



City of Kingston
Planning Committee
Addendum

2025-06
Thursday, March 20, 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

8. Business

1. Recommendation Report: 5 Lower Union Street

***1. Withdrawal of Business Item 1.**

The Consent of the Committee is requested for the withdrawal of Business Item 1. Recommendation Report – 5 Lower Union Street. Staff are requesting the withdrawal as updates are required to the Brownfields Community Improvement Plan amendment presented in the Report. Staff anticipate that an update report will be brought to Committee no later than August 31 of 2025.

12. Correspondence

- | | |
|--|----------|
| *1. Correspondence received, dated March 17, 2025, regarding 5 Lower Union Street | 2 |
| *2. Correspondence received, dated March 20, 2025, regarding 5 Lower Union Street | 7 |

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Robidoux, Meghan](mailto:Robidoux.Meghan)
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Meeting - 5 Lower Union St
Date: March 17, 2025 11:29:05 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

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

Dear Ms Robidoux,

As you know I cannot attend the meeting on Thursday because we are out of the country. Kindly confirm that my previous message to you constitutes opposition to the project that will enable me to appeal an adverse decision.

I cannot understand why the council would be so shortsighted as to approve the construction of yet another tower (are not the 5 towers on Block D enough??) that would further disfigure our beautiful waterfront — to say nothing of the negative environmental consequences— and deprive our citizens (and tourists) of a green space and a wonderful view of the lake. More concrete and cement?? What are you thinking?

Sincerely

Susan Murphy and David Haglund

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 4, 2025, at 19:12, Susan Murphy [REDACTED] wrote:

I understand that this spit of land is now privately owned. It would not be a victory in any sense other than Pyrrhic to allow a tower to be built on this waterfront land. Access?? Like around the Delta hotel? That is laughable. Please consider the rights to enjoyment of the waterfront— as well as environmental concerns!—of the public as a whole (citizens as well as tourists) before selling out to moneyed people. It is nothing less than scandalous to consider allowing another cement block to obstruct the public enjoyment of this beautiful green space.

Susan Murphy and David Haglund

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 4, 2025, at 17:46, Robidoux, Meghan <mrobidoux@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

Good morning Susan,

Thank you for your engagement on this file. I will ensure your comments below are included on the public record and in the addendum package for Planning Committee's consideration. If you are interested in joining the meeting virtually, please contact the Committee Clerk, Christine O'Connor, at cloconnor@cityofkingston.ca to request a Zoom link.

As a point of clarification, the subject lands are currently in private ownership, as opposed to City ownership, and are not accessible to the public. Advancement of this proposal would facilitate the establishment

of a public access easement over a perimeter waterfront trail and lookout to provide the opportunity for all members of the public to enjoy this waterfront site, as envisioned by the City's Waterfront Master Plan.

Please feel free to reach out to myself should you have any further questions at all.

Meghan



**Meghan Robidoux, MPI,
MCIP, RPP (she/her/hers)**

Senior Planner
Planning Services
Growth and Development
Services

City of Kingston

Located at: 1211 John Counter
Boulevard

216 Ontario Street Kingston,
ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 ext. 1256

mrobidoux@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.

Absence Alert: Please note I will be away on maternity leave beginning April 7th.

From: Susan Murphy [REDACTED]
Sent: February 28, 2025 2:17 PM
To: Robidoux, Meghan <mrobidoux@cityofkingston.ca>
Cc: Conny Glenn <connyaprilglenn@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Meeting - 5 Lower Union St

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

Dear Meghan,

My husband and I, who live at 26 Wellington St, are out of the country and will not be back in Kingston until April 22, too late to attend this meeting.

We are both strongly opposed to the construction of this large structure on this small point of waterfront land adjacent to our historic Kingston

neighborhood. The land should be kept as a public, green space for the use and enjoyment of the citizens of Kingston and visitors to our city. There are already too many concrete towers that block the waterfront, pave over the grass (and damage the environment) as well as blocking the sun. They benefit only those wealthy enough to live in them — as well as the owners of the buildings who have profited from their construction and sale. Please do not approve any more of these monstrosities!

I would appreciate your presenting our views at this meeting.

Yours truly

Susan M Murphy and David G Haglund

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 28, 2025, at 15:56, Robidoux, Meghan

<mrobidoux@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

Hello,

Please find attached the Notice of Public Meeting for applications for Official Plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment, and Community Improvement Plan amendment for the lands addressed as 5 Lower Union Street (D35-003-2021 and D09-003-2021).

The Planning Committee will receive a recommendation report with respect to the application at the Public Meeting, which will be available to the public on the City of Kingston website at www.cityofkingston.ca/PlanningCommittee on March 14, 2025.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Meghan

<[image001.png](#)>

<[image002.png](#)> <[image003.png](#)> <[image004.png](#)>

**Meghan Robidoux, MPI,
MCIP, RPP
(she/her/hers)**

Senior Planner
Planning Services
Growth and Development
Services

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

613-546-4291 ext. 1256
mrobidoux@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.

<Notice of a Public Meeting - 5 Lower Union St - March 20, 2025.pdf>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Robidoux, Meghan](#)
Cc: [REDACTED], [O'Connor, Christine](#)
Subject: Homestead Land Holdings Ltd., D35-003-2021
Date: March 17, 2025 10:08:56 PM

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

Hello,

I strongly oppose the proposed relaxation of the City of Kingston Official Plan and Kingston Zoning By-laws to permit construction of a high rise at 5 Lower Union Street. While unable to attend the meeting, I would like my protest recorded.

