CITY OF KINGSTON
INFORMATION REPORT TO COUNCIL
Report No.: 10-271

TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Terry Willing, Acting Commissioner, Community Development Services
RESOURCES STAFF: Jim de Hoop, Director, Community and Family Services
DATE OF MEETING: August 24, 2010
SUBJECT: Update on Status of the Potential Acquisition of Federal Surplus Land in Barriefield Village

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
In May 2009, the City of Kingston (the City) became aware of an opportunity to purchase surplus federal lands located within the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District (BHCD). At that time it was noted that a federal grant program existed which allowed the transfer of the lands for one dollar, provided a viable affordable housing project was approved for the land. The details of this opportunity were presented to Council in February 2010.

In response to the February 16 and 17, 2010, Council approved resolution Clause (1) Report No. 30, staff created a Request for Proposal (RFP). RFP #F31-CDS-CFS-2010-1, Consultancy on Potential Acquisition of Federal Surplus land in Barriefield Village. At the May 25, 2010 meeting Council approved staff recommendation to award the RFP to MHBC Planning Ltd.

Included in the MHBC Planning Ltd timeline was provision of a Council status update on public feedback received as result of the July 6, 2010 information meeting and the preferred site concept presented at the August 9, 2010 public information centre. An August 18th deadline was set to allow for this phase of public feedback. A summary of these findings were not available at the time of writing but will be provided as an added report (Exhibit C) with the August 24 Council package.

To date public participation can be summarized as follows:

July 6 Public Information Meeting – approximately 90 persons in attendance, 76 comment sheets submitted (see Exhibit A).
August 9 Public Information Meeting – approximately 100 persons in attendance, presentation slides shown (see Exhibit B.)
A final summary of comment sheets and feedback will be provided as an added (Exhibit C) at the August 24 meeting.
City web site submissions – over 300

MHBC Planning Ltd, after consideration of the feedback received and the findings from the specific studies, will present a recommended option to City Council as scheduled on September 7, 2010.

RECOMMENDATION:
This is an information report only.
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AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL SIGNED BY COMMISSIONER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry Willing, Acting Commissioner, Community Development Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL SIGNED BY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Gerard Hunt, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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CONSULTATION WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Beach, Sustainability &amp; Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Leger, Corporate Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim Keech, President, Utilities Kingston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N/R indicates consultation not required)
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:
In May 2009, the City of Kingston (the City) became aware of an opportunity to purchase surplus federal lands located within the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District (BHCD). At that time it was noted that a federal grant program existed which allowed the transfer of the lands for one dollar, provided a viable affordable housing project was approved for the land. The details of this opportunity were presented to Council in February 2010.

On February 16 and 17, 2010, Council approved resolution Clause (1) Report No. 30 which states:

1. **THAT** Council authorize staff to undertake as a high priority the following with respect to the subject lands:
   a. Proceed immediately with the steps necessary to acquire the surplus lands for affordable housing and to investigate acquiring lands as a buffer to Barriefield Village, should the preferred affordable housing option not prove viable;
   b. Proceed immediately with a review, and update if required, of the Heritage Conservation District Plan;
   c. The completion of a stage 2 and 3 archaeological assessment, environmental assessments and technical studies that may be necessary to determine the potential future uses that are viable for the properties and to complete the necessary due diligence for purchasing the property;
   d. The necessary public meeting(s) facilitated as outlined by the Council motion of November 17, 2009, addressing both affordable housing and heritage preservation matters;
   And further
2. **THAT** a budget of up to $250,000 be approved with funding from the Working Fund Reserve for the work;
   And further
3. **THAT** the report be completed no later than June 2010; said report should use existing materials to the greatest extent possible and should also include timelines for the necessary planning approvals;
   And further
4. **THAT** staff express the City’s interest in acquiring the property for affordable housing to Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC).

In response to this resolution staff created a Request for Proposal (RFP) to address 1 (a), (c), and (d); 2 and 3. RFP #F31-CDS-CFS-2010-1, Consultancy on Potential Acquisition of Federal Surplus land in Barriefield Village was released on March 12, 2010 and closed on April 7, 2010. Council approved award of the RFP to MHBC Planning on May 25, 2010 (Report 10-147).

The RFP identified that the work would be undertaken in two phases, with Phase 1 addressing the completion of the feasibility study, and Phase 2 addressing the implementation of any recommended work, with continuation to Phase 2 subject to Council's approval.

The phase 1 terms of reference, summarized in the RFP document, are:

- A feasibility study to assess the viability of developing the lands for affordable housing. Should this alternative prove to be non-viable, the study shall include an investigation of the option of converting the surplus lands into a buffer for Barriefield Village. In addition to addressing the development options, professional services, and historical, technical and sustainable requirements relating to the development of affordable housing on the surplus land, the study would also address the financial viability and funding opportunities associated with the various options. Special attention is being given to any and all restrictions associated with the various funding opportunities.

- The study will include an analysis of the risks and benefits of the recommended option, be it the development of affordable housing, or the conversion of the lands into a buffer for Barriefield Village. Regardless of which option is recommended, all public policy objectives would be identified and addressed. Should affordable housing prove viable, the study will address the specific type and tenure of affordable housing that would be the most effective. While identifying the various...
alternatives with respect to development, financing, and/or partnerships, the study will also include an examination of the role that the City would play.

- The study will also address the compatibility between the original Heritage District guidelines and the Affordable Housing objectives, identifying how well the various options address these two differing objectives. Prior to making a final recommendation on the preferred municipal use(s) for the surplus property, focused public consultations are to be undertaken to ensure that the intent of the Heritage District Plan and the Affordable Housing policies are realized, with all public benefits summarized with the recommendations.

- The recommendations associated with the Phase 1 work shall be presented to Council, and Council will make a decision regarding the acquisition of the property.

The consulting team has completed the following tasks to date:

- Technical staff pre-consultation
- A number of stakeholder interviews; more to follow
- Review of public comments; more to follow
- ‘Kitchen table’ meetings with the Barriefield Village Association and the Poverty Roundtable
- Completion of servicing, traffic and noise studies.

The consulting team hosted two Public Information Centres (PIC). The first was held on July 6, 2010 at the J.E. Horton Public School located in Barriefield and the second on August 9, 2010 in Memorial Hall, City Hall.

The July 6th PIC was an opportunity to introduce the consulting team from MHBC Planning to the community and to provide an overview of the schedule and planning process related to the Barriefield Feasibility Study. Exhibit A provides a summary of the results of the comment sheets provided at the July 6th PIC and received up until July 28. Any correspondence received after that date will be provided as an added report with the August 24 Council package, as Exhibit C.

The August 9th PIC provided an overview of studying findings to date, identified developments constraints and opportunities and reviewed preliminary site concept plans. The consultant’s presentation is attached as Exhibit B.

As presented at the August 9, 2010 PIC, included in the summary of findings to date were:

- **Servicing**: Utilities Kingston and Department of National Defence will require easements over infrastructure on Parcels 1, 2 and 3 (no permanent structures permitted on these easements).
- **Noise**: to mitigate noise impacts from the highway, dwelling units should be oriented such that outdoor amenity areas are shielded from the highway by the units themselves.
- **Traffic**: traffic control signals are not warranted at the intersection of Wellington Street and Highway 15
- **Traffic**: the sightlines for a driveway on the western limits of Parcels 2 and 3 with access to Wellington Street are satisfactory for safe operation as the minimum stopping sight distances are exceeded in both directions

Also presented were preferred development concepts as follows:

- Parcel 1: Development as public parkland
- Parcel 2: A 2 storey seniors apartment (32 units)
- Parcel 3: Single detached dwellings (13 units) and a semi-detached dwelling (2 units)

Comment sheets were provided at the PIC in regard to the presented information and a deadline of August 18th was set to allow for public feedback. A summary of these findings were not available at the time of writing, however, it will be provided as an added report (Exhibit C) with the August 24 Council package.
The recommendations associated with the feasibility study are scheduled to be presented to Council on September 7, 2010, and a decision regarding the acquisition of the property and allotment of further funding if necessary is expected on that date. Continuation of the Phase 2 work and a rezoning application will be subject to Council’s approval.

According to senior federal government staff, should Council decide to proceed with an application for the land donation, an application with development concept for the lands will be needed by no later than October 2010 and the land title transferred (with zoning in place) by Q1 2011, or April – June 2011. A formal contribution agreement would also require that the City (or a selected development proponent) have at most 2 years from the date of signing to have a substantially completed project.

