



City of Kingston
Planning Committee
Addendum

2025-19
Wednesday, October 1, 2025
6:00 p.m.
Council Chamber

Committee Composition

Councillor Cinanni; Chair
Councillor Chaves
Councillor Glenn
Councillor Oosterhof
Councillor Osanic
Councillor Stephen

Please provide regrets to Christine O'Connor, Committee Clerk at 613-546-4291, extension 1219 or cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca
Watch live on the [City of Kingston website](#) or register to receive the [Zoom](#) link.

Pages

13. Correspondence

- *3. Correspondence received September 28 - October 1, 2025 regarding
1054 Highway 2

3

Planning Committee Updates

Approved Site Plan Items

- D11-023-2024 – 800 Princess Street
- D11-020-2019 – 212 Colborne Street
- D-11-030-2024 – 800 Princess Street
- D11-015-2025 – 355 Waterloo Drive
- D11-023-2024 – 800 Princess Street
- D11-005-2025 – 19 Crerar Boulevard
- D11-008-2024 – 705 Arlington Park Place
- D11-031-2023 – 565 Princess Street
- D11-007-2024 – 1645 Sydenham Road
- D11-029-2024 – 209 Dalton Avenue

Applications Appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal

1. 2 River Street – OLT-22-004597 – OPA/ZBA – 5-week Hearing commenced on February 5, 2024. Hearing concluded. Written decision issued on July 25, 2025.
2. 1637 Boardwalk Drive - Minor Variance D13-020-2025 - Application submitted to the OLT on August 22, 2025. Merrit hearing being scheduled.
3. 92 Napier Street - OPA/ZBA/DPS D35-006-2024 - Appeal received Friday, September 5.

Links to Land Use Planning Documents

Planning Act: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13>

Provincial Policy Statement: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/provincial-policy-statement-2020>

City of Kingston Official Plan: <http://www.cityofkingston.ca/business/planning-and-development/official-plan>

City of Kingston Zoning By-Laws: <https://www.cityofkingston.ca/business/planning-and-development/zoning>

D09-007-2024
1054 Hwy 2 (Mixed-Use Residential Development)
Braebury Properties

Braebury Properties proposes to remove another approximately 62 ha from the rural area north of Hwy 2 comprising a large treed area, “limited” agricultural uses, unnamed natural water courses and wetlands in order to extend the Urban Boundary extension and build another 2215 residential units in Kingston East comprising 442 singles, 172 townhomes, 1601 apts (in 18 multi-storey buildings) plus some commercial space at 1054 Hwy 2, This application should be **denied** because:

1. the infrastructure, services and resources deficiencies in Kingston East are incapable of meeting the added demands,
2. Hwy 2 cannot support the added commuting demands from these 2215 new residences without significant improvements, and,
3. the natural heritage features (tree canopy, watercourses, Highly Vulnerable Aquifer and Significant Groundwater Recharge Area, coastal wetlands) are more important than more intensive housing to meet big city aspirations.

Kingston East lacks the resources, services, and infrastructure to support the new additional residents anticipated to fill the proposed 2215 units:

1. Family Drs (2 x clinics, **not enrolling new patients**)
2. Fire Hall (1 x volunteer fire hall with 3 trucks)
3. EMS (1 x station with two ambulances, County resource)
4. Police (1 x car unit)
5. Group Child Care [2 x public centers (GWP), 2 x school-based centers (GWP), 1 x private (KMFRC)]
6. Schools [0 x French public elementary, 0 x French Catholic elementary, 0 x English Catholic high, 0 x French high, 0 x French Immersion high, 1x English public elementary (**oversubscribed**), 1 x English catholic elementary (**oversubscribed**), 1 x English public intermediate/ high]
7. Transit [2 x GWP/Hwy 15 601/601 express services to downtown (with 601B/602A via CFB north side), 1 x GWP regular service to Coach Depot, 1 x regular service for CFB to Kingston Center]
8. Commuter Arterial Roads (1 x two lane E/W Hwy 2, 1 x two lane N/S Hwy 15)
9. Access Rtes to rest of Kingston (1 x two lane LaSalle Causeway, 1 x two lane Wabaan Crossing, 1 x four lane Hwy 401)
10. Cellular Service/Tower (0 x cellular tower, only 1 x bar cellular service)

11. Grocery (2 x small footprint stores ie, Food Basics, Independent)
12. Urgent Care (0 x clinic)
13. Library (1 x PT)
14. Community Center (1 x small facility)
15. Waste treatment facility (Review deferred until possibly maybe **2036**)

Planning Justification Report

The Project Justification Report completed by Fotenn Planning & Development states that the “New development will proceed only if the City of Kingston is satisfied that adequate services, roads, and utilities are available to can be made available to serve the proposal adequately. (PJR, Sect 4.1 Pg 33) Servicing adequacy of utility systems, or the transportation system, the City will consider not only the proposal, but also the potential for development that exists in the same service area.” (SWM) (PJR, Sect 4.1.1, pg 34)

This report conveniently ignores all the deficiencies that exist in Kingston East due to long term planning neglect to ensure this suburban territory can support all the new demands placed on it by the continuing influx of new residents. The new development will provide for a small commercial space to provide for selective basic needs of local inhabitants within easy walking distance, but all essential services and resources are far beyond its boundaries requiring a personal vehicle to navigate.

The proposed addition of a transit hub inside the access point to the development is a plus, however, it can only be beneficial to all if its route deeply penetrates the site with shelters along a loop at convenient locations to ensure accessibility for all on the main internal roadway. A park & ride at the main access will help encourage other commuters to consider the option assuming the transit route is reliable, timely, and reaches the destinations needed most to access employment, services, and resources. This is only possible if the developer makes space available and if the City of Kingston considers the proposal to be supportable, financially worthwhile, and is in place before car dependence is ingrained.

The report states that “It is anticipated that there is sufficient capacity to service the proposed development” (PJR, Sect 7.0, pg 20) however it ignores that the expansion and improvements recommended in the 2017 report on the Ravensview Waste Treatment plant have been deferred until perhaps maybe **2036** which is a year after the 2035 expected development completion and full habitation. There is no indication if the water supply service along Hwy 2 will be large enough to accommodate the 2215 new residential units in addition to the proposed 1533 new residential units also on the docket for approval for 790 Hwy 2 (west of 1054 Hwy 2). (D09-005-2024). When will the tipping point be reached and

the current plant is overwhelmed and incapable of processing all its new intake given the dramatic residential expansion up to now and should all 5 urban boundary extensions and residential property development applications be approved? (D09-007-2024, D09-003-2024, D09-004-2024, D09-005-2024, D09-009-2024, plus the Industrial Park expansion at 1423 Hwy 15) When will improvements to all water main and sanitary/sewage processing in Kingston East be a priority?

Local Expansion Criteria – Report PC-24-051 (JPR,pg16, sect 5.3)

The development proposal cites the following 7 critical public interests endorsed by Council to be met but there is no assurance this development project will meet them:

- a. Place making and Community Connections – there is park space and the same dull boring parkettes for young families, trails for human & dog walkers, but there is nothing for teenagers nor the retirees to induce community connections and activities year-round. Transit must be in place to ensure access to employment opportunities and services for teenagers and seniors without driving licenses.
- b. Social Equity & Accessibility – Accessibility is insular within the confines of the site, but all meaningful employment, services, and resources are far beyond the property boundaries. The transit system expansion is essential otherwise the walk to nearest transit stop at CFB is too far.
- c. Housing for All – the definition of affordable housing is diametrically polar between developers and families, singles, couples, retired couples, retired singles, low- and middle-income brackets and no guarantee this will be met by this developer.
- d. Complete Communities & Economic Prosperity – there is only one specialized employer in proximity (CFB) with a known salary chart for employees. There is no other employment within a reasonable active transportation distance to produce the incomes needed to pay for the residential units proposed by this developer. A small commercial space providing select basic amenities is inadequate.
- e. Climate Change Mitigation – How will the developer transition the residents away from fossil fuel energies (heating)? There is no guarantee the SWM will replace the natural watercourses draining snow melt and heavy rain flows from the property to the St Lawrence River. (Ainley, Enviro Impact Stmt, Sect 6.4, pg 12/13) This property supports a highly vulnerable aquifer and the water collection, absorption, filtration field needed for any neighbouring rural residential properties dependant needing a sustainable underground water table supply for drinking water wells.
- f. Protection and Enhancement of Natural Heritage systems – The developer is capitalizing on the compromised local environment and negates any value of at-risk species, natural water courses, woodlands, wetlands, riparian corridors, and,

agricultural activities that support the local area. All losses are considered negligible, easily mitigated, and replaceable with manmade alternatives under the minimums condoned by regulatory authorities whose purpose is protection.

- g. Transportation for All Ages and Abilities – A penetrating transit service within the development is essential as there is no safe accessible route to travel along Hwy 2 to the nearest transit stop on CFB. Car usage could be ingrained as the primary mode of transport to access the rest of Kingston long before reasonable alternatives are realistically possible for this area based on a 2035 completion date.

Directly impacting 1054 and 790 Hwy 2 developments are the following deficiencies:

1. Hwy 2 is the two-lane primary E/W daily commuter arterial road
2. There are no traffic signals along Hwy 2 for merging vehicles and speed control east of CFB on Hwy 2 unless proposed signals are installed
3. No sidewalks for pedestrians along N/S sides of Hwy 2 east of CFB
4. No crosswalks or crossing signals for pedestrians, cyclists, etc at unsignalized intersections along Hwy 2 east of CFB, unless added as part of 1054 proposal
5. No municipal sewer/sanitary along Hwy 2 north or south sides east of CFB
6. No streetlights along Hwy 2 east of CFB (makes it great for star watching at night)
7. No transit services along Hwy 2 east of CFB unless service extension approved and implemented for 1054 Hwy 2 development.

Regardless of the computer simulations produced for the proposal, 4000 additional potential vehicles on Hwy 2 from the proposed development sites at 1054 and 790 Hwy 2 will burden the 2-lane commuter artery without costly expansion and upgrading which are not desirable according to PJR, Sect 6, pg 38.

According to Sect 6 of the PJR “Environment & Energy”: No development and site alteration will not be permitted unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on natural heritage features or areas or ecological functions (PJR, Sect 6.1.3, pg 35) and include:

- a. Significant woodlands
- b. Unevaluated wetlands and coastal wetlands, and,
- c. Riparian corridors.

In the Appendix to the PJR, according to the CRCA: “There appear to be some unevaluated wetlands and at least two unnamed watercourses through the property. There are significant woodlands in the lot’s interior which likely support the hydrologic functions of the wetlands. The area is identified as a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer and Significant Groundwater Recharge Area.” Existing trees will be retained where possible and new

landscaping and planting of native species of vegetation will be introduced across the site (PJR Sect 7.2, pg 21) replacing abundant resident mixed wet and dry vegetation across the property. Regardless of the natural heritage features identified on this property nothing meets the “significant” category and therefore irrelevant so that the site can be developed to meet the intensification requirements of the Official Plan, and, with the support of flexible CRC requirements mitigations of all sorts can be utilized to maximize allowable development space at the detriment to nature, woodlands, riparian corridors, wetlands and wildlife including the setback requirements for both wetlands and watercourses that can be reduced to 15m. (Ainley Enviro Impact Stmt, Sect 5.9, pg 7) All life is expendable and replaceable. Two SAR Butternut trees have been identified within the tree canopy that would require all works in the immediate area to cease and harassment to SAR should not occur during any potential future construction activities (Ainley, Enviro Impact Stmt, pg 38) but the CRC allows compensation plantings should retainable Butternut be harmed or removed provided a series of steps are undertaken. (Ainley, Enviro Impact Stmt, pg 21) Why can't healthy Butternut trees be transplanted to a nurturing offsite location and then returned or offered to a neighbouring rural residential property that has space?

The above proves that whatever protections are in place by one authority or policy for rural areas with natural heritage features are easily over-ruled in favour of development and human expansion so that woodlands, wetlands, riparian corridors, wildlife, aquifers, agricultural lands, and water courses are eliminated (Ainley, Enviro Impact Stmt, Sect 6.6.3, pg 26), (Ainley, Enviro Impact Stmt, Sect 8.1.5 pg 38), (Ainley, Enviro Impact Stmt, pg 25), (Ainley, Enviro Impact Stmt, Sect 10.0, pg 43) then replaced with pavement, houses, a few select trees, and lawns after the developer razes and excavates to the bedrock and subsoil. One more rural space destroyed for human habitation based on the Watson Report.

The Watson Report has provided developers the power to demand and expect every development application to be approved without any indication of the source and demographics of the anticipated new residents. What is the source of these people? How will their needs be met? What will their demands be on what type of infrastructure, services, and resources?

