant









