

**SUMMARY OF THE SECOND PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
AND ONLINE SURVEY**

FOR THE

BARRIEFIELD FEASIBILITY STUDY

AUGUST 9, 2010

Prepared by



**SUMMARY OF THE SECOND PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE AND ONLINE
SURVEY
FOR THE
BARRIEFIELD FEASIBILITY STUDY
AUGUST 9, 2010**

Overview of Public Information Centre

A Public Information Centre (PIC) for the Consultancy on Potential Acquisition of Federal Surplus Land in Barriefield Village was held on Monday, August 9, 2010 from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm at Kingston City Hall.

The purpose of this meeting was to provide a summary of the study's findings to date; identify development constraints and opportunities; and to review the potential development concepts. A potential development concept was presented to the public for comment. The following is a breakdown of development by parcel:

- Parcel 1: developed as public parkland
- Parcel 2: 2-storey seniors apartment with 32 units
- Parcel 3: single detached dwellings (13 units) and a semi detached dwelling (2 units)

Attendees were asked to sign in and were provided with a comment sheet to record their comments following the PIC. Copies of all comments sheets and emails and other correspondence are found in the Appendices.

Public Information Centre Notification Details

The PIC was advertised in the Whig Standard newspaper and on the City web site.

Online Survey Results

At the commencement of the feasibility study until July 30, residents had the opportunity to vote on the issue of affordable housing at Barriefield on the City of Kingston's webpage. There were more than 300 respondents who answered the question:

*"Are you in favour of the City purchasing surplus Department of National Defence lands adjacent to Barriefield for the purpose of building affordable housing on the site?
Yes/No."*

The final tally was: NO = 255. YES = 52.
Comments are found in the appendices.

Attendance at PIC

Signed attendance at the Public Information Centre was 86.

City of Kingston staff included:

Jim de Hoop, Director, Community & Family Services
City of Kingston

The Project Team members in attendance included:

Wendy Shearer, MHBC Planning
Neal DeRuyter, MHBC Planning
Bernie Hermsen, MHBC Planning
Mark Brandt, Mark T. Brandt Architect & Associates
Brynne Campbell, Mark T. Brandt Architect & Associates
Ed Starr, SHS Consulting
Ken Foulds, SHS Consulting
Howard Williamson, Williamson Consulting Inc.

Open House Schedule

The Public Information Centre was on Monday, August 9, 2010 from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm at Kingston City Hall. Attendees were asked to sign in then review the information panels. At 6:15, a Power Point presentation was delivered by the consultants.

Following the presentation, a question and answer session was conducted until 8:30. Before leaving, residents were again asked to fill in their comment sheets and return them to the City by August 18, 2010.

A summary of additional comments provided are listed below with the number in brackets indicating the number of times a similar comment was received:

1. **Do you believe that the design concept for parcel one at the north end of Barriefield is appropriate?**

- Does the City plan to buy this parcel at "market value" for use as parkland? Or is the one dollar deal, applicable to parkland as well?
- What guarantee is there that this parcel will remain parkland forever? Who will maintain the parkland?
- Good compromise
- To be "public parkland" there must be access for the public to get to it from Highway 15. Cities should not be giving preferential benefits to one group
- Should not include this!
- Don't build on parcel 1(3)
- It is essential that this parcel remain open to preserve the scenic views of St. Mark's Church. Views of the church from Highway 15 across backyards would be inappropriate (6)
- How did this go from an affordable housing development to just a housing development? Anyone who can afford a \$236,000 house does not need an affordable house.
- Much too low density - put the seniors' apartment there, if at all. Seniors are a mere 10% of those on the urgent housing list!
- This should remain as a key feature of the "green crescent" that begins at the Matheson Gate and continues uninterrupted to the Hwy #2 traffic light.
- The proposal does not fulfill the key objective of the study, namely to provide affordable housing
- Yes. I'm happy to see that the consultants are sticking to the spirit of the heritage plan with regard to viewscales for this parcel. I'm also glad to see that there is widespread acceptance of this, both by villagers and Kingstonians, but also by those who are virulently attempting to get as much affordable housing development in Barriefield as possible, regardless of heritage concerns.
- Your approach to this iconic setting demonstrates an intelligent and sensitive understanding of Heritage planning
- Should continue as parkland
- Creating an attractive public park, especially in this location is a GOOD IDEA
- Too few houses could be squeezed onto this tiny parcel to make it worthwhile, given the constraints on the property
- Develop as parkland is an excellent idea, thereby preserving the space and sight/site of the historic church and environs (2)

2. **Do you believe that the design concept for parcel 2 south of parcel 1 is appropriate?**

- Despite comparisons to the school and the church, the structure seems too massive for this site. Better to put this structure on parcel 3 and spread out over more space
- 32 units are too many. Who will manage the apartment building? Who will maintain properties and plans?
- Higher density in parcel 2 , especially consider co-op
- The building design is fine. The target group is problematic. The greatest need is for non-seniors, non-specialized social housing. Under the Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA). Also it is universally agreed in this City that 80% of Market Rent is not affordable for low and moderate income housing
- But the affordability of over \$250,000 is inappropriately high
- Will it remain for seniors only?
- Some of the school land if released, should be allocated to a shopping plaza, so that the seniors are not isolated
- Only if institutional designation is unequivocal. Preferable that part 2 be family homes like part 3
- May be - senior housing is needed, but maybe a bit smaller, maybe okay
- Must be kept for seniors only
- One bedroom apartment are needed but the city's own waiting list shows that seniors are not in great need at this time
- Depending on a very sensitive design, this might work on parcel 2. Buildings need to be pushed further west; with the access road further west is possible because of the easements. Maximum is the given buffer between units and Hwy 15 is essential
- Should before affordable housing for families, not for seniors only
- Design looks like a Days Inn type hotel. Welcome seniors – fits into neighbourhood best
- More and more people are going to drop out of the middle class and the concept of affordability will encompass more and more people
- No: way too low density. Use the entire parcel for public housing
- Too many apartments! How would old people with limited energy and limited means be able to be able to maintain this apartment house inside and out? Is this plan leading to a slum area that would help nobody
- The seniors' grouping is far too large and too high and takes away advantage of the vistas of the church from Wellington and also from the South and part of Hwy #15. Also the residents would have no view other than Highway 15 with the noise and pollution associated with it
- It is too close to Highway 15
- Seniors are not the key priority group, so 10:20 (?) ratio between low income and seniors designation is not good
- Can a building be designated only for seniors? I thought that wasn't allowed
- No. In theory, a seniors' complex would be fine for being built in the village; indeed, it's my understanding that this is allowed for under the Official Plan.

The design that has been put forward though is two-stories, and I have a problem with this, given that my understanding is that 1 and ½ is the upward limit of building height. Like everyone, I'm concerned about what will happen to the school property when it goes on the market. Another concern is that the proposed seniors building might provide a precedent for other such buildings on the school property with the result of turning the area into a huge anomaly in the village.

- This is definitely the best use of this parcel of land. My concern however, would be the noise level caused by increasing traffic on Highway 15 would be unhealthy for seniors
- A seniors' block is certainly most appropriate here, and represents sensible use of public funds. The design concept looks appropriate, assuming a heritage finish. HOWEVER, I could only accept it if it is clearly designated for seniors - with no chance of a change to mixed-use!
- Since J. E. Horton Public School will be closed in the near future, any development of Parcel 2 should be delayed until a determination is made about the use of the school property. That said, the proposed apartment building is in violation of the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plans. Why would heritage consultants propose such a concept?
- Building an architecturally sensitive, heritage minded seniors I believe is the very best idea that the consultants have come up with, and are to be commended for it
- Yes, only in conjunction with that type of development suggested for Parcel 3. If council were to insist on Hughes Downey for parcel 3, this would not be appropriate. Furthermore, we hear that council in the past has built seniors' housing, and then opened it up to non--seniors. This must somehow be prevented
- The proposed building form and mass is not appropriate. The argument that the J.E. Horton School sets a precedent is not compelling, since the school is closing and proposal would then be the only massive building in the village except for the church, which is not relevant since it is historical
- I think the concept of affordable housing for seniors is appropriate; however, the 32-unit complex is too large for the scale of the community (and the Barriefield Village) and building design is not in keeping with the heritage designation. There is also no concern that the seniors' designation could be changed at some point in the future, as happened on Bagot St.
- Seniors housing is a good fit for the village as they are our elders in Barriefield as well as young families, renters and a diverse demographic. This in combination with the single-detached in parcel 3 reflects existing village; however, if they City were to build senior accommodation status for seniors, and then change the designation once it is built, that would be a big deception – a hypocrisy!
- I worry about the views of the church. Somewhere in the information, the mention was made of “strings” of buildings in Barriefield, and that this was the president for the design of seniors' apartments... There is only ONE “string” in the village, and it is the drive shed set, seemingly, beside a garage

- this is on Main Street and what is not visible is that there is a stone wall between the 2 buildings that extends into the back yards. It is not 2 houses abutted, and it is certainly not anywhere else in Barriefield

- Not compatible with Barriefield Heritage Conservation Plan. Would seem to block the view of St. Mark's from the entrance to Barriefield, which if so, would be a big loss. Would prefer Parcel 2, to be more like Parcel 3, with a wide setback from Wellington Street. How might this affect use of school property?
- I believe designating this land for seniors is a great idea. One concern with the design is the height of the building. Would it be possible to have the design more similar to Parcel 3?

3. Do you believe that the design concept for Parcel 3 at the south end of Barriefield is appropriate?

- Housing is facing “backwards” which makes for no streetscape, which conflicts with Heritage Plan. Potential for some very ugly streetscapes
- Too many units and they are too close to the highway and is doubtful that 15 units can be purchased at the prices contemplated of kept by owners is difficult circumstances; this is programmed to become a slum
- No home ownership on parcel 3 please. More units
- Home ownership is laudable. However, I hope you consider: 1) if you persist in keeping the income mix on parcel 2, as proposed (10 x RGI plus 22 x 80% market) then you must partner with Habitat for Humanity to allow lower income families to participate OR 2) make all of parcel 2 RGI Units under SARA and target group
- More units should be designated as assisted
- Should be home ownership as opposed to rental
- Intersections on Wellington are too close together – no discussion of the view from highway 2 – currently a mess
- The objective must be genuinely affordable housing. Amendments to policy needed to permit more semi-detached homes. For many decades, Barriefield was not an enclave of the wealthy, nor should it be now
- Should be for people who need housing – not people who can purchase housing
- Home ownership – not rental
- Free standing family housing – an “affordable” by the official plan definition is not the great need: 3-4plex rentals (one bedroom) is the need
- Much too dense development with miserly buffer from Hwy 15.(2)
- The same situation that prompted the construction of Hwy 15 bypass is proposed – homes too close to a very busy highway. One row of buildings with access from George Street, should be the multi-use development this parcel. The place for housing creates a complex completely separated from the village - has the potential to become ghettoized

- I think that it should only be for people on waiting list – not for family housing that people can buy
- Not enough green space left – takes away the rural aspect of Barriefield
- Way too low density
- Very apprehensive! The easement along George Street is now covered with trees and location. Will this remain like that? It could create a ghetto situation for the people living behind that. It would hinder greatly the desired interpretation for the new Barrie- fielders’
- This is hardly worth developing. This land for affordable housing with so few units on it – due in large part to the whole network of infrastructure and easements associated with them. Also the units facing Highway #15 are being used as buffers. That is not a fair solution. More people according to good planning principles ought to have their fair share at views (of the church) and lack of noise
- This is the design for median price houses in Kingston (\$220,000) therefore it is well beyond even the average income household (\$1,500 worth by payment would require \$60,000 around income, not exactly a low income)
- I liked the original design of the single buildings that held 4-1 bedroom apartments each. The minimum could be affordable houses for purchase and the apartments – a true mix
- This parcel is key to the feasibility of the whole idea of putting an affordable housing development in the village, it seems to me. As mentioned in your report, there are a large number of constraints on building enough units to merit going ahead with this project. You are to be complimented for being sensitive to the heritage as well as other constraints that this very problematic site presents.
- Fifteen units seems reasonable to me, given these restraints, but I’m sure it will not be reasonable to those who are intent on housing all 1,000 people on the waiting list in Barriefield! The design is a good design given the constraints and the pressure to get as many units in as possible.
- I think I would have preferred to see houses along George St., but that is clearly impossible to do. The current and future noise and pollution constraints from traffic on Hwy. 15 are as you know considerable. I do share the stated disbelief of others at the public meeting concerning the viability of houses fronting the highway. The trucks that gear up and gear down at that point of the highway are extremely noisy and extremely polluting. If we’re all being honest, this is not the best way to use taxpayers’ money to build affordable housing, even with the land being offered for \$1.
- I would suggest as an alternative design is to make the proposed new road straight (in keeping with the grid pattern of the village), and to build one row of houses along it (i.e. 6 or 7 single unit, 1 – 1 ½ storey houses). That would leave ample room behind the houses to provide a natural buffer using trees, lilac bushes and other landscaping.
- The proposal for Part 3 is quite appropriate, though I would suggest that the street leading from Wellington should be straight, like the rest of the streets in the village, and not curved. The density and proposed form is in keeping

with my understanding of the Official Plan and Heritage Conservation District guidelines.

- You have squeezed too many houses on this parcel. The laneways probably should mirror the grid setting of the village
- With reservations. The number of units could be less dense, i.e., fewer - but must conform fully with the heritage materials and finish requirements
- Yes, in as much as it adheres to the Heritage design constraints and providing the building materials conform. But it still does not demonstrate integration. The result is a ghetto. A seniors residence (as in Parcel 2) would be best use
- Between the noise violation, along Highway 15, and the easements, one must really question the practicality or reasonableness of any development, let alone the heritage considerations. That said, the proposed density of primarily two-story dwellings is not in keeping with gradual, integrated development of the heritage district
- This is manifestly NOT the location to build a concentrated block of housing units. First, as heritage guidelines will have to be respected, is too expensive. Money would be better spent elsewhere. FOR INSTANCE on refurbishing existing housing stock on CFB Kingston and allocating this, close to schools and services, as affordable housing. And second, all recent progressive social thinking is to integrate small units of affordable housing in already established communities, like Barriefield, not erect instant ghettos!
- The concept works for the village. The lands constraints forcing some houses to face Highway 15, a few meters away is very unfortunate. If it were to be built as planned, we know there would be a subsequent cry. For more noise mitigation (sound barrier walls or the like)
- This is the maximum number of units that should be contemplated for the site. The proposal seems to fit quite well within the heritage designation. Because as site constraints, maximizing the # of about (15). Unfortunately, forces, a number of them close to Highway 15 - with front yards facing the highway. This does not seem appropriate
- I like the observance of varying heights in the present housing stock. That is echoed in the new designs for #3, the garage/backyards. I wonder about the setback for Highway 15 (lots of!), but realize the restrictions due to utilities on the George Street side of the Parcel. I very much like the “ownership” concept, which will ensure upkeep and buy-in from our new neighbours and, will, I think, make for a more stable neighbourhood
- One concern is the lack of green space in vegetation between the busy highway and the village. If in fact, so many provisions need to be made to mitigate the noise of the highway (i.e., air conditioning, the front of the house facing #15...) then how is this feasible? It seems to be a major reason for not building the houses on this parcel or the other two. Does the front of the house not also deserve to have quiet? The notion of a front porch doesn't seem to work well in the face of all that noise
- I like the plan for small single-family homes. I like the open NE corner. The entrance to Barriefield would seem to benefit if the house on Wellington

Street were eliminated - i.e. keeping the entire stretch along Wellington Street opened. But, it greatly depends on how the exteriors are finished and on landscaping, and I worry that whether there are enough funds available to follow through effectively on this project

4. Do you believe the overall development concept is appropriate for Barriefield in its design and scale?

- What are the restrictions on re-selling for profit if home ownership is envisaged? A co-op is a better model which protects the public investment in the long term. I am not convinced that this housing should be for seniors. The young single is more in need and the City has built for seniors recently (than Order Drive) 90% of the waiting list is not seniors
- The price of \$1 is very important. The overall development calls for mainly purchased homes – doesn't create a mix
- The parcel 3 should focus on semi-detached unites perhaps 24-26 of these. Otherwise it utterly fails to meet the key objective of your study
- This site is not appropriate for affordable housing, or other housing for that matter
- You will destroy a valuable cultural landscape. You will achieve minimal affordable senior housing. The costs would be prohibitive for such persons (and for the city to finance it). You are constrained to push your units to the periphery without benefits of view and sealed inside to escape the noise
- It should cater to low income (equals less than \$20,000) family income
- Does not deal with the issue of affordability
- If there needs to be development, the design is not appropriate for the seniors housing. Looks like a hotel
- The city Affordable Housing Development committee (I think that is their name) was not consulted - they said this at the meeting. Why didn't you ask them?
- Part of the development concept is appropriate for parcels 1 and 2. Identity for parcel 3 is to create and process development to close to Highway 15, with its road noise and pollution. This is an insult to those who might wish to purchase where they are confronted with less than desirable locations as "second-rate citizens". One row of buildings on parcel 3 is all of the site can realistically accommodate. I would support the concept of geared to income ownership for units on parcel 3
- The preliminary plan put forward in October 2009 is much more sensible
- I think the village can and should accommodate affordable housing. My neighbours don't agree.
- Accommodation must be for more homes Part 2 and 3
- The word should be "Pittsburgh" not "Barriefield". I do not think the construction has been properly priced
- Seniors are not the group most in need
- 3 story building, and more duplexes would be fine

- The scale of development on parcels 2 and 3 is too big and the offset against the highway is too narrow
- I want to compliment you on giving due diligence to this highly problematic situation. You clearly gave it a lot of careful thought. The Barriefield Village Association Steering Committee (of which I am a member) was very grateful to have had the chance to meet with you. Affordable housing or indeed any housing can be put anywhere, but once heritage is lost or diminished, it can never be regained, as you know. I thus urge you to continue to hold on to the guiding principles of the Official Plan and the heritage plan, and not give in to the pressure you will likely receive to recommend to Council all kinds of zoning and heritage plan changes, to accommodate the aims of those who wish to maximize affordable housing on this unique and sensitive site.
- The concept of seniors housing and family dwellings is appropriate. Overall, however the development is too dense. Could the Seniors housing be placed on part 3 and get back further from Highway 15?
- Yes, especially design idea for Parcel 3
- Absolutely not. The scale is going to overwhelm the rest of the village. As for the design, that was not at all obvious, and yet absolutely crucial in a protected heritage setting. How can the feasibility of the project be completely judged with this huge component missing? It is difficult to respond to a plan with so many major factors not accounted for. The idea that “peaked roves” or “front porches” is all that is needed for heritage is short-sighted and not acceptable to those of us who live in and care for the preservation of homes from the 1800s
- The concept shows in-depth understanding of the development of Barriefield and mode of living in our agreeable community. The density is in keeping, also, and will not be a ghetto style addition, as was first proposal
- Just part 3. No to part 2 (too big a complex). The village currently has 90 homes. 15 new units is an increase of about 17%. That is already a large change for a land-locked neighbourhood. Adding any more would be an outrageous change
- Barriefield is the village for all intents and purposes, of about 90 dwellings. This proposal would add 47 new dwellings - a massive change in population. Further, the scale and form of the apartment building is simply not appropriate there
- It is difficult to say. As usual, in this process from its inception, we have not seen enough detail. For example, the layout of lots and houses in Parcel 3 presented on August 9 looks okay - but we do not know anything about these
- Ideas for Parcel 1 are good, those for Parcel 2 even better, but the whole business of placing affordable housing on Parcel 3 defies any spatial logic (remote services and facilities even basic ones) , and is too costly to think with innovative social thinking. There also noise and safety factors related to proximity to Highway 2 and 15. Two out of three meeting with approval is better by far than I anticipated, but plans for Parcel 3 should be rethought