Any questions or comments from members of Council can be directed to the prime contact or the undersigned for transmittal to MHBC Planning Ltd.

EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW:
A number of existing policies and by-laws are being consulted as part of this project, including the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan, the Official Plan, the 2005 Kingston Model for Affordable Housing, various zoning and other by-laws, as well as provincial and federal regulations and statutes.

NOTICE PROVISIONS:
No notice requirements

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS:
This report is available in alternative formats upon requests. This report is available translated into French upon request.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:
This report has no financial implications at this time.

CONTACTS:
Jim de Hoop, Director, Community and Family Services (x4957)

OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED:
George Wallace, Director of Planning and Development
Cynthia Beach, Commissioner, Sustainability and Growth

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:
Exhibit A – Summary of the July 6th PIC
Exhibit B – Consultants presentation at the August 9th PIC
Exhibit C – Summary of the August 9th PIC (provided under separate cover)
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Overview of Public Information Centre

A Public Information Centre (PIC) for the Consultancy on Potential Acquisition of Federal Surplus Land in Barriefield Village was held on Tuesday, July 6, 2010 from 5:30 pm to 8:00 pm at J.E. Horton Public School. The purpose of the PIC was to introduce the consulting team to the community and to provide an overview of the schedule and planning process related to the study.

A brief walking tour of the village began shortly after 6:00 pm and was hosted by Wendy Shearer, a heritage consultant. A number of tours took place over the evening. The purpose of the walking tour was to view the Department of National Defence surplus lands in the context of Barriefield Village.

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

Public Information Centre Notification Details

The PIC was advertised in the Whig Standard newspaper and on the City web site. In addition, information about the PIC was sent to constituents by Councillor Foster.
Attendance

Signed attendance at the Public Information Centre was 93.

City of Kingston staff included:

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

The Project Team members in attendance included:

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

Open House Schedule

The Public Information Centre was held at J.E. Horton Public School from 5:30 p.m. until 8:00 p.m. The Public Information Centre was organized to provide an overview of the schedule and planning process and to introduce the consulting team to the public. There was no formal presentation since studies have not been completed.
Comment Sheets

A total of 65 comment sheets were completed at the Public Information Centre. Following the Public Information Centre, an additional 39 additional comments were faxed and emailed, for a total of 104 responses.

Each comment sheet had a total of six questions followed by an open ended request for additional comments. The first four and sixth questions provided for a yes and no response, along with additional comments. The following is a summary of the information received on the comment sheets.

1. Was the information provided at today’s Public Information Centre useful?
   ____ 42 ___ Yes  ____ 27 ___ No

2. Was the venue for today’s Public Information Centre appropriate?
   ____ 76 ___ Yes  ____ 3 ___ No

3. Was the date and time of today’s Public Information Centre convenient for you?
   ____ 59 ___ Yes  ____ 19 ___ No

4. Do you believe that municipal governments and local residents should support building affordable housing stock in Ontario?
   ____ 56 ___ Yes  ____ 2 ___ No

5. What are the important values that make Barriefield an appealing village?

6. Do you believe that Barriefield could accommodate affordable housing if it reflected the heritage values of the Village?
   ____ 33 ___ Yes  ____ 32 ___ No
A summary of additional comments provided are listed below with the number in brackets indicating the number of times a similar comment was received:

1. **Was the information provided at today’s Public Information Centre useful?**

   - Insufficient information (4)
   - Moderately (3)
   - I thought it would be a presentation with Q & A. Photos and pictures were good but no discussion of community impact, costs, heritage etc. Simply put there was no public information (2)
   - The information did not add to my knowledge of this issue/proposal. There were a lot of pictures of houses in the neighbourhood which I’m not sure of the purpose
   - Confused - I thought you were looking at whether any building should occur, seems like a done deal
   - Not up-to-date information on the various plans
   - Incomplete - somewhat biased
   - I did not learn anything new. However I realize that the consultants are very poorly informed about sustainability, focus and heritage issues impacting this project
   - There was nothing new here. Topographical base plan very out of date missing many houses but dated July 2010 - more like before 2000
   - Seen it before, but good conversation with consultant. (The enclosed development would utterly destroy the present community)
   - Somewhat, but much is still unknown – could/should have been much more detailed. We don’t really know what is happening tonight as we are independently reviewing posters & completing forms. No outline etc. People don’t know if there will be Q & As, speeches, etc.
   - Limited opportunity for dialogue - public questions plus public input. We have seen all of this before - when will the “city” plus their consultants, actually give us a forum where we feel that we are being listened to?
   - Information needs to be in a take-away format
   - Visuals are a positive addition to what is discussed in the presentation
   - The presentation material sugarcoats the Village - doesn't present the accurate representation of mixed construction, inappropriate, non-compatible construction
   - Much more information about the city's intentions would also be appreciated It would have been enhanced if it included the options available as alterations, e.g., land swap. The presentation provided a biased view for anyone unaware of alternatives
   - Old news - it was somewhat useful, though would have been helpful if the presentation had included some information on the scale of the contemplated housing project
   - Being able to tour the three parcels of federal land and see them clearly designated on maps was useful. So were the photos of Barriefield Village useful as an overview of the architecture and layout at the Village
There was no picture of the monster housing built in Barriefield
For those not familiar - I am familiar, so nothing new has been revealed some of the information is not up to date however, and it is very limited
Presentation did not give a complete overview of the heritage aspects of the Village, its proximity to the UNESCO World History Site
Most of the charts enlarged, static presentations were professional. But there were several maps etc. that were not understandable without printed information. Nobody was introduced. The question and answer session did not exist except in a one-on-one setting and most of the team was not easily identified. The one person I spoke to kept saying that this was not their area of expertise, and so the question went unheard, and unanswered
A bit slanted towards the housing proposal
The information at the website for the City of Kingston should include this information. Perhaps project mailing lists could be established
It was useful but not sufficient. It should have brought out more strongly the unique heritage value and worth to Kingston and future Kingstonians. A characterization of what there is and needs protection
I am reassured to know that the process is starting from scratch, rather than working with the “Hughes Downey” plan
I trust that this study will advocate for inclusion of those on very low incomes, well below the 60th percentile
What about plans for a Village Green model on one of the areas?
Much of the information is contained in the HCDP. Useful to see timelines etc.
It just shows the existing housing and landscape (village-scape). We had no indication of what might be put up building wise; pity
There was some confusion over whether previous reports (The Downey Report) had any bearing in this Feasibility Study. This feasibility report will be very comprehensive, and I am unsure how they will be able to do a thorough report with a very limited timeline
The information was a nice introduction, but did not deal with many important issues and facts, but more ha (hectares). For example, parcels three, two and one, are marked as 1.60, 1.35 and 0.63, but respectively, but there was no provision of the total size of the Barriefield Village. Were the parcels 40% of the total? Further, what are the boundary conditions imposed by DND - is it automatic? Is it a contest with others across the country with similar aspirations?
It would help if someone directed us to what was happening in the evening. A few words would be nice, also setting our expectations of what happens next
Would have liked more information on specifics of analyses such as traffic, noise and view shed. Answers to these were vague
Everybody contradicted each other.
Jim DeHoop gave info different from all consultants. They said, original, Downey plan was "off the table" and starting fresh.
DeHoop said the opposite!
Some of the consultants were not answering the questions being asked and seemed to be lacking background information on this complex issue (2)

The information provided at the public meeting was not useful in my opinion. The format was disjointed and some of the consultants seemed not to either have their information or simply told people to refer to another consultant to answer certain questions. If the consultants hired by the city had more time to prepare, then maybe the meeting would've had a much better result

It was hot. I only skimmed the boards, but it gave a good idea of the scope of the study and an opportunity for those interested, to speak to the various experts. I appreciated the opportunity to go on a walk with a landscape person

To some extent; it did not include enough information on the perimeter is and regulations of the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District

There was no information provided. Maps and photographs of what currently exists or not. "Information" about what is planned, or at least under consideration. This proposal has been about as un-transparent as possible from the start - and not in conformation with 10-061 - which I'll cite in my additional comments

The consultants only showed us pictures of the existing Village, and told us nothing about what might be or how they are thinking about it. They've had four weeks to start, and were disappointing in their unwillingness to engage

2. Was the venue for today's Public Information Centre appropriate?

It was ideal, easy access (4)
The concept of tours was a great asset - even more value than the visuals. Together they managed to provide a depth of knowledge (2)

Very good to have the venue in the very school that sits in this community, next to the sites under construction

Could've been held at City Hall - more accessible for most of city - this is especially convenient to Barriefield residents

A third meeting should be held in a neutral location or City Hall. Perhaps the meeting could be held at the Invista Centre

It was reasonable to have it in Barriefield

A lovely school. Too bad it's designated for demolition and couldn't be open as a community centre

Because of where it is situated, there is a suggestion that this is a Barriefield issue. This is an issue for the entire city and the province. This is a heritage site.

A focal point of the community

It would have been nice to have a general overview presentation for the first 15 minutes

Given the traffic nightmare today - another session is needed. Also access for scattered population (low income for example) and people not resident in Barriefield but concerned

Actually, much too warm without air-conditioning!
Time of year is not the best – most people are away on holidays. Too rushed, feel like we are being pushed into something
Of course, the venue was appropriate for it took place in the village that it affects (2)
Venue was okay
Venue appropriate, but a lot of information to absorb at once. Slideshow was very rushed - a handout of the slides would have been more informative
Absolutely as this is the site concerned. Should not be anywhere else. August 9, should be in the village too for all to see site concerned!
Allowed non-residents to look at the site

3. **Was the date and time of today’s Public Information Centre convenient for you?**

- It is very unfortunate that process is happening during the summer. Many people that would otherwise be there (10)
- 401 closed due to accident - resulting in major traffic delays (6)
- Unfortunately, the 401 closing made it difficult to get the session. It would be helpful to have a second similar session this summer
- The traffic problem (completely contingent) prevented many people not already in Barriefield from attending. It should be rescheduled. It was heavily overrepresented by conservative Barriefield residents
- 6 pm is difficult for working people with families (7)
- Good to have it while the light to view the village was at its best
- Obviously it should have happened earlier in the season. Not during the “dog days” of summer, when many people are away and a bit too hot for elderly residents to take part
- July and August are holiday months. For many families, and not a good time for most people. The next meeting should be in Kingston East not Memorial Hall. This is where the issue is, and we don’t need the parking hassle
- Date and time okay (rushed process overall)
- How ridiculous to choose the first week of summer vacation for this turnout is not representative. Due to family vacations. I had to delay start of holidays!

4. **Do you believe that municipal governments and local residents should support building affordable housing stock in Ontario?**

- When appropriate - cost effective (4)
- Not in Barriefield (2)
- Affordable housing should be integrated into other housing not built in a block beside existing housing (2)
- I believe we need affordable housing, but there is a place for everything. Why ruin something the government has set up and is proud of (Barriefield Heritage Village) and ruin it with subsidized housing (2)
This should be sized and located appropriately within a community. All opportunities should be considered, and reflect the existing city plans.

In carefully chosen neighbourhoods where the community is able to support families with greater social needs - amenities, services, etc.

Hopefully without rancor or on either side.

Development of affordable housing should be done based on direction provided by a social housing plan for the city. There is no plan, and this is why this is being fast tracked. Integration is preferred approach.

I believe the integration of affordable housing is essential. No one neighbourhood should be seen as a ghetto - i.e., Rideau Heights.

The Federal and Provincial Governments should provide leadership and funding to ensure that municipalities have all the residences needed to fill the need for affordable housing and successfully address the needs of the homeless.

It is essential in a civil society, that all residents are provided with safe and quality homes.

You could buy affordable housing (i.e., at Elliott Avenue) for less, or foreseen as defined price for affordable housing. Helps people right away!

A tricky question, as government support would be primarily financial, and “local residents” support would be “moral” or by way of plebiscite. The question is “in Ontario” and the answers must be “yes” when asked “

To a limited extent, but certainly not to overshadow other public interest such as conservation of heritage.

I live in Sydenham ward, an expensive area. These nevertheless, have many units of affordable housing. I would support more in my own area.

We are not islands unto ourselves. The private for-profit market is nonfunctional to meet this need. Despite the “someday” reputation. We need a balanced, approach, which only can be accomplished as a community.

This is a motherhood and apple pie question. What is meant by support? As a principle, the answer would be yes.

The moral case is clear that the case regarding the social cost to the whole community for not supporting affordable housing is the more important one.

Everybody deserves a home and everyone needs to be included in our society. Inclusivity leads to a dynamic, diverse community that enriches everyone.

Of course, but the right development in the right location, integrated into existing housing.

Kingston has a severe housing problem. We need to look at mixed income affordable housing across Canada. Kingston and Barriefield are ideal locations for well designed project.

But only in suitable locations, at suitable costs. A designated Heritage district is a poor choice for relatively large development of the kind inefficient. Barriefield is a unique asset, not just for its residents, but for the whole city.

Every care should be taken to preserve its unique character.

In more appropriate areas, not within the heritage boundaries.
But not high density, and not to increase taxes, and policing in any area of Kingston
Absolutely, but such controversial neighbourhoods, like heritage neighbourhoods such as Barriefield, should not have so much wasted time and money spent trying to put affordable housing in it when it is just not appropriate
It is difficult to answer a question when the wording is not understandable – “affordable housing stock”? I do not know what that means. Supporting affordable housing is one thing - but in the appropriate setting and at reasonable costs to the taxpayers. This Feasibility Study is necessary, but it's cost could have gone towards houses and apartments in the areas where study is not necessary
Affordable housing should not be detrimental to historic site. It should also pay attention to modern experiences of housing that still work and doesn't need to be demolished in 20 years, because it was integrated
I'm supportive of building affordable housing, but if it comes to a choice between affordable housing and heritage, then heritage must take priority. Heritage is in one place, while affordable housing can be built in many places
But not as the City of Kingston currently does. Affordable housing should be throughout existing housing stock as individual units. Not clustered in ghetto complexes
How and where is crucial, though. Heritage districts poor choice
Absolutely - there are many reasons to provide affordable housing - however, not at the expense of other important sectors such as heritage; UNESCO designation
Federal and Provincial governments need to play a big part, but not at any price. Estimates have been made at $390/sq.ft to build in Barriefield. That is not fiscally responsible
But, with an open mind to all options available - choose best option. Don't force non-conforming buildings into Village of Barriefield
Provinces should not have downloaded it onto the municipalities
At the same time, Municipal Government and local residents must respect other aspects of the community and unique qualities that may exist. In this case, Barriefield has a remarkable designation that should not be ignored. i.e., the first village to achieve Heritage Conservation District designation. It is an integral boundary to be Fort Henry/Rideau Heritage UNESCO designation
Social housing is based on models proven to fail, in a large clump on the outskirts (Parts 1, 2, 3) of an existing community. Integrated housing in existing dwellings would be preferred, or new builds integrated but not isolated from their neighbors, as proposed here
Affordable housing is a necessity for many of our citizens. However it should not be provided in large housing developments, whereby all of the residents have low rental income. This is deleterious to the children who are not integrated. It is clear that affordable housing should be provided as part of the community in single dwellings
But why would you choose to maroon persons in affordable housing in a place where an automobile is almost essential? There were a few services within walking distance. This evening it took 30 minutes to walk from downtown to Barriefield.

What kind of question is this? Of course, but not at any price. It has to make sense from a financial, social and land-use planning perspective.

It is important to do it in an appropriate location or locations that do not infringe on heritage areas. Also housing of this kind should be integrated in the community, avoiding ghettos. And it should be done close to amenities such as shops, doctors and so on.

The number, type, density, cost to build here, versus elsewhere in the city etc., would have to be given before I could answer, if affordable housing would be suitable.

This question is very unfair in that yes is the only possible answer, but there has to be more context (not at any cost).

“Affordable housing” definition does not include many people in need.

We should have a national affordable housing strategy.

Taxes too high.

Affordable – integrated housing is the key. Barriefield is neither one. The city, according to council has enough housing. There is no shortage - due to some existing housing not being usable. Apparently repairs need to be made to make available housing re-usable. Perhaps our money and surplus budget money could be used to complete repairs and not new construction.

If the City is going to invest further in affordable housing, they just need to manage and maintain premises much better than they do currently; for example, the units adjacent to Wally Elmer Arena are in a horrible state - this type of housing would be unwelcome in any neighbourhood in any city.

Never all at one location. It’s been proven that the ghetto never works, the housing should be threaded throughout the whole city. This has been proven possible and much cheaper.

Not in the behind-closed-doors method in which this venue came about.

Decent housing is important for health and sense of well-being. Market rents and housing prices are beyond the means of many to the point of cutting back on other essentials when rent/mortgages have to be paid. Those with limited means, in poorly built/maintained housing may pay more in terms of utilities than the more comfortably housed. In Kingston, figures from the Mayor’s task force on poverty suggest that the working poor make up 40% of those considered “poor” by Statistics Canada’s Low Income Cut off standard - more than 7500 people.

We need appropriate affordable housing, integrated into existing communities. The Hughes-Downey proposal was not appropriate!

Of course, but to select sites that are expensive in terms of both time and money without a transparent discussion of other possible options is reckless and irresponsible.
I believe that the literature shows that these should be relatively small projects do not fit into the existing community. In the case of Barriefield. There are 84 existing units-81 single tenant dwellings and four duplexes

If the city is going to invest further in affordable housing. They first need to manage and maintain premises, much better than they do currently; for example, the units adjacent to Wally-Elmer Arena are in a deplorable state - this type of housing would be unwelcome in any neighborhood, in any city

Should be interspersed with other housing rather than being built in identifiable enclaves

Local Official Plans and Heritage Arts must be complied with

At the right place. I support affordable housing in Toronto as well. How about housing on vacant lots within downtown core. I do not support building in Barriefield

The needs of those persons must be considered i.e., walking distance and weather conditions (especially winter) to needed services and facilities

Poorly worded question and I cannot answer it as is. In this City, the taxpayers have very little say in matters like this. Our councillors operate from their own personal agendas. With our country, operating on huge deficits, seems like a badly timed question

No, I do not think that municipal governments and local residents should support building affordable housing stock in Ontario. The affordable housing access at the present should be made ready much more readily. Why is it that housing takes so long to fix up for new residents? With the economy as such, this question seems a bit ridiculous. We simply can't afford to build up inventory. When every level of government seems to be lacking funds

Not sure if governments should be building affordable housing stock. If stock is built it should not accommodate residents, who do not uphold a strict responsibility code with regard to property upkeep, cleanliness, respect for neighbours and neighbourhoods, etc. i.e., you should not be allowed to live on a taxpayer subsidy AND abuse what you are given

I believe, municipal governments need to be accountable to local residents in all aspects like affordable housing and heritage conservation

As long as the process is inclusive and consultative with the communities involved. This particular project was well underway before residents and other stakeholders were even informed. This created tunnel vision on the part of the city and divisive battle lines that need not have happened. It improved, but only with time and effort

5. What are the important values that make Barriefield an appealing village?

- Historical heritage buildings and green spaces (6)
- Rural setting (i.e., surrounded by green space - the reason Highway 15 was moved to its present location); grid street layout; variety of housing forms and materials; mostly small scale of houses; gardens and green spaces – lilacs; and small scale of village i.e., fewer than one hundred houses (4)
Historic importance; historical appearance; size and community spirit (2)
Barriefield is a jewel in Kingston. There is a lovely mix of homes, a modest to large - all have pride of ownership demonstrated in their presentation. It is quiet and peaceful which has been lovely, while raising a family. There is a sense of community. There is great pride in the beauty and history. This project threatens the very integrity of our lovely village.

It is beautiful, quiet, and picturesque, with plenty of green space. Anyone would be happy to live here, and people who can't afford to buy property here should not be excluded. There is common ground, both literally and figuratively in Barriefield to accommodate residents, where value does not depend on well. Villagers and newcomers alike could learn a lot from each other in an integrated community.

Barriefield is a cute little island, whose “heritage” value is hugely overrated. It is being used by Barriefield residents to preserve their lifestyle. It is not visited by anyone not already directly associated with the residents. Its historical value is minor at best.

The small scale of Barriefield, with a history of housing, low and moderate income households would seem to be an ideal location for thoughtful, well designed, new housing.

Close to downtown, quiet pace. Close to Gore Road Shopping Centre

The size of the village and neighbourliness. Heritage designation and people’s commitment to maintaining its integrity, low traffic and quiet. Safe, low crime rate.

The values that make Barriefield an appealing village have everything to do with it being exactly that - a village. Small enough for people to be acquainted. An atmosphere with enough green space in and around it to protect village character. In this case, Barriefield is unique because of its heritage character which has been scrupulously maintained and should not be thrown to the days of progress and residential development.

Safe, secure, easy for kids to roam around. Beautiful vistas - streetscapes and sightlines are incomparable. Wildlife - dear, fox, raccoon, coyote. Green space - beautiful walks with heritage homes that are marvelously maintained, community spirit - open and welcoming village.