The raging testosterone fuelled development bull rampaging through Kingston must be tamed, controlled, and supervised. Development applications can no longer be rubberstamped due to flowery trigger words to meet an ambitious objective and development applications **cannot** be evaluated in isolation. Applications must be considered as part of the collective totality of all the submissions pending consideration, plus, those that have already been approved. Residential expansion in Kingston East has

been continuously approved without the essential infrastructure investment needed to support the ongoing population expansion. If you lived here, you would know that Kingston East is underserved in all critical areas of human and family needs (except fast food outlets and pharmacies).

D09-007-2024 should **not** be entertained for consideration as part of the urban boundary expansion because further approvals in Kingston East would establish an undesirable precedent favouring unsupportable intensified residential development without costly investment in infrastructure and services upgrades (PJR, pg 38) to support this and the other 4 new residential developments.

We deserve to have unadulterated natural green space untouched by development for our mental and climate health.

Karen O'Hanley

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Councilor Boehme and Senior Planner Gilchrist,

I am responding to your request for comments and concerns with regard to potential urban boundary expansion and these two proposed developments.

Firstly it is not a logical expansion of the urban boundary:

These lands are in no way contiguous to existing urban development and never will be as long as the Military base separates it from Kingston and it is surrounded by established rural low density housing developments. The proposed developments, on properties smaller than most parks in Kingston would have a population as large as a small town, but with no schools, community centre, churches, police station, daycare and viable food and drugstores; and are at least 5 km from any semblance of these necessary urban facilities. For this community to be anything but an urban island wasteland; will require inordinate resources from the city to support it, at the expense of the rest of the city. Its hard to see how any amount of urban planning will cope with the 3,000 vehicles, provide a safe place for the likely thousands of children, and provide for the pollution, noise, and comfort of 10,000 people packed into this tiny space.

These lands are not suitable to be brought into the urban area. They are down range from the Base range and down wind from the sewage smells of The Ravensview Treatment Plant. There is effectively only one access road west through the base, The sites are surrounded by inaccessible forest/agricultural area, and the only public areas in proximity to the developments are the busy highway, and the streets and parkettes of the surrounding rural subdivisions.

My specific concerns with this development are with the Sewage and Wet Pond storm water run off plans. Firstly it would seem that any proposed plan to service these development by individually connecting to Ravensview would be costly to tax payers and more importantly divert money and attention from the critical twinning of the single forced main linking the rest of Kingston to Ravensview. Secondly, Wet Ponding of the significant run off of this densely developed land hot spot, in its self has significant challenges to be effective. In addition there are literally hundreds of wells (see <https://www.ontario.ca/page/map-well-records>) in close proximity to these ponds. As well, all this toxic run off will make its way downhill to the nearby shoreline where people obtain drinking water and swim. Unless the proposed Hydrological studies can prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the toxic runoff from these densely packed/paved sites will not contaminate the ground water or negatively affect the shore line; this urbanization should not even be considered in this area.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and concerns.

Please notify me of any information, meetings and decisions related to the OPA and these developments.

Thank You
Claude Sherren

Resident/owner



Hi again Christine, I am advised by Jon Lenton that you need the questions in advance so here goes.

1. When will we be provided with a cost breakdown on the UBE that describes in detail the money spent so far by the city (studies, staff, consultants etc), the projected costs for infrastructure upgrades to support the projects on Hwy 2 east and the ongoing support costs for those projects once completed.
2. Who will bear the costs for question 1 above and if it is the taxpayer, how will they be realized and will all city of Kingston residents be billed equally or will east end residents or us in the county pay more?
3. Have any plans been submitted by the developers for subdivisions based on rural zoning and if so, how many units could be created on both of the Hwy 2 east properties.
4. What are the estimated infrastructure costs and ongoing support costs by the taxpayer if these properties were developed along rural zoning guidelines?
5. If the urban zoning change is approved, when would the construction of these properties begin and what is the estimated time to completion for each project?

Regards, John Frandsen.

Purposed Development Project on Hwy 2

From Pierre Compeau [REDACTED]
Date Wed 10/1/2025 2:43 PM
To Gilchrist,Tess <tgilchrist@cityofkingston.ca>

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

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

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my deepest concerns about the proposed development project planned for Hwy 2 in our neighborhood, Ravensview area.