- With the concern that the concept for Parcel 3 years, crowded. Otherwise, I believe the consultants have produced an acceptable solution - a huge improvement over the hasty Hughes-Downey mess

5. Do you have any additional comments about the design concepts presented at this Public Information Centre?

- Where is the parkland for this housing? There is 47% as open space but is there a place for children to play or seniors to walk or sit outside? Parkland is important. Is it realistic to think that seniors want to live on a 2nd floor? Often stairs become difficult. Would there be an elevator? Is there a reason not to flip this and make parcel 3 the senior's area and parcel 2 for singles/couples? I would prefer to see more integrating with Barriefield. This seems to build a "tack-on" rather than a natural extension of the village. There seems to be a barrier between the existing village and this new development. Maybe a play area could go in part of this part of Parcel 3 and be accessible to Barriefield residents too
- My problem is not with your concepts of design, layout etc., but the focus on having a large number of senior citizens units. The demand is not there. As I understand the demand is for single accommodations space. I am disappointed in the way that this study has addressed the needs of the poor in Kingston
- You need to speak with cooperative housing and adjust your plans to meet the needs of the poor in Kingston! I think it is perfectly possible to meet the requirements of their ages when building affordable housing, and in favour of having affordable housing built in Barriefield
- Please consider mix of ages instead of a seniors only apartment complex
- This is a difficult situation. I think the design needs to be able to accommodate more of a mix of incomes. The school property should also allow for a mix of incomes and housing
- The lack of consultations with key stakeholders fundamentally invalidated your design process. No consultations with city affordable housing committee is particularly appalling
- The process is way too fast for this type of development
- My complaint is not so much with the design concepts which are a big improvement over the 1st proposal offered by Hughes Downey group of architects. It is the location – so close to an increasingly busy Hwy 15 - that is at issue as far as I am concerned
- A remarkable poor (and self interested) display considering how much public money has been paid for this process
- There is generally a basic lack of realization and understanding of what a treasure Barriefield is for the City of Kingston. While house owners will certainly their reward (expensive, if you follow the renting requirements!) Good citizens who add to their City's assets.
- The designs themselves are fine. It is the use of the land that is deficient. There should be housing across all parcels (there is already much green

space on all sides of Barriefield). It should be duplexes on new housing; it should house the poor, not people who can afford a quarter million dollar home, with or without subsidies. I want my tax dollars (those \$260,000 the city will contribute) and the ¾ million dollars the federal government is willing to let go or \$1, to go to the neediest in the community, not to people earning \$61,000

- No one seems to be happy with this plan – and this is before the financial visibility analysis is complete. The financial analysis will no doubt show the high cost of this plan. Please do not go ahead with the purchase of their lands for affordable housing
- The consultants caved in to the Barriefield people. Did NOT do wide enough consultation. (i.e. Affordable Housing Development committee and the July 6 meeting was a bit of a farce since many people could not attend because of the 401 accident – the meeting was skewed by the large number of people able to attend from Barriefield. The meeting should have been held a second time
- The exercise has been an expensive waste of money so far
- I think it is a very good compromise to stick with the Barriefield plan and gain some housing. I do not live in Barriefield
- More of this housing has to serve low income people from the SHRA wait list. Either they must be served on the rental side on parcel 2 or on the have ownership side on parcel 3. There is a great need for the following types of housing for low-income people. 1) non-specialized 1 bedrooms units/home 2) large (4-5 bedroom) family units units/homes 3)larger 3 bedroom accessible/special needs units/homes
- Only if bylaws can be changed and high level 3 stories and density can be had. I think the proposal will be economically unfeasible
- More should be said about the process by which the contemplated housing unit will be allocated. More should be said about the design of the units and at what cost it will satisfy the standards of the Heritage District
- It would seem that the money for “affordable housing” would be better and more effectively spent on housing in an area not adjacent to Heritage District.
- Given the tone of most of the questions and comments, it seems the “Affordable Housing” advocates expect the Barriefield development to solve all of Kingstonian’s housing problems. Again seems that the land is the only land in Kingston subject to Heritage legislation it seem Housing goals would not be achieved in other locations
- One of the characteristics of Barriefield in the generous green space surrounding the built areas. This proposal reduces the identifying green buffer by placing housing on parcel 3 in close proximity to Hwy 15 as proposed. Using the houses themselves as a noise buffer is a completely unacceptable proposal and demeans those who could potentially occupy them. The Barriefield Hwy 15 by-pass was constructed to avoid the noise and other aspects of the proximity of houses to the roadway.

