



City of Kingston Official Plan Review Summary Feedback Report



Report from Public Open House and Workshops held on November 30 and December 6, 2006

Consultation for the development of the comprehensive Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Review is ongoing. Please contact either of the following to provide additional comments. Notices for future meetings and workshops will be on the City's web site and advertised by notice in the papers.

Wes Paetkau, MCIP, RPP
Senior Policy Planner
Planning & Development Department
City of Kingston
Mailing Address: 216 Ontario Street, K7L 2Z3
Office Location: 1425 Midland Avenue
Phone: (613) 546-4291 ext. 3232
Fax: (613) 384-6645
opzb_update@cityofkingston.ca

Sue Cumming, MCIP, RPP
Public Consultation Facilitator
Principal, Cumming + Company
201 Riverdale Avenue
Toronto, Ontario M4K 1C4
Phone: (416) 406-6607
Fax: (416) 406-6141
cumming@total.net

City of Kingston

Official Plan Review: Public Consultation Sessions Round 1 Summary Feedback Report

Table of Contents

Executive Summary: Key Messages that were heard

1.	About the Official Plan Review Public Consultation Sessions	Page 5
2.	What makes a Liveable Community	Page 9
3.	Significant Attributes of the City of Kingston	Page 11
4.	Elements of Smart Growth that people would to see in Kingston	Page 12
5.	Views on the City's Growth Management Objectives	Page 14
6.	Proposed Urban Growth Boundary	Page 18
7.	Ideas for achieving intensification	Page 19
8.	Views on providing flexibility in the Official Plan	Page 23
9.	Individual Comments for consideration	Page 27

APPENDICES

Appendix A	List of Official Plan Background Studies
Appendix B	List of Participants
Appendix C.	Regional Commercial Study Update
Appendix D	Downtown and Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines
Appendix E	Agricultural Study

Executive Summary

The first round of public input to the Official Plan was intended to identify issues and to learn of ideas for consideration as part of the development of a draft Official Plan document. It was also designed to present recently completed or ongoing background reports including the Regional Commercial Study Update, the Agricultural Study and initial findings of the Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines Study. The emphasis of these sessions was to engage and listen to the public. The scheduling of these events was planned to optimize participation by ensuring that the public had the opportunity to attend during the day and in the evening.

One public open house was held on December 6 in the morning and three workshops were held - one in each of the afternoons on November 30 and December 6 and one in the evening on December 6. The public sessions were advertised through notices in Kingston This Week, the Whig-Standard, and the City's web site and through letters to an extensive list of community and business stakeholders. Over 140 people attended.

The following highlights key messages where there was wide concern and support for:

- The Waterfront and access to it are highly valued with the desire for improved public access to it and protection of views and public use.
- The historic character of the City is key to its future with the need to protect and restore the heritage character of the many buildings and sites within the downtown.
- There is strong support for protecting the City's natural environment and connections to it.
- The downtown is a key destination and a vibrant people place. There is a desire to bring more residential units to the downtown with services and amenities that would support daily living. In the downtown there is a public concerns about lack of available and affordable parking which acts as a deterrent for coming downtown. There is a desire to continue supporting the variety of unique shopping, restaurants and community uses, both indoor and outdoor.
- The City's agricultural character is important. There are many rural issues and a general feeling that there needs to more support from the City of rural issues and concerns.
- There is a sense that City should grow in an orderly fashion with no leapfrogging of development or services. People want to see existing areas built out and intensified and do not want to see developing sprawling sprawl out with low densities. Infilling the gaps is supported over expansion into greenfields.
- Servicing for development is to be strategically undertaken on full municipal services with serviced land being uses prior to the consideration of the extension of services.
- People want to see strong protections where growth should not occur with a view to protecting the natural areas, rural character, and waterfront among other areas.
- People want goods and services nearby.

- The public supports redevelopment of outdated or vacant commercial sites and sees the opportunity for new housing and community and service uses.
- A greater mixing of uses is supported.
- A more compact walkable community is supported which will support walking, cycling and improved transit.
- There is support for ready access to a well designed system of interconnecting green spaces and natural areas.
- Universal design standards are important.
- High quality urban design is expected.
- There is public acknowledgement of the significance of the City of its institutions including Queens University, Royal Military College, Prisons, and CFB.

There is much interest in the Official Plan on the part of the citizens of Kingston. People want to be involved and to provide their view and perspectives. The approach of facilitated workshops utilized for the Round 1 Consultation on the Official Plan was widely supported and encouraged for future consultation.

1. About the Official Plan Review Public Consultation Sessions

The Official Plan is a policy document that guides City Council in decisions about how lands in the municipality will be used, laying out potential growth and change for the next 20 years. Each of us makes choices about where we live, work, play, shop go to school and how to get from point “A” to point “B”, which are all affected by the Official Plan policies in a community. A zoning bylaw is used to implement the policies in the Official Plan. It divides a municipality into specific areas -- or “zones” -- which contain a list of permitted uses as well as detailed site and development regulations.

The City of Kingston is consolidating and updating its three Official Plans and five zoning by-laws. These documents which were prepared at different time-frames have different approaches, and differing requirements for development. There is a desire for a common vision for the long-term planning of the City of Kingston and this vision will be reflected in updated policies and standards that will encompass new Provincial requirements, greater strategic planning and greater flexibility, where possible. The Official Plan review is being undertaken through a number of significant background studies many of which have been completed over the last several years with significant public input. A full list of these is found in Appendix A.

The key aim of the comprehensive Official Plan is to replace the three Official Plans with a single Official Plan that will:

1. Guide the City’s long-term land use planning and development strategy. This is important because it will determine how new development opportunities and planned growth can be supported and serviced. It will provide policies to ensure that proposed developments in distinctive areas are sympathetic to existing uses and features and that stable neighbourhoods as well as agricultural and natural heritage areas are protected.
2. Harmonize existing policies and regulations to provide more clarity for the goals, objectives and land use policies City-wide.
3. Incorporate recommendations from recent major planning studies including the Urban Growth Strategy and the Transportation Master Plan. The Official Plan will also include recommendations from the Regional Commercial Update Study, the Harbour and Downtown Guidelines Study and the Agricultural Study which are underway.
4. Conform to current provincial policies and legislation.

Sorensen Gravely Lowes Planning Consultants were retained by the City of Kingston to create one comprehensive Official Plan and the Zoning By-Law. The City of Kingston’s Comprehensive Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Review provides the opportunity to develop a consolidated and updated approach to planning. Central to achieving public input and support for this process will be the means of stimulating constructive discussion and interest. To this end, there is much emphasis on undertaking a proactive and transparent public input program that provides a variety of forums for involvement throughout the study. The objectives for engaging the public include the following:

- To educate the community and stakeholders about the importance of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and what it means for them;
- To build an understanding about the policy framework through consultation, information dissemination and exchange of views;

- To engage the community and stakeholders in a discussion about the policy directions that will support their longer vision of Kingston and the quality of life and community that could result and;
- To provide opportunities for the public to have meaningful input into the Official Plan and Zoning By-law studies and provide feedback to the City throughout the process.

The first round of public input to the Official Plan was intended to identify issues and to learn of ideas for consideration as part of the development of a draft Official Plan document. It was also designed to present recently completed or ongoing background reports including the Regional Commercial Study Update, the Agricultural Study and initial findings of the Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines Study.

The emphasis of these sessions was to engage and listen to the public. The scheduling of these events was planned to optimize participation by ensuring that the public had the opportunity to attend during the day and in the evening.

One public open house was held on December 6 in the morning and three workshops were held - one in each of the afternoons on November 30 and December 6 and one in the evening on December 6. The public sessions were advertised through notices in Kingston This Week, the Whig-Standard, and the City's web site and through letters to an extensive list of community and business stakeholders. Over 140 people attended.

December 6th Public Open House

The open house session held on the morning of December 6 provided the opportunity for viewing of displays and informal discussion with City staff and consultant team members. The displays included information about: what an official plan is, the process for the review, and background study information. Stations were set up to provide additional information on the Transportation Master Plan, Natural Heritage Study, and Regional Commercial Study Update. To present the results of the Agricultural Study a rotating presentation was set up. Similarly preliminary concepts for the Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines Study were available for review. Consultants were available to discuss findings with individuals using a standardized comment form to canvass ideas and options.

Throughout the Public Open House and three workshop sessions, questions were addressed by City Planning staff, representatives of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Cataraqui Conservation Authority and by members of the consulting team. A list of participants and consultants involved in these sessions is found at Appendix B. Throughout the room, there were tables with comments forms for participants to provide detailed comments and many people took this opportunity to do so. Their input is included in this report.

November 30th Rural Focus Workshop

The presentation and discussion at the workshop held on November 30 was focused primarily around rural issues. It was held in the afternoon at the Cataraqui Community Centre from 1 to 5 p.m. The workshop format included an overview presentation by the facilitator Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company on the process and format for the workshop. This was followed by a joint presentation by Wes Paetkau, Senior Policy Planner from the

City of Kingston and Catherine Gravely, Principal of Sorensen Gravely Lowes Planning Consultants which highlighted the background, scope, and process for the Official Plan Review. After this orientation, Bob Clark presented the results of the Agricultural Study. The majority of the time was used for table discussions using a workbook that posed a number of questions. At each table, there was a mix of participants and City staff from the Planning and Development Department or consultants who facilitated the discussion. Discussion points were documented using flip charts and the input is included in this report.

December 6th Urban Focus Workshops

The second and third workshops were held on December 6, one in the afternoon and one in the evening. A similar format was used for these workshops with an introductory presentation and table discussions using a workbook. The focus of these two sessions was on urban issues including the Regional Commercial Study Update and Downtown and Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines Study. Input from these sessions is included in this report.

About this Report

The report has been prepared by Sue Cumming, Cumming + Company who is an independent facilitator working with the City of Kingston as part of the consulting team to engage the public in this important study. It is the culmination of detailed input and a summary of feedback received through these interactive sessions. The participants worked diligently through a number of key questions providing their input through workshop table discussions and through individual written comments in the workshop guides. In addition to the workshop discussions, the public had the opportunity to prepare written comments through the workshop guides and over 120 responses were received.

This report is being used by the City and its consultants as a lens from which to view the land use planning framework for the City. The report is not intended as a verbatim account of the public discussion. It reflects the concerns noted and ideas put forward. Where an opinion is widely held by a majority of those that attended this has been noted. Other comments that were held by a number of individual are also indicated. Section 9 includes those comments that were expressed at the workshop and in the written workshop guides that reflect individual concerns and ideas for consideration with the Official Plan Review. All of the views and ideas are relevant and provide significant value to understanding the important directions that the public would like to see incorporated into the Official Plan.

Consultation for the development of the comprehensive Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Review is ongoing and a draft Official Plan is being developed. Future consultation meetings are planned when the draft is available to seek input on the policy directions. Notices for future meetings and workshops will be on the City's web site and advertised by notice in the papers. There is a great deal of interest in the Official Plan reviewed as expressed through attendance at the sessions held for the Issues and Option: Round 1. The facilitator has tried to reflect the input received. In some instances City staff will follow up with a specific response to letter received. The continued interest and involvement of those that attended is appreciated. The public can get involved through any of the following:

- Through the major planning studies available on the City's website.
- By participating in future public sessions that will be posted on the City's

- website and advertised in the local newspapers.
- By providing written comments and filling in comment forms.
 - By contacting the project team members (noted on inside cover)

2. What makes a liveable community

A strong land use planning vision will affect how the City of Kingston will evolve and grow over the next 20 years. The Official Plan will serve as a safeguarding and enabling tool by encouraging the right kinds of growth, development and redevelopment in the right areas and away from significant natural or sensitive areas. The Official Plan will affect how neighbourhoods, commercial areas, the downtown and the waterfront will evolve and the attributes and characteristics that each will have. It will affect how the rural areas are planned and how agricultural land uses will evolve. The Workshop participants discussed how each person would describe what in their opinion would make a liveable community. This was an important question for being able to talk about characteristics that are essential for maintaining the quality of life in Kingston while allowing for growth and redevelopment that will support the community.

2.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Comfortable walkable community which promotes active living for all ages.▪ Natural environment, green spaces and access to it.▪ An accessible and attractive waterfront.▪ Vibrant downtown core.▪ Agricultural character.▪ Preservation of historic areas and buildings.▪ Diversity of housing choice.▪ Strong arts and cultural activities.▪ Diverse and strong commercial base with many employment opportunities.▪ Goods and services nearby.▪ Compact urban form and intensified land use.▪ Ready access to a well designed system of interconnecting community parks, outdoor recreation, natural areas, walking paths and bicycle trails.▪ Access to health care▪ High quality design.▪ Planned communities on full municipal services.▪ Maintained and improving infrastructure▪ Well planned multi-modal transportation system with efficient and affordable transit.

2.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

- Accessibility for all citizens through implementation of universal design principles.
- Strong connections between the urban and rural communities.
- Retention of the rural way of life.
- Diverse opportunities for residential.
- Open space in neighbourhoods.
- Sustainable strategies for waste, resources, finances.
- Variety of recreational facilities (adequate soccer fields), indoor and outdoor community centres.
- Neighbourhoods that are self reliant with access to schools, shopping and community amenities.
- Neighbourhoods that are structured to meet the needs of people instead of buildings and cars.
- Family-friendly with parks and gathering places for social interaction.
- A mix of commercial and residential with opportunities for live/work connections.
- A range of living accommodations including downtown living, and affordable accessible housing.
- A community that provides social equity and diversity

3. On the most significant attributes of Kingston

The City of Kingston has many strengths to build upon for its future. At the public sessions, the participants were asked to identify the attributes that are significant to the City's character and important to its citizens.

3.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan. Overwhelmingly, five themes were noted by all of the participants.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Kingston's history –age of the City, its history, historic character and heritage buildings.▪ Vibrant downtown.▪ Extensive waterfront and navigatable waterways.▪ Presence of significant institutions (Queens, RMC, Kingston Prisons, CFB and other)▪ Kingston's geographic location - regional centre between major urban cities.

3.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

- The City's size, our population remains manageable. The scale that is large enough to support arts yet small enough to have strong community feeling.
- Rural and urban components.
- Easy access to rural area from City.
- Built, natural and cultural history.
- Proximity to larger regional parks and natural heritage areas.
- Access to lakes, rivers, rural areas.
- Strong neighbourhood structure.
- Stable employment with availability of major employers and with strong public sector employment base.
- Great recreation opportunities.
- Creative people, lively social and cultural life.
- Participation in the City.

4. On defining elements of smart growth

There has been much discussion about “smart growth” and the need for a long-term land use planning framework that supports the principles of smart growth. Workshop participants discussed what smart growth means to them in the context of managing challenges and opportunities for growth in Kingston. There was much interest in this discussion with many ideas being noted. The following is a synthesis of the table discussion and individual workshop guides and highlights the themes that emerge from the discussion:

4.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Grow in an orderly fashion, no leapfrogging. Don't expand into new areas until existing areas are intensified and built out. Intensify within the built up urban boundary. Infill and intensification should occur on planned development instead of sprawling into new development areas. Fill in gaps where services are available.▪ Direct growth within existing growth boundaries to strategically use infrastructure. Ensure future development is on full municipal services. Use serviced land prior to considering extension of services. Make better use of the existing developments and neighbourhoods to ensure utilization of existing space and resources.▪ Create strong protections for areas where growth should not occur specifically by preserving and protecting agricultural lands and natural heritage features.▪ Protect the waterfront ensuring open views and access.▪ Make development compact to reduce sprawl, employ good community design principles in all infill and intensification. Ensure that all new development is designed to be integrated and walkable and people-friendly.▪ Encourage redevelopment and intensification in the downtown, underutilized and outdated sites and more dense residential/commercial developing along main transportation corridors (Sir. John A. MacDonald, Princess Street, Division and Montreal Streets).▪ Improve multi-modal transportation system within the City (more emphasis on walking, transit, car pool lots, downtown parking, shuttles, and overall better connections).▪ Establish clear definition of development boundaries. Create strong protections for areas where growth should not occur.

4.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concern raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

- Fill in downtown before building new subdivisions; ensure good transportation to the downtown core. Preservation of heritage buildings and character of downtown should be a top priority.
- The City needs to encourage revitalization and intensification of the urban core by creating more housing and pedestrian ease. Create opportunities for medium density housing in the downtown.
- Keeping distinctive areas distinctive – intensification that leaves the downtown an attractive place to live, work and play. Plan carefully with design to intensify existing neighbourhoods.
- Create more accessible and affordable housing.
- All new development must include Universal Design Principles.
- More employment in the City. Create live/work opportunities – find some pilot project and work on these. Build commercial close to residences.
- Move away from sprawling commercial strips. Redevelop for multiple employment opportunities with good transit and car transportation.
- Kingston needs to be prepared for closures of federal facilities (prisons, military bases, etc) by having a plan for how these lands would be managed.
- Develop strategies and incentives to encourage Brownfield redevelopment.
- Ensure that growth is financially feasible. Infrastructure spending needs to keep pace with development.
- Put infrastructure improvements in place to manage growth as and before it happens.
- Create development with less reliance on the car.
- Make public transit more affordable. There are too many commercial strips, too much dependence on the automobile, lack of sidewalks which relates to a lack of accessibility for people to walk and get to stores, especially in the winter.
- Incorporation of green and walking space to join residential communities
- There is so much building of houses and businesses in the townships while the downtown area remains unchanged
- Ensure that services are available to all whether you live in the city or township

5. On the City's Growth Management Objectives

The City of Kingston has completed an Urban Growth Strategy which identified how the City is intended to evolve and grow over the next 20 years. Growth Management Objectives were developed to provide for the orderly development of the City. The public discussed the Council approved growth management objectives and provided input on what are the important issues and ideas and policies that they would like considered in the new Official Plan?

5.1. City's Growth Direction and Management Objectives

5.1.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Would like to see a greater mixture of uses and intensification of older sites over expansion into Greenfield space.▪ Need to stop sprawl – no more leapfrogging, fill in the gaps.▪ Maintain the green spaces and protect for more.▪ Need stronger recognition of rural/agricultural issues by the City Corporation.▪ Protect agricultural character.▪ Development emphasis should be on good quality infill intensification, redevelopment and brownfield development.▪ Need to create more parking in the downtown. Downtown roads need to be fixed.▪ Public access is diminishing with new buildings. Lack of plan to ensure access to the waterfront. Need to maintain waterfront views. Concern about tall buildings filling in the waterfront.▪ Need to extend waterfront walkway and green space connections.▪ More focus on transportation, car pool lots, transit, shuttles, and better connections.▪ Infrastructure planning should meet the City's short and long-term needs, where we grow east or west or north of 401 will significantly affect this.▪ Maintain infrastructure boundaries where possible.▪ Respect existing neighbourhoods.▪ Contain growth within the urban boundary.

5.1.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

- Council approved land within a committed boundary and that seems to have changed. How can we manage growth if it is allowed beyond committed areas? There is too much flexibility and interpretation.
- Severances add a burden to farmers with more complaints from new homeowners.
- How can we move forward with economic growth while protecting our green spaces, rural areas and avoid sprawling new development
- How will the Hamlets develop?
- Stronger protections to limit tree clearing.
- Need strategies for managing mineral aggregates.
- Plan for adequate recreation facilities.
- Prepare for potential closures of federal facilities (prisons, military bases, etc).
- Address Queen's growth and student housing.
- Would like more discussion of local food system development with complete food cycle.
- Review accessibility policies for transportation, housing and recreation.
- Ensure accessibility of City-owned buildings.
- Use universal design standards in all new and renovated structure public and private.
- Important to ensure that growth is consistent with historic character of Kingston.
- There should be a relationship between the amount of residential development and the population growth.
- Improve east-west transportation connections (i.e. 3rd crossing)
- Ensure that policies are supported through staff and Council actions.
- Educate citizens, staff and Council about need for intensification and smart growth.
- Need to ensure that water supply and the environment are protected.
- Create a conservation designation for the waterfront before there is no waterfront left. This should be added as a Growth Management Objective.

5.2. Ideas and policies to be considered

5.2.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Create more opportunities for mixing uses.▪ Better mix of housing densities.▪ More walkable policy direction.▪ Develop compatibility standards for intensification and infill.▪ Policies need to be more sensitive to rural issues.▪ Develop policies for Hamlets i.e. Glenburnie▪ Protection/preservation of cultural and natural distinctive features,▪ Protect natural/heritage features.▪ Ensure that there are strong policies for coordinated infrastructure expansions.▪ Establish a recreation category within the urban structure.▪ Establish policies for urban agriculture – community gardens, etc.▪ Update Official Plan to include Universal Design Principles.▪ Protect and encourage the downtown.▪ Add a new objective – “to protect built and cultural heritage”.▪ Strengthen no development buffers besides waterways and along waterfront.▪ Encourage commerce and development for job growth.▪ Provide roads and bike paths at the same time as new development occurs.▪ Plan for transportation routes.▪ Cultivate more service focus – bus shelters, washroom facilities – etc to ensure comfort and appeal of transit.

5.2.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

- Include more emphasis on energy efficiency for buildings and transportation.
- Encourage clean industrial growth.
- Encourage and promote residential uses in the downtown but not at the expense of the waterfront.
- Develop flexibility in zoning to allow for appropriate live/work in areas surrounding Queens and downtown
- Create dedication for public creative space, % of new private/public building must be designated for onsite art incorporation
- Strengthen tools for getting public benefits for allowing greater height or density i.e. public lands, waterfront areas, etc.
- Ensure that all lots must be developed on full municipal services.
- Develop healthy community criteria to assess development supporting development that is good for the environment and advances public health.

- Set up guidelines for redevelopment – replace old buildings with more appealing architecture.
- Encourage high-rise residential in strategic locations.
- Stop all urban sprawl! No more severances in the urban-rural split that are not on full services i.e. water, sewer. All planners must be consistent the Official Plan, Committee of Adjustment must be consistent also. No exceptions.
- Local food system development (agricultural lands, complete the food cycle, organic waste back to the lands, develop all elements in a systematic fashion, all areas need simultaneous development.
- Establish stronger protection for no impacts to ecological areas instead of minimizing impacts.
- When significant woodlands and wetlands exist in areas slated for development there needs be increased public input.
- Establish wildlife corridors to connect City to other areas.
- Maintain green space and protect for more.
- Protect and preserve natural heritage areas, protect the sensitive green areas by providing buffer zones next to waterways.
- Create stronger policy protection for natural heritage features including increased buffers.
- Increase developer requirement for green space compensation and tree planting.

6. Views on the proposed future urban boundary for the City

The proposed City Structure Map identifies the future urban boundary for the City. The public discussed what is important about this urban boundary? What concerns do you have, if any? What policies would you like to see in the Official Plan?

6.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Recognize that there is a large inventory of vacant land within the urban area.▪ The City must be careful not to continue to “sprawl” out instead of redeveloping sites within the existing built up areas. Maintain the boundary with no exceptions!▪ Highway No. 401 should be the northern boundary of growth.▪ The western limit needs to be further clarified with support for establishing the urban/rural limit at Collins Creek.▪ There is a support for protecting rural landscape, agricultural uses and green space and focusing growth into existing areas south of the 401.▪ Provide efficient and sustainable infrastructure so that we don’t overextend our resources.▪ Make sure all development takes place on full municipal services. Not premature development on partial services. Development must be phased in.▪ Maintain the boundary. There is support for infilling in existing built up areas within the urban boundary. Do not allow development to leap-frog to a peripheral area.

6.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concern raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

- There are already sufficient employment lands with frontage on the 401
- Within the secondary plan areas, front-ending agreements which allow development ahead of city’s growth needs should not be allowed.
- Retain the agricultural land in secondary planning area north of the 401. Don’t permit development in this area. Support for intensification which allows more natural growth.
- Do not let developers prematurely “jump the queue” or pay for services.
- Strong resistance to new subdivisions that cannot support transit (rural estate lots excepted).
- Ensure that lands within the fully committed boundary are fully serviced i.e. Old

- Front Road, Eunice Drive, and Sydenham Road south of the 401.
- Work with military to see what future plans which may impact growth objectives. That we adequately plan for and provide full municipal services as our urban boundary expands.
- Transit expansion should to include new areas.
- Urban boundary should follow topography. Both sides of the road should be considered when establishing specific development limits.
- Work with our municipal neighbours to address more complimentary planning along the 401.

7. Achieving intensification in Kingston

The 2005 Provincial Policy Statement requires that the City of Kingston plan for strong communities that include intensification and redevelopment. Workshop participants agree with the development of more intensified urban areas including the redevelopment of outdated commercial sites, redevelopment of Brownfield's, intensification in the downtown and infill in existing residential neighbourhoods as key ways to accommodate future growth. Many issues are raised about how best to achieve the intensification while protecting stable neighbourhoods, ensuring compatibility of new uses and appropriate design. Throughout the round one public consultation sessions, participants were asked how to make intensification work. This included what form of development, densities, intensification, mix of uses would be preferable land what concerns would need to be overcome. The following comments were noted:

7.1 Discussion on how intensification can be achieved in Kingston

The following suggestions and ideas were noted on ways to achieve intensification in the City.

7.1.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elevate urban design standards for new development and redevelopment. ▪ Educate citizens on intensification and involve people in the process being mindful to put common good ahead of special interests. ▪ Promote intensification in centres and corridors (Princess, Montreal, Division, Sir John A MacDonald). Increase densities along the mainstreets through mixing uses (live/work/play/services). ▪ Focus intensification in the downtown with full services to support residential population. Encourage more live/work in downtown. ▪ Intensify outdated commercials sites through new mixed uses. ▪ Add second and third stories to commercial uses (malls) for residential. ▪ Redevelop Brownfield sites. It was generally agreed that the City may have to take some risks to jump-start the process. Tax incentives may contribute to demolition and redevelopment.

7.1.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

- Move forward with smaller scale projects.
- Explore strategic upgrade of the capacity of the infrastructure.
- Accommodate existing heritage sites when planning for intensification so as to preserve heritage and integrate within community.
- Intensify below the 401. Protect uniqueness of rural areas and be smart about how to intensify where appropriate hamlets building on existing settlements.
- Encourage affordable housing close to intensified areas.
- Assess and address demographic trends and optimize densities in relation to services, transit, green spaces and mix of housing.
- Develop intensification guidelines to control size, massing, building façades and other design and impact considerations.
- Consider implications of future of provincial properties.
- Consider height (increasing where appropriate).
- Promote commercial interests on the ground floor and affordable housing above.
- Encourage upper floor residential in downtown core.
- Promote the “hub” should be the prime downtown residential area for students.
- Address issues such as parking capacity and needs in core to facilitate intensification.

7.2 What form of development densities, intensification, and mix of what land uses would citizens like to see?

7.2.1 Comments noted which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Reinforce older commercial nodes with residential densities and other uses including medical offices, community and public uses.▪ Support balanced mixed use development which are walkable, have good transit and bike trails.▪ Promote a mix of housing types.▪ Promote a better mixing of commercial and residential uses.▪ Increase densities in the core and ensure services to support including parking.▪ Residential mix with small business.▪ More live/work in downtown. (same as in 7.1)▪ More upper floor residential in downtown core. (same as in 7.1)▪ Residential and commercial should be mixed better with residential above the commercial especially on the main corridors. (same as in 7.1).

7.2.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concern raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

The following key points were noted:

- Redevelop suburban neighbourhoods more intensively.
- Need for more affordable rental housing. Would like to see this in mix of housing developments instead of in one building.
- De-surbanization: Turn strip malls into new urban centres.
- More residential and retail development in the old City of Kingston.
- More commercial and light industrial to build on current employment base.
- Less big-box retail close to downtown. Good mix of small and medium sized retail and more commercial/residential developments.

7.3 Concerns that were identified which need to be overcome

7.3.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Lack of municipal parking downtown.▪ Lack of services and amenities to support increased population in the downtown including grocery uses, public washroom facilities.▪ Keeping high-rise buildings away from the waterfront.▪ Protecting heritage buildings.▪ Protecting natural heritage features.▪ Maintaining more green spaces.▪ Providing a high level of urban design.▪ Parking throughout the City or at least a parking area with transport available to whatever building or venue people are going to.▪ Managing potential conflicts of more growth and development in relation to services available (i.e. access to medical services).▪ How to use intensification to promote more walkable communities and avoid current over reliance on auto use.▪ Ensuring that services are in place.▪ Delivering transit more timely and effectively to support intensification.

7.3.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

The following key points were noted:

- Fear of intensification, growth and development.
- Intensification means more noise conflicts, privacy conflicts.
- How to protect amenity space, walking and cycling paths.
- That infill will be ugly and inappropriate to surrounding neighbourhood.
- Buying back large enough areas to redevelop. Challenge of getting investors and developers to think “redevelopment”.
- Where residents demand large suburban lots, property taxes should reflect the greater cost of servicing these lots.
- Less retail development in the former Kingston Townships (west end).
- As intensify, concerned with how many new big box retail will be put in.
- A tendency to underestimate the impact of residential on contributing positively to the downtown while overestimating the market for more commercial.
- Collins Creek Watershed and Mile Square must be protected from development.
- More focus on developments to attract younger and more technologically advanced.

8. Planning for a consistent yet flexible planning approach

There is a desire to provide flexibility where possible in the new Official Plan in order to enhance the City's regional significance and growth. Areas where change is to be encouraged or development is desired, such as business parks, employment areas and tourist attractions, may require a more flexible proactive policy approach. In areas where very little change is anticipated or desired, such as stable neighbourhoods or heritage areas, a more prescriptive policy approach may be required. There is a need to balance comfort or certainty for landowners, investors and the general public with flexibility to respond in areas to encourage innovation and investment. In other areas preservation and gradual transition is needed.

8.1 When to be more flexible

In response to the following question "What in your view are the circumstances where a more flexible policy approach would be appropriate?"

8.1.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan. Overwhelmingly, five themes were noted by all of the participants.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public

- The majority of those attending the sessions noted that the Planning approach in urban areas has been too flexible in some instances with changes being approved that are not consistent with the existing policy framework.
- Those attending the session on November 30th on rural issues expressed the desire for there to be a more flexible agricultural rural planning approach to support the viability of agricultural uses.
- Increased flexibility supported where there are significant public gains i.e. access to the waterfront.
- Flexibility is generally supported to achieve the following:
 - To change from single-use to mixed use.
 - To encourage Brownfield redevelopment.
 - To encourage redevelopment of areas that are failing.
 - For neighbourhoods for which rejuvenation is likely impossible.
 - For employment lands.
 - Where there are fairly large development sites.
- Flexibility is desirable where it is a solution to potential identified problems but it must be specific within the hierarchy of values to ensure good development. We should not use the goal of intensification as a reason for development of important natural heritage lands.

8.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

The following points were noted:

- When someone wants to bring forward accessible – universal design standards.
- For intensification in areas away from the waterfront close to the city core area.
- When building smart and designing smart.
- Could allow more flexibility when there could be a mix of commercial, industrial and institutions uses.
- Develop policies to and flexible zoning to allow for appropriate live/work in areas surrounding Queens University and downtown.
- For development occurring in committed development area where policies are clear. Would need to look at individual sites for what is appropriate for each site.
- Allow for intensification in older neighbourhoods i.e. combine 2 or 3 lots to build bungalow senior development with small courtyards.
- In depressed areas with poor residential stock and empty storefronts, new ideas and development initiatives not completely conforming to current zoning should be considered.
- The Provincial Policy Statements should be considered a minimum.
- It is okay to be flexible is the principles are met. There needs to be a basic understanding of the values underlying the Plan.

8.3 When to be more prescriptive

In response the question “What in your view are the circumstances where a more prescriptive policy approach is desired?”

8.3.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan. Overwhelmingly, five themes were noted by all of the participants.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public

- To protect views and access to the waterfront.
- Where heritage character is to be maintained.
- To preserve agricultural land.
- To protect natural heritage and green spaces.
- For the protection of setbacks for natural heritage areas. Areas around streams and wetlands should have their buffers written in stone.
- Downtown – because of its importance to Kingston.
- For anything outside of the committed development area.
- Waterfront must be well designed and safeguarded for people activities /entertainment.
- Maintain views of historic heritage sites. Infrastructure with smart design and remediation of drainage – water essential.

8.3.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concern raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

The following points were noted:

- When visual appeal is at risk.
- For student housing to manage density of, requirements of landlords, expectations of Queens which creates the demand and neighbourhood impacts.
- To control height and massing to ensure that the appropriate scale for a site can be developed.
- To require minimum density along Princess Street corridor and in the downtown.
- To develop waterfront for public use with parks and walkways.
- To manage large developments such as subdivisions and large apartment buildings where the scale of the project has impact.

8.4 How should the public be involved in changing circumstances?

In response to the question “How should the public be involved in the implementation of changing circumstances over the next 20 years?”

8.4.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Public input is fundamental. The more input the better.▪ Any significant policy change must require mandatory citizen input.▪ There needs to be an ongoing process for public input on new developments.▪ Public involvement at all phases.▪ Open, transparent process and information sharing with the public.▪ In areas where flexible policies apply, additional public input should be required.

8.4.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals as being important for consideration in developing the new Official Plan.

The following points were noted:

- When reviewing supply of adequate development lands.
- Employ an interactive web site devoted to information on new developments where concerns and comments can be noted.
- Hold more focus groups, workshop style meetings (like ones held on November 30 and December 6). This process is a good start and a good model.
- Consider having public working groups on issues.
- Foster neighbourhood associations with more neighbourhood level consultation on broader city issues. Assist with resources for associations i.e. websites, newsletters, etc.
- More mail outs to alert the people who don't get involved and yell that they never heard about it when the Official Plan is adopted.
- I would be nice to see more visible notices of public consultation. They are easy to miss unless you are diligently looking for them.
- Public meetings that are well advertised, meetings held in the west end.
- When changes are proposed to the Official Plan.
- The public must be fully involved as part of a public education and decision process to determine overall priorities in the long term. Large changes will have to be made soon on how municipal life is conducted.

9. Individual Comments

In addition to the structured discussion at the workshops, it is important to ensure that individual have the opportunity to provide additional comments about the workshop sessions and considerations for the Official Plan Review. There were two paper assistants that aided in this process. The first was Part D of the Workshop Guide and the second was a comment form entitled “Things I didn’t get a chance to say”. The following comments are extracted from these forms.

9.1 Comments about the workshop sessions

9.1.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Well planned and well run session – great format.▪ Very informative meetings.▪ The discussions around the table were exceptional.▪ The worksheet / yellow booklet is excellent.▪ Good group size – allowed everyone a chance to contribute significantly Better acoustics next time.▪ The stations at the open house worked well. It was a good opportunity to talk to the planners.▪ Very good consultation process.

In addition, the following individual comments were noted:

- Would like all presentation materials and the maps readable online.
- Too many communities groups involved and not enough business participation.
- More advertisement in larger ads in the paper.
- More advance notice.
- Notice sent by City received only 3 days before first workshop.
- With such widespread participation how will critical content get included?
- The table discussions – we worked well together, process allowed us to accept criticism well and to find common ground.
- Like the workshop aspect – intro presentation not really needed and too long.
- More focused facilitators at tables.
- Don’t hold session just before Christmas and try to get more people out.
- Use easel for flipcharts.
- Updates on status/upcoming public meetings/etc should be issued with future tax billings as a means of keeping landowners (in particular, out of area owners) informed.
- Update tense (i.e. reads as if done today) for web site to ensure that there is proper representation of information.
- This is long overdue. We need to get this right. Looking forward to the next stage.

- The City may need to put a hold on major developments at a certain stage to prevent someone trying to push through what would not comply with the new Official Plan.
- Some felt sessions too short, others too long.
- Some felt rushed; others felt that the pace of discussion was appropriate.
- Would like to see continued discussion on some themes.
- Involve the public in establishing priorities of where tax dollars are spent. An annual meeting before the budget is decided where the public could have verbal and written input. City staff could provide presentations on funds available to give context to the discussions.

9.2 Individual Comments for consideration

Other Individual Comments to be considered as part of the Official Plan Review are noted in the following:

1. Please review the standards of the provincial Ontario Disability Act and incorporate these standards into the Official Plan. These standards will be enforceable and people can be charged for not following them. Do it at the beginnings and avoid both the expense and problems of renovating.
2. Collins Bay Pen property protected as green space regardless of federal decisions for next 20 years if not agricultural.
3. Makes sure that the City Departments follow the plan and understand what is necessary for implementation. It is also important to ensure that staff has the resources to implement the Plan.
4. Please do not allow urban sprawl or leap-frog developments.
5. Please give all heritage features the attention they deserve. Once they are gone – they are gone. Buffer zones need to be adequate to enhance, preserve and protect.
6. There needs to be a parking strategy for the downtown which will result in more spaces, greater accessibility and low cost to maintain the downtown as a destination and to encourage people to go there. Parking is a real deterrent.
7. The current practice of zoning in Kingston makes it too easy to amend zoning. Kingston is too developer friendly.
8. Negative view of OMB – experiences with OMB have found that it can be a rubber stamp for developers. As currently configured the Board is not useful to those wishing to restrict unrestrained developments.
9. The City of Kingston has a very good layout and atmosphere to live in. The future developments that are being planned such as the large venue entertainment centre should have a very good effect on the City especially tourism.
10. Kingston is great place to live, and the planners and various councils have done some great things. I think, however, that Kingston needs new developments that can encourage growth in different ways than the past. Take the emphasis off building subdivisions that sprawl out a more emphasis on revitalizing urban areas.

11. Aggregate resource mapping should be established before process goes much further.
12. In the Queens area, the area needs to continue its support for two family dwellings, if not consideration for multiple-unit dwellings provided the land support the development (parking, etc.).
13. On parking, don't believe that parking should be reduced below one space per unit, while parking may not be a primary necessity today in the downtown, it may be in future years – it is next to impossible to create after the fact.
14. Residential intensification downtown and in Queen's area will assist to keep a vibrant downtown.
15. Accessibility is now the law in Ontario. The City needs to include a commitment to accessibility in the Official Plan. The infrastructure needs to be put in place.
16. For protection of wetlands, woodlands, species at risk, rivers, lakes, streams and floodplains setbacks are needed to provide protection for the natural ecosystem.
17. Support for the arts. Restore focus on family use and swimming. Use of historical buildings and maintenance i.e. Aberdeen House, TETT Centre, needs to be appropriately maintained for public use. Negotiate with Invista for access to waterfront.
18. Have you included Artscape's plan for the Tett Centre in your background information?
19. Rejuvenate Portsmouth Village.
20. Include the redesignation of the Alcan lands in the new draft Official Plan.
21. Designation should include either introduction of new format retail to reinforce the Princess and Sir John A MacDonald area as a regional commercial node. City of Kingston does not need a detailed commercial hierarchy. Municipalities are eliminating various categories. City only needs three categories – large facilities (over 35,000 square metres), mainstreet, and centres less than 35,000 square metres.
22. Would like more discussion on the option of protecting Agricultural lands with zoning by-laws vs. official designations. It is difficult for us to understand the implications (pros and cons).
23. If Kingston aims to truly integrate the rural areas, I think that they will need to do these 2 things: Come up with a new representation formula: solely by population means that they will forever be underrepresented and facilitation of local markets for produce from the farms into the cit would go a long way to integrate the rural areas into City of Kingston.
24. Ribbon development currently exists along most rural roads. The new plans should allow anyone with property along an existing road to sever of as many lots as they want as long as they have the road frontage of 200 feet and meet requirements for septic and water without doing a plan of subdivision.
25. Infilling is fine below the 401 but don't try and force everyone to live in that area. Allow the creation of nice lots in the rural areas as it is only going to increase your

tax base and give people a choice of where to live. Otherwise they will go to other counties to get the property that is more suited to their lifestyle.

26. My concerns centre on planned development. Developers should never be allowed to escalate phased in development prematurely. All development should proceed only on full municipal services, plans of subdivisions, secondary plans as per the official plan.
27. Upper Princess street from Clergy to old traffic circle needs a special “redevelopment plan” to be incorporated into the OP which goes as far as imposing “some” architectural guidelines so we don’t continue to allow the mish/mash of uses and derelict buildings currently there. Some thought should be put to this part of the City which is an eyesore.
28. Phase out neon signs on lower Brock and Princess Streets where historic buildings are located. It will appeal to tourists more and give downtown a more historic feel. I.e. Port Hope, Niagara-on-the-Lake have no neon signs.
29. Extend pavers and black historic street lights throughout the downtown as I see it is already happening on Wellington Street, etc. continue this trend/policy.
30. Waterfront with public access is very scarce and valuable in the City while correctly zoned industrial the shoreline and major portions of waterfront from Wartman Park through Carruthers Point to Front Road are largely undeveloped. The best beach in the City is within this area as well as valuable and untouched woodlands unique to the area. Birders, dog walkers, cyclers, swimmers, and joggers currently use the area steps in a revised official plan to recognize the huge recreational value of this waterfront and adjoining woodlands and protect it from further degradation. It should ultimately become public parkland.
31. To be included in the official plan is a proposal for a new by-law – a wooded conservation by-law, a municipal fill/site alteration by-law and landscaping guidelines as per the central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study, June 2006.
32. Blending the three plans makes sense. Prioritizing what areas of a certain type should be developed or considered first (and why), north of 401 to some extent, attempt to treat all areas of the City equitably.
33. While it is important to make sufficient land available for growth needs, it is also important to not overstate these needs. Growth in Kingston has not been as fast as predicted.
34. Kingston is blessed with a stock of wonderful 19th and early 20th century properties and a few examples of interesting and good later buildings. We need to begin by identifying those properties which are worthy of preservation through individual, streetscape and district designation. These constitute interesting streetscapes and neighbourhoods. In many cases these properties are being lost through neglect, unsympathetic repairs and additions and exploitations. The City must reverse this trend or it is going to lose one of its major economic assets.
35. The term “adjacent” properties in the PPS need to be more than properties on either side. It needs to be a radius if we are serious about protecting the integrity of a heritage property.

36. Areas for heritage conservation district designation should include: Market Square, Barriefield, Lower Sydenham District, Portsmouth Village, King Street Corridor, Alamein Drive, Areas in King's Town District, Areas in Williamsville District, Downtown Core, Historic parks and the properties facing onto them and clusters of heritage properties in the rural area.
37. Judgment on minor variances should be based on whether or not the proposal constitutes good planning for the neighbourhood, not trying to please the applicant. We need major improvements on what is being recommended for approval by the Planning Department.
38. Concerns about "visual pollution" – signs, etc.
39. To prevent urban sprawl, the more green space that we have in the City the better. Build on successes of Little Cataraqui marshland which is a fabulous asset to the City. The popularity of LeMoine Point, the Phych Hospital and Lakeshore Park indicate their importance too.
40. Ensure buffers around all of waterways, marshlands and woodlands within the City. We need continuous corridors for animals to move in and out of areas.
41. Congestion caused along the causeway. Need for more north/south corridors required i.e. Wellington Street extension.
42. The proposed change to move the urban boundary westward of Collins Creek to include Mile Square is not supported. The proposed development within Mile Square includes low-density housing and a golf course. Pesticide, herbicide and nutrient run-off from a golf course would further pollute the watershed. There are very significant ecological and recreational reasons not to include this unique natural habitat within the development boundaries. Given current environmental stresses such as climate change and the loss of green space in urban Canada it is imperative that we do what we can to protect remaining natural spaces for future generations.
43. Changes to the plan – moving of the urban boundary must be explained to the public, especially when two previous study groups have reported to the City that these areas (Collins Creek westward to Mile Square) should not be included in this boundary. To be included in the official plan is a proposal for a new by-law – a wooded conservation by-law, a municipal fill/site alteration by-law and landscaping guidelines as per the central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study, June 2006.
44. Provide resources to the planning department to provide more proactive guidance to development proposals.
45. The sooner the Official Plan is put into place the better. This will help our community achieve growth and diversity in the long-term.
46. Flexibility to respond to new ideas and approaches. It is impossible to anticipate all possible new opportunities i.e. promoting green design.
47. If the City permits development (which is not supported) outside the urban growth line developers should pay for all costs associated with expanding water, sewer and transportation.
48. We all live in Kingston and should be part of the process. Need to stop catering to

influential families.

49. Put in place heavy penalties for slumlords and residents to provide a disincentive for unkempt properties, and help redevelop older residential areas downtown.
50. Please give all heritage features the attention they deserve. Once they are gone – they are gone. Buffer zones need to be adequate to enhance, preserve and protect. Don't compromise our unique ecosystem around waterways; preserve the area around Collins Creek with a boundary extending west from Coronation Blvd. no development east of Coronation Blvd. to the Creek, stop at the creek.
51. I am concerned about the effects of urban sprawl. The boundary must remain as shown on the map at Collins Creek. Maintain the current green space west of the Creek and declare/rezone it as a conservation area. Make the boundary in the west end at Collins Creek – no more westerly than the creek. The proposed change to move the urban boundary westward of Collins Creek to include Mile Square is not supported. There are very significant ecological and recreational reasons not to include this unique natural habitat within the development boundaries.
52. Include in the Official Plan is a proposal for a new by-law – a wooded conservation by-law, a municipal fill/site alteration by-law and landscaping guidelines as per the central Cataraqui Region Natural Heritage Study, June 2006.
53. The urban boundary as shown in the proposed city structure map fails to allow for growth along Highway 15 to the 401.
54. Flexibility is required to encourage alternative energy sources – wind/solar.
55. Amend OP and Zoning of Alcan lands to promote redevelopment and environmental remediation. Consider mix of retail, office and residential.
56. Recommended buffers around wetlands and green spaces should be adhered to – refer to CRCA Natural Heritage Study, and Provincial Policy Statement.
57. The 30 metre buffer around stream beds and wetlands not considered provincially significant is inadequate and needs to be increased to at least 60 metres. Paths placed within these buffers should not impede wildlife crossings.
58. Development along Butternut Creek has already been allowed too close and it is a good example of what not to do.

Appendix A

Recent major planning studies:

Information on these studies is available through the City of Kingston web site.

- Focus Kingston Progress Report, 2006.
- Population and Housing Projections, 2003 and 2006.
- Downtown Action Plan, 2003.
- Cycling & Pathways Study/Transportation Master Plan, 2003 and 2004.
- City Owned Industrial Land (COIL) Development Strategy, 2005.
- Central Cataraqui Natural Heritage Strategy, 2006.
- Kingston Model for Affordable Housing Development, 2005.
- Urban Growth Strategy.
- Land Use Survey Update, 2005.
- Municipal Brownfields Program.
- Urban Design Guidelines: North Block Central Business District, 2004.
- Waterfront Strategy (Background Report)(in progress).
- Regional Commercial Study Update.
- Agricultural Study (in progress).
- Downtown & Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines (in progress).

Appendix B

The City of Kingston appreciates the participation and contribution of the following individual who attended the public sessions. The asterisk represents where individuals attended more than one event.

Paige Agnew	Diane Duttle*	Patricia Johnson
John Armitage	Dennis Eberhard	Kenzie Johnstone
Joan Axelrad	James English	Joche Katan
Jason Barbosa	Robin Etherington	Bill Kehler
Doug Barker	Lindsey Fair, KEDCO	Lorraine Kenney
Joseph Barr	Elaine Farragher	Rudy Copenhouse
Barbara Baxter	Helen Flutap	Alex Lacasse
Claude Bellerose	Nancy Foster	H. Lashi
Marilyn Birmingham	Pete Freeman	Bob Little
Barbara Bradfield	Skyler Freeman	Graham Lodge*
J.P. Briggs	Shirley French	Mark Lodge
Katrina Broughton	Steve Garrison	Lorne Long
Pierre Brunex	Treena Garrison	Jeff Lowes
Roger Bryant (Cruikshank)	Mary Gartenburg*	Bruce Lyons
John Byers	Jason Gilmour	Jeanne Ma
Rose-Marie Burke	Peter Ginn	Gord MacGregor
Ryan Burley	Bill Glover	Joyce MacI Hood-Kune
Chris Cannon*	Bob Gordon	Irena Manolu
Kym Clark	David Grier	Tyler Medeiros
Siobhan Coady	Ron Griffiths	John McCance*
Sharon Critchley	Andrea Gunn	Matt Money
Andrea Cumpson	Peter Gunn	Jane Murphy
Jason Cyr	Mathew Gventer	Ignacio Garcia-Nicoletti
Taneda Dawes*	John Halloran*	John O'Neil
Dan DaCoste	Suzanne Hamilton	Lisa Osanic
Carolyn Davies	Mark Hanley	Mary Elisabeth Poirier
Eric Davies	Betty Harlow*	Paul Rappell
Mary Margaret Dauphine	Bob Harlow*	Alec Ross
Bernard DeGarince	Steve Harvey	Andrew Sacret
Charlene Deyarmond, Ontario Realty Corporation	Rob Hutchison	Carol Seymour*
Kim Donavan	Kim Bo Kastiknev	Murray Seymour*
Brenda Draper	Daniel Hee	Liz Schell
	Kris Hebert	Bob Scott
	Dorothy Hector*	Jeff Scott
	Rob Hutchinson	Gerry Shoalts*

Rory Dimnish-Shut
Stan Sinkins
Sergio Sismondo
Martin Skolnick
Ed Smith
Rebecca Spawldix
Bryan Springer

Doug Springer
Michael Springer
R. Sramek
Doug Swift, ORC
Vince Terprstra*
Glenn Tolls
Nancy Tolls

Darrell Townsend
John Turner
Linda Whitfield
John Williamson
Christine Yee*

Appendix C

City of Kingston Official Plan Review Summary Feedback Report

Input received on the Regional Commercial Study Update

Report from Public Open House and Workshops held on November 30 and December 6, 2006



This report has been prepared by the independent facilitator. It is not intended as a verbatim account and is provided here as a record of the input. Direct Comments on the report to: Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming + Company, Tel: 416 406-6607 cumming@total.net

Regional Commercial Study Update

1. Regional Commercial Study Update

"The Regional Commercial Study Update (RCSU) was commissioned in 2005 to review commercial policies and make recommendations with respect to harmonizing the commercial policies of the three Official Plans which have remained in force after amalgamation. The Commercial Study was undertaken by Sorensen Gravely Lowes Planning Consultants Inc. and "urbanMetrics inc." as market consultants. The draft report received by the City in June 2006 . The RCSU: reviewed and compared Official Plan policies, reviewed the findings of the 1999 Regional Commercial Systems Study, commented on more recent trends in retailing, reviewed approaches of other communities, and addresses issues the City is facing including the conversion of industrial sites to commercial use, and policy strategies to re-position older commercial areas for new activities.

The Study makes specific recommendations with respect to a commercial hierarchy for the enlarged City and modifications or additions to planning. The Study makes specific recommendations with respect to a commercial hierarchy for the enlarged City and modifications or additions to planning policy that can be used in the new Official Plan."

The first round of public input to the Official Plan was held on November 30 and December 6, 2006. One public open house was held on December 6 in the morning and three workshops were held - one in each of the afternoons on November 30 and December 6 and one in the evening on December 6. The public sessions were advertised through notices in Kingston This Week, the Whig-Standard, and the City's web site and through letters to an extensive list of community and business stakeholders. Over 140 people attended.

The Official Plan consultation sessions were intended to identify issues and to learn of ideas for consideration as part of the development of a draft Official Plan document. It was also designed to present recently completed or ongoing background reports including the Regional Commercial Study Update, the Agricultural Study and initial findings of the Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines Study. The emphasis of these sessions was to engage and listen to the public. The scheduling of these events was planned to optimize participation by ensuring that the public had the opportunity to attend during the day and in the evening.

The Official Plan Consultation Sessions held on December 6, 2006 provided information on the findings of the Regional Commercial Study Update and provided the opportunity for public discussion on important aspects of various types of shopping, ideas for maintaining the viability of existing commercial shopping. A discussion of how to plan for other uses on outdated commercial strips and a discussion about Downtown Kingston. A workshop booklet outlined several key questions and this report is a summary of the input received.

2. Important aspects of various types of shopping

Participants were asked to identify what aspects for example location, traveling distance, and amenities are important about daily shopping, weekly shopping and comparative shopping.

2.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public		
Daily Shopping	Weekly Shopping	Comparative Shopping
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Short walking distance, cycling distance ▪ Get there by foot, specialty shopping and services. ▪ Emphasis on sidewalks and pathways. ▪ To meet localized needs. ▪ On your way shopping – home, work, daycare. ▪ Accessible buildings and sidewalks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Medium walking distance. ▪ Within walking, cycling distance or short drive or on bus routes. ▪ 15 minute drive. ▪ Mixed services: library, fitness centre. ▪ Variety of stores. ▪ Part of a large planned shopping centre. ▪ Accessible buildings and transportation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Driving or bus - 30 minute drive. ▪ Downtown model or mall model – not big box model. ▪ Choice. ▪ Must be easily walkable with lots of stores in small area - clustering of services and shops. ▪ Large format planned shopping centre. ▪ Accessibility once at location is a factor.

2.3 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- Daily shopping should be located and allowed everywhere in the urban areas – need parking, can walk or bus.
- Trends around use of internet, telephone and ads stuffed in mailbox to comparison shop for most large items. Don't always need to travel to stores.
- In the west end, location and availability great – just too many stores
- Too many grocery stores now in the west end
- Willing to travel, to reduce big box stores
- Cat centre is great. Good location, access for all and out of elements, unlike RioCan, bad idea especially for elderly/disabled.

3. Ideas for maintaining the viability of existing commercial shopping

A number of outdated or vacant commercial sites exist in the City which has raised the issues of how best to plan for new commercial development while respecting and ensuring the continued viability of the downtown and the existing commercial sites. At the December 6, 2006 workshops, there was a discussion of how best to maintain the viability of existing commercial shopping in the City. A key question was posed about impact tests. In response to the question as to whether impact tests should be applied to new commercial proposals, the majority of participants agreed that these should be done.

3.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ There was agreement that impact tests should be applied to all commercial proposals.▪ Tests for new commercial proposals should consider capacity and impact on downtown.▪ Test should determine impacts on other commercial areas already established.▪ New development should reinforce current commercial nodes.

3.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- Will City Council be prepared to refuse an application which would serve the broader public interest and site specific benefits vs. longer term community viability?
- New development should reinforce current commercial nodes.
- We need to recognize that as trends change we need to retain flexibility as it relates to our Official Plan.
- City should consider tax relief for staying downtown.
- City should consider concessions for making stores and buildings accessible.
- Do tests for commercial proposals of a significant size (what ever that may be) Hopefully Frontenac Mall may get a new lease on life with Centennial Drive extensions, more density to the north).
- Do all of the tests that you like, our free market economy will have the final say on what commercial enterprises we will end up with.
- Existing commercial – much of its viability is up to the business owner. Impact tests vs. competition.
- When is there a surfeit of commercial development? An aging population must be considered – smaller stores are easier to navigate for elderly and disabled.

- Big centres such as Rio Can have stores that really don't make sense, and as a result there is already quite a turnover. The standard model of these places doesn't fit our area.

4. Ideas for other uses on outdated commercial strips

For outdated commercial strips that have lost their retail function, there was a discussion about what ideas or policies should be considered to plan for other uses. The following comments were noted.

4.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow flexibility to encourage their creative redevelopment. ▪ Redevelop for housing, other business uses and community uses. ▪ Encourage residential development – higher density on some site and compatible infill on others. ▪ Encourage redevelopment for a mix of uses. ▪ Create opportunities for public uses such as: health clinics, adult learning centres, schools, community centres, recreation centres (indoor and outdoor), artist's studios to cite a few.

4.2 Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- Some may not be worth retaining. It may be better to redevelop the land or to rezone it.
- Perhaps if impact tests had been applied to these areas, they probably would not be sitting empty now.
- Keep a neighbourhood commercial/service component if economically feasible.
- Look at sites for potential for affordable accessible housing for people with disabilities and people who are living below the poverty line and the working poor.
- More out patient medical facilities, turn them all into Doctor's offices and fill them with doctors

5. Downtown Kingston: What people value and ideas for its improvement

Throughout the public discussion, the downtown was highlighted as an important attribute of the City and as an area which is enjoyed by many for its history, unique shopping, restaurants, activities and waterfront. There were a number of workshop questions that focused on the downtown and the following highlights the opinions and ideas noted.

5.1 What people value about Downtown Kingston.

5.1.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Unique downtown setting amidst waterfront and historic setting.▪ Waterfront access.▪ Diversity of experiences.▪ Variety of merchants and uniqueness of stores.▪ Its cultural life, restaurants, entertainment (outdoor), festivals, events, farmers market, meeting places (pubs and cafes).▪ Attractive built form with compact densities and mix of uses.▪ Sense of community, strong sense of place, vibrant and people oriented.▪ Lots of activity for all ages.▪ Ability to walk everywhere within the downtown.▪ Look and character with decorative elements, hidden walkways, benches and patios.▪ Beautiful limestone historical buildings

5.1.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- New market square.
- Attraction for tourists.
- Downtown Kingston BIA events and festivals, etc.
- Downtown for working and living.
- Accessibility and parking.
- Pedestrianized sidewalks/streetscape
- Outdoor entertainment.
- Water access and harbour activities.
- Preservation/enhancement of the series of walkways/courtyards that are currently used for parking
- Courtyards and passageways should be encouraged for redevelopment

5.2. Commercial functions to be maintained and encouraged in the downtown.

The following describes commercial functions that the public would like to see maintained and encouraged in the downtown.

5.2.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Encourage mix of business and services uses to ensure vibrancy.▪ More Jobs.▪ More residents.▪ Continuation of unique retail shops.▪ More office space.▪ Grocery stores.▪ Full service uses to accommodate a growing residential population.▪ Daily life needs.▪ Restaurants, cafes and entertainment uses.▪ Health services.▪ Arts and culture uses.▪ Better services in the downtown – public washrooms.▪ Improved waterfront access.▪ Better parking

5.2.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- Marinas, ferries, docks.
- Conference centre.
- Recreation uses.
- Bookstores (new and used), specialty grocery stores, services (picture framing, shoe repair, hair salons, etc.), hardware stores, banks, and clothing stores.
- Support small scale local businesses, more parking garages needed.
- More office space – need people working and living downtown.
- New format retail uses now, larger stores to draw shoppers from the entire City.
- Grand theatre.
- Screening room (repertory cinema).
- Tourism related business.
- Encourage education /campus node.
- Diverse restaurants and shops
- Parking that does not cost as much as your meal

5.3 Ideas for improving the downtown as a key destination.

The following describes ideas and policies that the public would like to see considered for the Official Plan to improve the downtown as a key destination:

5.3.1 Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Implement a downtown parking strategy to increase available, affordable parking downtown.▪ More residential to build on sense of community and vibrancy.▪ Services and amenities to support increased population in the downtown including grocery uses.▪ Services and facilities including public washroom facilities, bicycle lock-ups.▪ Delivering transit more timely and effectively to support intensification.▪ Continue with ongoing programs with festivals and events and encourage/support/foster cultural events and historical events.▪ Preserve and enhance series of walkways/courtyards.▪ Continue to support unique shopping and restaurant uses and ensure through policy the continued vibrancy and viability of the downtown.▪ Build on green space connections and waterfront walkway creating unique cycling opportunities and new draws for the downtown.▪ Expand on attractions near ferry docks, marina and services for boaters making the Kingston downtown a key destination for boaters.

5.3.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- The downtown should be number one in the City's commercial hierarchy.
- The downtown is a great for the City. It is what really makes us unique and stand out from the rest of the Province and this needs to be nurtured and protected.
- Downtown needs to coordinate the marketing and hours of operation. Need more of the staple products.
- Promote the downtown.
- Seek further opportunities for art centres, community centres, convention centres, office and entertainment uses that will draw people to the area.
- Offer municipal incentives that encourage more spending to encourage office space.

- Consider tax incentives for restoring older buildings and consistency in approach to signage.
- Keep downtown area clean.
- Consider creation of a pedestrian zone. Designate at least one street that connects with Ontario Street as a pedestrian mall – this has been done with great success in other urban areas.
- Better bus system is needed.
- Many complain about the lack of availability and cost of downtown parking. Real or perceived this is a deterrent for people going to the downtown. Explore opportunities for underground parking, organized municipal lots, motorcycle, and bicycle parking, longer term and short stay parking.
- Develop Queen Street as a commercial/creative hub.
- Non-viable business locations (such as northwest corner of Johnson and Ontario) should be examined for a viable solution.
- Council vision and determination to maintain and improve downtown.
- Motorcycle parking a must *
- Better linkages with Queens University at Division Street
- Create incentives for building residences – this alone is a deterrent for downtown living.

5.4 Ideas for improving the downtown as a place to live?

The following describes ideas and policies that the public would like to see considered for the Official Plan to improve the downtown as a place to live:

5.4.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages to be reflected in the Official Plan.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attract grocery stores and shops and services for daily living needs. ▪ Provide for more services and amenities. ▪ Deliver transit more timely and effectively to support intensification. ▪ Look at opportunities for upper storey residential, medium density housing projects, and infill projects. ▪ Create a more connected pedestrian walkway system and linkage to the waterfront. ▪ Develop neighbourhood plans for the downtown. ▪ Keep it clean. ▪ Enforce property standards. ▪ Ensure that the area is well lit and safe.

5.4.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- Queen Street need to be used as part of commercial area.
- Keep streets clean and encourage more housing units downtown.
- Maintain the streets and attend to snow removal.
- Improvements to waterfront to promote pedestrian activity.
- Create more things to do with respect to the waterfront.
- Assess the scale of new residential to keep it lower and more integrated. Move higher density residential tall buildings away from the waterfront.
- Continue to foster the sense of community and participation in decision-making.
- Better linkages with Queens University at Division Street.
- Eliminate student housing slum lords.
- Create incentives for building residences – this alone is a deterrent for downtown living.
- Make it reasonable and workable for developers and landlords to turn unused spaces (old stores, etc) into apartments and lofts.

Appendix D

City of Kingston Official Plan Review Summary Feedback Report

Input received on the Downtown and Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines

Report from Public Open House and Workshops held on November 30 and December 6, 2006



This report has been prepared by the independent facilitator. It is not intended as a verbatim account and is provided here as a record of the input. Direct Comments on the report to: Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming + Company, Tel: 416 406-6607 cumming@total.net

Downtown and Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines

1. Downtown and Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines

The Downtown and Harbour Area Architectural Study is underway and identifies architectural guidelines for the restoration, redevelopment and new construction in the City's Downtown and Harbour Area to ensure that proposed development of new buildings or alteration or restoration of existing buildings is compatible with existing built forms and features. The study is another tool to fulfill the Official Plan requirements of the former City of Kingston that call for the need to preserve the character of the core area. Recommendations from this study will be included in a secondary plan for the Downtown.

The first round of public input to the Official Plan was held on November 30 and December 6, 2006. One public open house was held on December 6 in the morning and three workshops were held - one in each of the afternoons on November 30 and December 6 and one in the evening on December 6. The public sessions were advertised through notices in Kingston This Week, the Whig-Standard, and the City's web site and through letters to an extensive list of community and business stakeholders. Over 140 people attended.

The Official Plan consultation sessions were intended to identify issues and to learn of ideas for consideration as part of the development of a draft Official Plan document. It was also designed to present recently completed or ongoing background reports including the Regional Commercial Study Update, the Agricultural Study and initial findings of the Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines Study. The emphasis of these sessions was to engage and listen to the public. The scheduling of these events was planned to optimize participation by ensuring that the public had the opportunity to attend during the day and in the evening.

Baird Sampson Neuert Architects consultants undertaking the study overviewed information at the December 6th Open House and Workshops and received input on preliminary concepts and ideas. The following are the points noted and are organized in response to four questions. This summary reflects the input of those that attended the session on December 6th and includes eight written responses.

2. Architecture and streetscapes in the Downtown and Harbour Area

The public expressed their views on the existing architecture and streetscapes in the Downtown and Harbour Area. The following architectural and streetscape attributes were identified.

2.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Heritage building resources.▪ Restoration of some of the historic buildings has been done well (i.e. along Brock Street).▪ Cultural heritage in the downtown.▪ Limestone buildings.▪ Small scale of buildings.▪ Building envelopes that are close to the streets in situations that won't block important, vital views.▪ Cobblestone paving (like market square).▪ Opportunity to have various styles with options and flexibility.

2.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- Unusual retail (specialized).
- It is not too cute like old Unionville.
- Views to lake from upper Princess and other streets.
- Nice appropriately sized signage.
- Nice public parks and open spaces.
- Mural parking garage.
- Opportunity to have an area of heritage buildings where they more or less fit with each other and form a community or, an area with diverse types of architecture which will still blend with and be restored to respect the community.
- Would like to see empty buildings filled.
- Approach to downtown from arterial roads needs improving.

3. Concerns about the existing architecture and streetscapes

The following points were noted what people don't like and concerns that they have about the existing architecture and streetscapes in the Downtown and Harbour Area:

3.1. Comments noted by individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by individuals.

1. Concerns about mismatch in scale and height.
2. Concern about loss of views with increased building heights at waterfront.
3. Improvement is needed with signage with a preference for front lit painted signs, no neon and signage that should not project from the building face.
4. Would like to see the heritage conservation district expanded west and north to include Princess Street.
5. Some key sites need to be reworked i.e. would like to see Princess Towers demolished, empty Plain concrete buildings corner of Brock and King should be demolished and improvements to hotel properties which seem to monopolize the waterfront access.
6. No more flat roofs unless they are at least three floors above the sidewalk or have some graceful facades to camouflage the ugly flatness.
7. City control over colour - need to clarify intent and application.
8. Mandated views through downtown can have a negative impact to development.
9. More need for homogeneity to capitalize on historic architectural quality.
10. Trees that died and been destroyed should be replaced.
11. More downtown development that appeals to a wider housing market—currently downtown housing focus is for seniors.
12. High rises and hotels are ugly and block access to the waterfront from pedestrians – are also unattractive from the water.
13. Improve waterfront with more amenities. Good water's edge patios, restaurants and activities.
14. Confederation Park archway sculpture is awful.
15. Regulation is required to prevent long-term vacancies or burned out buildings.
16. Approach to downtown is unsatisfactory from Highway 401 – streetscape to be considered all the way into downtown from 401 exits.
17. Paving on streets – potholes and bumps detract from appearance and create noise pollution that detract from environment for those enjoying patios or residents – i.e. Brock and Wellington.
18. Don't locate all commercial activities outside of the downtown like food shopping, Food stores are critical to creating vibrancy in the downtown and making it a good place to live. Downtown is a good example of how car trips can be reduced because it is walkable.
19. The streets need to be repaired and upgraded.

4. Qualities suggested for improvement in the Downtown and Harbour Area

The following lists the architectural and streetscape qualities that people would like to see most improved in the Downtown and Harbour Area:

4.1. Comments noted by individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by individuals.

1. Implement a streetscape and signage and other design features to improve the approach to downtown from all Highway 401 exits.
2. Develop gateway features at Princess and Division.
3. Apply universal design standards to improve accessibility throughout the downtown.
4. Develop more residential downtown for mix of residents.
5. Encourage heritage conservation with both incentives and disincentives with zoning controls and architectural guidelines that have flexibility and transparency.
6. Strong push for architecturally pleasing building design.
7. Implement design guidelines for all renewal projects.
8. Develop a strategy to rejuvenate emptied buildings to create vibrancy. Restore burned out buildings.
9. Clean-up some of the buildings etc that are starting to look rundown.
10. Create through block pathways.
11. Provide for public washrooms downtown.
12. Increasing height of some buildings that don't block views.
13. Fix up paving on streets – potholes and bumps that detract from appearance.
14. Extend pavers and black historic lights throughout the downtown i.e. what is happening on Wellington Street.
15. Ban neon signage and implement signage control that has had good results in other communities i.e. Port Hope and Niagara on the Lake.
16. Need to create transition opportunities for old retail to new uses. Old retail could be used for low-cost starts-ups or arts groups
17. City should help fund program to encourage use of unused upper floors.
18. Upper Princess Street from Clergy to old traffic circle needs a special “redevelopment” plan to be incorporated into the Official Plan with architectural guidelines to avoid the continuance of mismatched development.
19. Replacement and refurbishment of facades to be similar to what is existing for historic buildings.

5. Attributes or qualities for any potential new development proposals

The following lists the attributes or qualities that people would like to see in any potential new development proposals in the Downtown or Harbour Area:

5.2 Comments noted by individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by individuals.

1. All new development should include historic design features that complement the existing built form in the downtown.
2. Desire for infill in the downtown around core historic areas.
3. Height is an issue and new buildings should not obstruct or disrupt views to City Hall dome.
4. Need to safeguard views; these are being lost through recent new high density construction along the waterfront.
5. Differentiate 21st Century / 20th Century / 19th Century buildings.
6. Implement intelligent design that builds upon the “limestone City” foundation.
7. Create a plan to overcome the concern about potential mismatch in scale and height.
8. Would like to see high quality residential downtown.
9. Plan and develop the downtown as a place to live with more opportunities for and range of housing that appeals to a wider market.
10. Consider having an LRT from Highway 401.
11. Good waters edge patios, restaurants and activities.
12. Pedestrian path at waterfront.
13. Park at waterfront for large outdoor venues.
14. More people friendly access to the waterfront.
15. More public access to harbour.
16. Trees where possible.
17. Buildings built to near maximum envelope.
18. Create centralized parking near Princess.
19. Develop attractive safe structured parking.
20. Structured parking with green “attributes”: storm water collection and solar energy.
21. Universal design standards for all projects.
22. Accessibility to the waterfront ensuring that no new buildings become a barrier blocking views and access.
23. Consider lower form buildings and stepping back from the waterfront.
24. New public washrooms that are open 24 hours are required.

Appendix E

City of Kingston Official Plan Review Summary Feedback Report

Input received on the Agricultural Study

Report from Public Open House and Workshops held on November 30 and December 6, 2006



This report has been prepared by the independent facilitator. It is not intended as a verbatim account and is provided here as a record of the input. Direct Comments on the report to: Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming + Company, Tel: 416 406-6607 cumming@total.net

Agricultural Study

1. Agricultural Study

The Agricultural Study is an important building component for the development of the new Official Plan. The first round of public input to the Official Plan was held on November 30 and December 6, 2006. One public open house was held on December 6 in the morning and three workshops were held - one in each of the afternoons on November 30 and December 6 and one in the evening on December 6. The public sessions were advertised through notices in Kingston This Week, the Whig-Standard, and the City's web site and through letters to an extensive list of community and business stakeholders. Over 140 people attended.

The Official Plan consultation sessions were intended to identify issues and to learn of ideas for consideration as part of the development of a draft Official Plan document. It was also designed to present recently completed or ongoing background reports including the Regional Commercial Study Update, the Agricultural Study and initial findings of the Downtown and Harbour Architectural Guidelines Study. The emphasis of these sessions was to engage and listen to the public. The scheduling of these events was planned to optimize participation by ensuring that the public had the opportunity to attend during the day and in the evening.

At the workshop held on November 30th and at the Open House and Workshops on December 6, 2006, Clark Consulting Services overviewed their key findings on the Agricultural Study. The workshop on November 30 was focused on rural issues and in addition to receiving general comments, there were a number of specific discussion questions where input was sought. These same questions were utilized for the sessions on December 6 through the opportunity to review the Clark Consulting presentation and to have informal discussions with Bob Clark. Comment forms were also available. The following summary of public includes the workshop discussion on November 30 where over 30 people attended and the written comments received at the December 6 sessions from six individuals.

2. Suggestions to address the changing nature of farming.

The public was asked based on what you they heard from the presentation, for suggestions to address the changing nature of farming. The following comments were noted:

2.1. Policies suggested

A discussion took place on what policies people would like to see considered in the Official Plan that would address the changing nature of farming.

2.1.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants that should be considered.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public

- Ensure the long-term protection of agricultural land while moving forward with policies and incentives that would support the viability of farming.
- Large areas and rural land should be designated and protected for agricultural use.
- Good farmland should be protected from development.
- Development should be restricted where it will interfere with farm operation and present increased costs to taxpayers in future or where farm operations might cause excessive exposure of residents to farm chemicals and pesticides.
- Protect natural heritage features with setbacks when “development” occurs on farms.

2.1.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

- Integration of health and welfare of community with all aspects of farming should be a goal of the Official Plan policies.
- Nutrient management /source water protection / Clean Water Act results in loss of community.
- Need to consider policies supporting establishment of Agricultural Land Trust.
- Make it easier to be successful in small farming activities by reducing restrictions.
- More flexibility is needed for allowing family members (grown kids) to have housing on farms through long-term leases instead of requiring severances which then divides the land.
- We must preserve, enhance, compatible land uses. The municipality should promote farming practices.

2.2. Role of the City in promoting farming

The role of the City in promoting farming was a key issues raised at November 30th workshop. Those from the rural community noted that there needs to be an increased awareness of the importance of agriculture within the City. Many expressed concerns that they feel underrepresented on Council and feel that there need to be more focus and action on working with the rural community. The following are specific ideas and comments were put forward:

2.2.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Rural /urban disconnect noted.▪ Need for a champion at City Hall to advocate on behalf of the farming community.▪ Lack of strong representation at Council with only one Councillor representing the rural area.▪ Focus at City Hall is on urban issues.▪ More support needed on promoting farming practices.▪ Create a liaison role with the farming community to sort out farming problems – an ombudsmen type of function – municipal road liaison.▪ Need to strike a task force to develop ideas and bring the agricultural community together with urban representative.▪ City encouragement of local food purchasing.▪▪

2.2.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- There needs to be more support from the City in promoting farming practices.
- It was suggested that the municipal ward boundaries be restructured for the 2010 election to have at a minimum two councilor representing the rural area.
- The City should encourage and assist farmers in providing local food to local people.
- Buy local! A small farmer’s market in the west end would be desirable. If the City supports other development, why not support farmers market in the west end of Kingston!
- To make available information to rural residents and farm operations – items such as the OMAFRA fact sheets and other information in hard copies.
- The city should develop an incentive program to support pilot initiatives and incubators for rural economic development to encourage new uses and to support small scale home industries and operations, farm industries, etc.

2.3 Improvements required for municipal services in the rural area:

The following improvements were noted:

2.3.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protect water supply ▪ Drainage is a number 1 issue for all farms. ▪ Drainage remediation is an issue. ▪ Roads and hydro would be required for marketing way of a co-op. ▪ Good roads. ▪ Transportation and communication infrastructure should be enhanced. ▪ Places for rural people to congregate to inside and outside.

2.3.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

- Alternate energy
- No encroachment on farms
- Busing in the rural area.'
- Snow ploughing and road maintenance not as good post amalgamation.
- Look at old rights of way not developed in rural areas for increased access.

3. Ideas and policies to encourage uses which support farming operations

3.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support local production and markets. ▪ Identify needs and support for small family farms. ▪ Create places to sell products; not just a farmers but owners of small pieces of property. Need more indoor farmers markets. Suggestion to create farmers markets in an outlying area (i.e. MacAdoo Raceway). ▪ Improve access to urban market (infrastructure and marketing). ▪ Explore ideas for increasing the ability to supplement the farm income on property (i.e. using existing facilities – small industry). ▪

3.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

The following points were noted:

- Pay attention to food security - availability of land, access to markets.

- Combine uses of small farms and leased land to make a larger farm operation especially if landowners are required to use A1 to A3 for agricultural uses because they get tax incentives.
- Put farm land to use even if it is for tree farming.
- Recognize flexible farm lot size based on type of agriculture.
- Look at potential for distribution co-ops (trucking for several farms).
- Urbanites need to recognize that there are dust and odours.
- More education of the public – doesn't get to the right people; elementary school kids are being taught but very few kids connected to farming.
- Only large farms pay, second jobs are needed - not economical for full-time farming.
- Indoor markets, niche growers were highlighted in a Ked?? Pamphlet – not sure of impact.
- Promote organic feast of fields.

4. Ways to encourage new small scale farming practices

There was a discussion on ideas and policies that people that people would like to see in the Official Plan that would encourage new small scale farming practices with direction to consider and support partnerships through farmer's markets, cooperative processing and distribution of locally grown food.

4.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indoor all season farmers market.

4.2. Individual Comments

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions.

1. Public procurement: guaranteeing markets to local farmers through public contract for food programs is a key economic development strategy in many Canadian and U.S. Cities. University of Toronto has just introduced such a policy.
2. CSA Promotion—community shared agriculture (CSA) is an excellent direct marketing method for local growers—few middlemen = higher share of food dollar for farmers = increased profitability.
3. Business development funding: targeting local processing initiatives—KEDCO
4. Co-operative processing makes the operation affordable.
5. A good example to consider is the Desert Lake Gardens, an organic produce and now supplier, distributor and restaurateur near Sydenham, Ontario. The City should talk with Desert Lake Gardens to learn their experiences. They are true rural entrepreneurs who value the environment.
6. Farm vacations would be a new use to support the farm with no downside.

5. Dealing with regulations and restrictions on agricultural practices

The discussion on how the Official Plan should deal with regulation and restrictions on agricultural practices identified the following points:

5.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Acknowledge that farming is unique.▪ Concerns about protection of natural heritage▪ Impact of nutrient management and source water protection.▪ Issues about code of practice.▪ There needs to be a firm definition of boundaries.▪ Emphasis on small farms; organic farms; diverse/mixed farming.▪ The City should emphasize its ability to provide information and services to farmers.

5.2 Comments noted by individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by individuals.

1. There are chunks of farmland that are not big enough to be protected under Provincial policy but we still need to recognize it as agricultural land and protect it as a resource.
2. The current system of provincial assessment with farming assessed as a commercial operation is not helpful to the farmer.
3. Support upper-tier policies.
4. There should be less regulation, but more education.
5. Let farmers farm and police their own industry.
6. With respect to pesticides: they cause cancer for farmers and others in the food chain. The City should promote organic practices through a long-term phasing out of many agri-chemicals.
7. With respect to water: contamination from feedlots and pesticide run off in environmentally unsustainable and therefore economically unsustainable. Long-term phase outs are the solution.
8. For soil conservation: encourage diversified farming and cover cropping by encouraging local market growth and a turn away from monoculture commodity farming.
9. A land use policy could discourage large feedlots or industrial hog farms.
10. Development should not be permitted where it will create conflicts around agricultural practices now and in the future (noise, smell, pesticide use). Essentially, most residential development in the rural areas is urban sprawl and should be borne by those creating them. For example, the need for improved public transit, and the need for more and better highways when highways are converted to residential streets with reduced speed limits.

6. Candidate areas and long term protection in an agricultural designation

Clark Consulting presented information and asked whether there was agreement with the candidate areas shown and their designation for long term protection in an Agricultural designation? The following responses were noted.

6.1. Comments notes which appear to be widely held by many participants

The following table identifies opinions that were frequently noted and which appear to be widely held by many participants as important messages.

Frequently noted comments raised by the public
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Good agricultural land should be protected for agricultural (for the future).▪ Agricultural designation may be too restrictive based on current farm economic situation – leave it rural with the option for farming.

6.2. Comments noted by a number of individuals

The following points are other comments that were noted for consideration by those attending the workshop sessions. These points highlight issues and concerns raised by a number of individuals.

- Protect what we have and what we can get.
- Look into land trusts.
- Agricultural Land designation restricts severances. The rural designation allows more flexibility.
- Kingston Township has lots of land but not many farms and limited water.
- Pittsburg drain to be addressed – another investment into soils – raises soil capability classification.
- Would like to see how the designation would allow for the fair price of land?
- There needs to be an area of viable farms – to help them stay in business.
- Provide support should be provided beyond the Planning Act.

7. Individual comments received on the Agricultural Study

The following individual comments about the Agricultural Study and input to the Official Plan Review were noted:

1. The current practice in Kingston makes it too easy to amend the zoning. Kingston is too developer friendly. The Ontario Municipal Board how it is currently configured is not useful to those wishing to restrict unrestrained development.
2. Hopefully, the City will become an active partner in the “building a sustainable local food system” project now beginning. The National Farmer’s Union will seek participation in the Project Steering Committee from a variety of food system stakeholders (farmers, restaurateurs, retailers, processors, food bank, meal providers, public health departments, college/university professors and students and all citizens). The City should be on this committee as it works towards a local food system speaker series, conferences, local food policy council, and a local

food charter for the Kingston area. To be successful this initiative will require public leadership.

3. There needs to be a flexible planning approach adopted for encouraging and managing agricultural and rural land uses that supports long-term protection and ongoing viability of farming operations.
4. There is a need for caution in introducing uses that could conflict with farming operations. Severances for non-rural and farming uses – i.e. residential and entertainment and other non-rural uses create many issues. The planning approach has been too flexible in some instances to the detriment of the farming community.
5. Planning documents are sometimes too flexible – anything goes.
6. The Provincial Policy Statements should be considered as a minimum standard.
7. If Kingston aims to truly integrate the rural areas, I think that they will need to do these 2 things: Come up with a new representation formula: solely by population means that they will forever be underrepresented. Secondly there needs to be facilitation of local markets for produce from the farms into the city would go a long way to integrate the rural areas into City of Kingston life.
8. Ribbon development currently exists along most rural roads. The new plan should allow anyone with property along an existing road to sever of as many lots as they want as long as they have the road frontage of 200 feet and meet requirements for septic and water without doing a plan of subdivision.
9. Infilling is fine below the 401 but don't try and force everyone to live in that area. Allow the creation of nice lots in the rural areas as it is only going to increase your tax base and give people a choice of where to live. Otherwise they will go to other counties to get the property that is more suited to their lifestyle.
10. One individual wrote that he would like the City to consider allowing more severances in the rural area. He indicates that by only allowing the severance of two lots with anything after that being a plan of subdivision, that this is too costly and makes no economical sense thus stifling any future lot creation. He further notes that he is not talking about allowing lots for new development where more roads have to be put in but on lands that have an existing road. He notes that not everyone wants to live in the area south of 401.
11. There was a question from a local high school student about urban agriculture and what regulations would deal with a community garden project, in the City and specifically in the Calvin Park –Portsmouth neighbourhoods. He inquires about the possibility of use park land within the City to grow a communal garden or church lands or a network of home gardeners.
12. We do not need the creation of new non-farm lots. This is not consistent with the Official Plan.