My opposition stems from the following concerns:

- **Incompatibility with Existing Area:** The proposed development's height (19 storeys) is incompatible with the surrounding built environment (11 storeys).
- **Potential Loss of Navy Memorial Park:** The project may require the removal or destruction of Navy Memorial Park, a green space that recognizes the role that women veterans have played in our military history.
- **Negative impact on the Shipyards residents:** The development would significantly disrupt the daily lives, and enjoyment of residents in the existing Shipyards building.
- **Fire & Safety Concerns:** a similar proposal offered by Jay Patry received significant opposition, notably from fire and rescue services regarding accessibility in case of a fire. It is unclear what changes have been implemented to address these critical safety concerns and ensure the safety of Kingston residents in the proposed development.

I recognize the need for housing and ongoing municipal growth, but cannot support this development for the reasons stated above. I would urge the city to collaborate with Homestead Land Holdings Ltd ("Homestead") in order to reconsider a development of a more reasonable height.

In closing, I suspect that Homestead has put forth an unpopular proposal ("19 storeys") to anchor and guide public expectations, so when they reveal a more "reasonable" fall-back plan ("15 storeys") it will be accepted and approved, despite itself also suffering from many of the criticisms I have listed above.

Best,
Lorne Beswick

March 19, 2025

Planning Committee Members
City of Kingston
216 Ontario St.
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

Dear Councillors:

As a resident of 5 Gore St. and a constituent in District 11 King's Town, I have been engaged in the public discussions on the development of 5 Lower Union ever since it was sold to private developers and have closely followed the various iterations of the project since 2017.

Clearly, every decision on development involves balancing often conflicting imperatives. On one hand, the City needs to meet the demand for new housing. At the same time, city councillors are elected ensure that Kingston residents can enjoy neighborhoods that are livable, sustainable and respect the unique heritage of this area.

Along with many residents in the affected neighborhood, I continue to have concerns about the current state of the Homestead project along with the Report to the Planning Committee which endorses it without recommendations for any significant changes. For the sake of brevity, let me point to what I see as at least two major issues that remain unresolved --- and I look forward to a more robust discussion of such issues when the Report is discussed by the Committee.

1. Building Scale, Form and Spatial/Visual Impact

First, councilors should carefully consider whether the scale and design of this building truly is an optimal fit for the residential neighborhood. While 5 Lower Union may be close to the downtown, the projected building is not on an urban street-front --- as such, the project is not analogous other recently-approved high-rises such as the Capitol Theatre and the Homestead Queen's Street buildings. The proposed building on 5 Lower Union is a building set in a waterfront park and is part of the historic district of Sydenham ward – and it is this unique location that should inform both its size and design.

It is salient to note that Homestead's first iteration of the residential building (that was discussed in a Planning Committee meeting in 2021) was designed at the height of 14-storey with a projected 68 units for occupancy. At the time, the design was in line with the recommendations made to city planners in a 2018 report by Dillon Consulting that the appropriate height for any such building on 5 Lower Union be no more 14-storey. So, we fast forward to the current proposal – and find the building to be significantly larger (19 storey and 118 units) than the size that was deemed appropriate for neighborhood just three years prior. There have been no significant changes in the surrounding buildings in the neighborhood in the interim --- so why is the 19-storey design now considered to be the appropriate size in relation to the buildings and homes around it? Certainly, this raises the questions of whether the city is going to maintain any real standards on the size of buildings in residential neighborhoods or whether the “goalposts” will be constantly shifted to accommodate whatever interests are at play.

The size and scale of the building have important implications for its visual and spatial impact. Councillors should closely read the very thorough architectural critique laid out by Paul Mitchell (contained in your Agenda package) which describes the relationship between the size of the building and the design features. As he argues, the design of the building falls short of current standards of “best practices” in numerous ways. The large base and mass of the proposed building is obstructive of pedestrian views to the sky and the water. The design of 5 Lower Union is also in stark contrast with the size and visual impact of buildings in Block D which are located at a reasonable setback from the waterfront. Moreover, the standard practice should be to lower building heights toward the perimeter of higher density areas such as Block D; the current proposal does exactly opposite.

2. Mixed-Use Zoning/Deep-water Dock

Councillors should carefully consider the zoning issues involved in allowing for the proposed continued designation of this area as a harbour. Presumably, this element in the “mixed-zoning” status of the site will allow for a possible development of deep-water dock at some point in the future. There has been no real public discussion or thorough technical analyses of dock construction by City and the suggestion that this may be one of the collateral benefits of this project seems fanciful at best. Councillors should carefully read the excellent analysis laid out by Jim Parker in his letter of September 30 2024 (included in the package) about the myriad environmental, traffic and other impacts of a cruise-ship dock project in residential neighborhood. Council should take actions to stipulate that the 5 Lower Union residential building project (should it be approved) does not encompass any concession, tacit or otherwise, to facilitate a dock project. Any such project would require robust studies and a transparent process to consult with citizens --- and none of that has taken place thus far. At a time when many cities around the world are taking actions to mitigate the negative effects of the cruise industry, Kingston should take heed and not assume that “more” tourism of any sort is a benefit.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to a thoughtful discussion of these matters in the Planning Committee meeting.

Sincerely,

Catherine Conaghan
5 Gore St.