- To put forward a proposal the places new buildings in the same situation for which the highway was diverted is unconscionable to say the least. With respect to the heritage of the Village and potential future residents please treat them with respect and keep housing well removed from the Highway. The proposal for parcel 3 violates the proposed houses, development, into the existing village. The incorporation of the senior's complex into the plan is the positive move, but the lack of local amenities could be a deterrent to its success. Again, a single row of houses with access from George Street on parcel 3 would be the maximum sustainable.
- My main worry is that, though this study is touted as a feasibility study, and my understanding is that you are to advise the city on whether this is a Go or No Go decision on Sept. 7th, it feels as if the Go decision has been a foregone conclusion since the beginning.
- A final comment is my concern that, before Phase 2 of the feasibility study is done, the City will, for political reasons, commit to asking the federal government for the land. Phase 2 may well turn up further obstacles to building on this land, which would really make this project unfeasible, if it's not already, or an extremely wasteful use of taxpayers' money. Further to this, I feel this is an added pressure for you to make this feasible, come hell or high water.
- I welcome a seniors' home as part of the development of the village. But it must be smaller in scope and with building mass. Perhaps the consultants could consider an alternative structure, embodying, say, a town-house like community of seniors connected by pathways, to avoid the massive structure.
- It is evident that the social activist community is not happy with the Barriefield proposal. It was always obvious that the Barriefield project was going to be a deluxe version of social housing due to the constraints of the site and all the planning issues. The location is very problematic due to the noise & pollution from Highway 15 which we believe cannot be eliminated. If the city does not proceed with this proposal, we do not believe the land will sell for private development for the same reasons. The City will get much better value for money from other sites – for example the former (now torn down) Toyota site on Princess Street. This is an expensive, impractical and cumbersome project which should be abandoned.
- As planners you have made the best of an impossible situation. You have been presented with a difficult task because: 1) the council did not do due diligence prior to trying to push the project through. They thought a few buildings sketched by Hughes Downey would shut us up. They did not pay attention to the Official Plan or the HCDP. Certain councillors underestimated the sense of heritage stewardship within the village. 2) These same councillors were intent on pushing this through in the summer months so you were given extremely tight deadlines for a task that required thoughtfulness, cooperation & vision.

- Due to the fact that the current school of J.E. Horton will only possibly be there for the next few years, my concern is the height of Parcel #2 buildings. And what it could mean for future building of the current J.E. Horton site
- I wasn't able to be at the Aug 9 meeting, but based on what I've read about it, I'm sorry more detail wasn't available
- I understand that the plan states that every building can occur, but surely there is a limit. Already, several new homes have been constructed, and allowed by the city, with no way for villagers to react to size and design. They have already tipped the balance between old and new buildings. When that plan was written, there was no idea that the surrounding DND property would come into play. More consideration needs to begin to the entrance to Kingston at this right at the UNESCO Heritage site.
- Cost of building homes appropriate to heritage site would also be a big consideration, and this was not available. There really was, in the end, insufficient information because of the time crunch. But surely that time crunch is also a factor
- The public was never given all the necessary details. The residents of Barriefield are attempting to preserve the village's heritage. If mistakes are made with a large new development, the heritage factor is lost. If the advocates for affordable housing did not get development bills here, they have many other chances. There are other priorities that have been suggested (i.e. beside the Pittsburgh Library, off Highway 15 - lots of land, near stores, doctors, dentists and schools; the Memorial Centre property) and other that have not been scouted out. Or that are being hidden, and for them. This is not a one-shot prospect.
- The other question that seems to be ignored revolves around current thinking about how best to house those in need of assistance - large ghettos or individual scattered around the city. I wonder how much real research, the city has done on this question
- I'd like to commend the consultants on the collaborative process that led to this concept wide consultation, good research, thoughtful collection of information, and – vitally - listening has made this a success. If only the City had used this approach from the outset, much resentment and divisiveness could have been avoided. Secret processes will usually arouse suspicion, unnecessary rhetoric, and in us/them atmosphere. In principle, the design concept is good. It remains to be seen how Council will choose to execute the buildings, how much Council, will adhere to its own Heritage rules and the provincial legislation governing Heritage Conservation Districts
- The consultants need to be commended for a recommendation that respects the constraints of the sites. While I understand from the meeting on August 9 that some in the audience were disappointed that there were not more housing units - they should not have been surprised. Opponents to this proposal have not been opponents to affordable housing, but have been honest in their assessment and recitation that the Barriefield sites are inappropriate - for many of the reasons the consultants have identified. The Barriefield sites are problematic for many reasons related to the physical site