While I understand the need for growth and development, I believe this project raises several serious issues that could negatively impact our community:

1. Traffic and Congestion

The proposed development will significantly increase traffic on already busy roads such as Hwy 2 and many of the neighbouring roads will not be able to get out. Our current infrastructure is not equipped to handle the additional volume, which could lead to safety hazards, longer commute times, and increased air pollution. This also would require significant traffic lighting as well or many accidents will occur! The proposal states Hwy 2 will be expanded to 4 lanes please explain how as the land isn't suitable for it.

2. Strain on Public Services

Our local schools, healthcare facilities, and emergency services are already operating near capacity. A new influx of residents or commercial activity could place additional pressure on these essential services without proper planning and funding. No bus systems are in this area either. Furthermore, this area has very few Kingston Police officers patrolling and the fire department is only a volunteer station pretty much.

3. Environmental Impact

Has an environmental assessment happened? What about the wildlife, trees ecosystem and so on. How will this affect our ecosystem in this area? The development may result in the loss of green space, mature trees, and wildlife habitats. We urge the planning committee to conduct a thorough environmental assessment and consider more sustainable alternatives that protect our natural surroundings. Furthermore the City hasn't even developed a sawyer system in this area for all local residents even neighbouring ones next to the water treatment plant. Priorities are not set properly.

4. Community Character and Aesthetics

This area is valued for its character and sense of community. Large-scale developments or high-density housing could alter the visual landscape and erode the charm and cohesion that residents cherish. Bringing in a lower income bracket into this area will cause a significant impact to this community is the city ready to address this issue?

5. Lack of Community Consultation

Many residents feel that the planning process has not been transparent or inclusive. We respectfully request greater community engagement and the opportunity to provide feedback before final decisions are made.

6. Commercial infrastructure

This area of the city zero commercial infrastructure for all this individuals to go to and shopping, this development is larger than the city of Gananoque yet Gananoque has infrastructure the city has not done anything in this area.

7. Taxes

How will this development affect the taxes in this area? As if these are apartments and lower income, it should lower the taxes to all houses affected, similar to what Toronto does.

In conclusion, I urge you to reconsider the scale and nature of this development and to work closely with local residents to find a solution that supports responsible growth without compromising the well-being of our neighborhood. As of right now, this plan does not seem sound or well thought out for the city of Kingston.

Sincerely,
Pierre and Jennifer Compeau
39 Faircrest Blvd



October 1, 2025.

Dear Planning Committee and the City of Kingston,

I am writing to express our concern regarding the proposed development at 790 Highway 2 East. My wife and I have two young children and we are unable to attend the planning committee meeting tonight unfortunately, but we hope our concerns can still be considered. Our main concerns for the proposed development are as follows:

1. The proposed development is not compatible with the semi-rural character of our area

- The proposed development is for medium to high density housing, whereas our area is semi-rural in character. High density housing would significantly disrupt the balance of the community.

2. Traffic and infrastructure issues

- Highway 2 East is already congested at peak times, especially when there are issues with the LaSalle Causeway or Waaban Crossing. Adding many more households to our area would worsen traffic and lead to increased travel times.
- This development would require new infrastructure at considerable cost to the City of Kingston and taxpayers

3. Impacts on natural environment

- Clearing land for dense housing could affect the natural environment and wildlife, and degrade biodiversity.

4. Elementary and high school capacity

- Adding hundreds of residents, including many school-aged children, would strain the east end's schools which may not have the capacity to absorb them.

5. Existing urban boundary

- Kingston does need more housing, however we feel growth should be occur within existing urban boundaries rather than expanding into our semi-rural area which risks sprawl.

Our Suggestions

- Reject or downzone the proposed plan to low density in line with the surrounding community.
- Prioritize medium to high density development inside the existing urban boundary.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns. We appreciate your service to our city and hope that future development respects the needs of residents and the character of our area.

Sincerely,

Jon & Alicia Campbell

[Redacted Signature]

Hello O'Connor,Christine,

I want my email submitted to the committee.

"The neighbourhood on Highway 2 East Kingston, After the army barracks, needs a sewer line that can be connected and used by people and businesses in that area. This area of kingston will flourish with houses and businesses if they have a sewer line, it will be a big revenue stream for the city and tourists coming to kingston for fort henry guards show."

Thank You

Best Regards

Ian Ross