of the costs involved. If the City truly wanted to quickly and efficiently improve the stock of affordable housing in Kingston. A could stop wasting time and money choosing the “cheap” land in Barriefield (which at the end of the day is anything but cheap) and find other sites that are shovel ready and not riddled with problems

- This proposal is driven by the ongoing myth that the DND lands are cheap (\$1). They are not - building here requires a great expense in studies and clearances that other property in Kingston does not. There are other documented sites that are shovel-ready and would house more people and furthermore be much cheaper than this development would be, even including the cheap land.
- The only rationale seems to be to establish more affordable housing, east of the river to fit some unclear sense of balance. This is ironic given how little attention to City has paid to “East of the River” is passed. The major concern is that, if the consultants to come up with a scaled down version of the seniors' complex on Part 2. How do we know it will remain a seniors' only complex? What prevents the city, under pressure from vocal activists, from changing the OP and opening up residences to all, with disastrous consequences like Van Order Drive and Bagot Street?
- Designed for construction and finishing materials. Our fear, as it has been from the start, is that Council (i.e. the majority that has been insisting on developing these parcels) does not actually care about the Heritage concept. They have made that clear from the start. Consequently, when costs start to rise, they are likely to abandon the design and materials standards that village residents are held to. While I'm generally in favour of your concept, it is unfortunate that you haven't been given enough time to present us with a complete picture
- Parcel 3 offers a wonderful opportunity to reinforce the heritage designation of Barriefield by having the consultants think next in terms of increased parkland or recreation there. Or without, given the strategic Gateway to the city concept, establish another Visitors Information Centre here. That way, visitors could walk around, in Parcel 3 refurbished parkland/parking, over to the garden for the BEST VIEW OF US KINGSTON, and then wandered through Barriefield Village before heading into town. I strongly feel that building any kind of housing, save for the brilliant idea of the Seniors Centre, will tarnish the image of a beautiful entry point to a beautiful city
- Heritage Conservation Districts preserve heritage that is centuries old. They are the product of much study, careful reflection and sensitively developed policy. Development in such districts should not be careless or ill-conceived. The rush nature of this initiative has not, sadly, respected the fundamental principles enunciated above
- Cannot believe this is a viable, affordable housing location. Quite apart from expected infrastructure construction costs to meet Heritage standards, the time frame to completion is far greater than it would be to build at other city locations, were much greater value for dollars could be achieved. On the face of it, then this proposal represents an irresponsible waste of taxpayers'

dollars. P. S. the Hughes Downey plan is another example of irresponsible use of funds. Totally ill considered. Councillors supporting it should be shamed into reimbursing the city out of their own pockets

- I do not believe any form of affordable housing can possibly be provided at this location without introducing a Ghetto that contradicts all notions of good planning and especially integration. The councillors who supported the study did not do their homework, and certainly not listen to city staff. The timeline for thorough completion of the study is far too abbreviated, which is not fair to all concerned. Also, I do not trust those same councillors to keep a seniors residence only for seniors.