The green open spaces around the village are integral landscapes that define Barriefield as a village and not just another subdivision. These green spaces are to be protected and conserved under the heritage conservation district plan. The existing proposal offends this principle. Single-family tolerance.

Outstanding citizenship, a willingness to undertake at personal cost alone, a historical tribute to the past - resulting in a thing of beauty that is carefully nurtured. The city has no extra cost - the residents themselves are willing to foot the bill.

Low-profile, low-density housing is essential to the character of the village and is not what has been proposed for the new development to date.

It's a very open and welcoming village that has rural heritage and community at the heart of it while it is all about. The concern is foundationally the density and nature of the housing.
Flora-Fauna - a unique 19th century rural village; whole bigger than the sum of its parts; crucial it be buffered from highways and encroaching subdivisions; a shared investment in and commitment to heritage

Site, southwestern approach, views, interesting juxtaposition of slate, wood and brick buildings, maintains the attention residents have paid to their houses

The village is a beautiful place in our city; it provides easy access to downtown and the services provided there; it provides a great location for the people who enjoy living there now & will do the same for future residents of an affordable “geared to income” project

The total is greater than the sum of the parts. Most importantly, it is the rural village consideration, which is almost the most fragile

Small houses; quaint village

It is culturally and economically diverse - many seniors on fixed incomes. To increase this village by nearly half is not feasible. There are no services here, i.e. stores

Is small, defused, has all the aspects of a village. The community is strong, integrated, a true community

Architectural styles and layout. Open spaces, sense of family, gardens, heritage, colour

Peaceful, quiet, separate, open/green space, the use of city and countryside/church, variety of single-family dwelling, density, limited traffic and entrances into the village

The actual age of the homes and their stone, wood architecture, without later styles to distract from the streetscape; essentially no through-traffic; its modest size, with stone and well-located church in Gothic style, totally a-keeping

The green entrance to the village sets it apart from the highways. It is appealing as is. It was chosen as the first designated Heritage Village in Ontario, and this needs to be maintained, not altered. It is already a mix of different people with mixed income, some who fall into the affordable housing criteria. The village is found under UNESCO Heritage Zone and the entrance to the U-shape needs to focus on the green buffer zone and heritage houses, not public housing. Residents take great care to adhere to heritage guidelines

Historical housing that garnered heritage conservation district designation. See for example, “Lilacs and Limestone”, a book that outlines the very rich history of Barriefield. Outstanding citizenship, municipal advocacy and responsibility

Heritage designation of the village - built from and the layout of the streets (Based on 19th century military grid pattern). There is an ambience that cannot be reproduced; the sweat and tears of local residents is evident in their attention to rural, the preservation of the heritage character. A village “look and feel”; it is quiet and safe for kids and pedestrians to walk/cycle without traffic
Its heritage character as revealed in the buildings and their relationship to open lands (buffer zone, rock gardens). It is the proportions of “built to un-built”, heritage structures to new structures built within heritage guidelines that have created a unique cultural landscape. Unique to Kingston, Ontario and nationality. You disrupt the delicate balance at your peril.

Its historic aspect depends on its separate feel is a village of primarily historic homes. Overwhelming the village with the development, any development will turn the village into just another subdivision.

The heritage aspect of the village and the people who live there, working to maintain that aspect of the village. If you were not born in Barriefield or have come here to enjoy and be a part of Barriefield you have no idea how special this place is. My grandfather built my house, my mother was born in the front room, and now as a single dad, I have raised my two sons here, they will take ownership. When I pass on, Barriefield is a part of my life, my sons lives and now the city is preparing to destroy it.

Its heritage, stature, but most importantly because it is a genuine village.

Historical designation; beautiful, quaint; stepping back in time; quiet, safe; beautiful green spaces where deer, foxes and other animals live.

Its well-defined boundaries giving it an ideal historic community to foster development. That is compatible in scale and design with the rest of the village. Its green spaces, lanes and footpaths, streets with a truly residential scale. Its heritage buildings and newer buildings that try hard to fit into a heritage context. Its views within; south to Fort Henry; west to the city and north to St. Mark's Church (from the centre of the village).

Scale, location, heritage - also community integration. What is not appealing is the “xenophobic” exclusionary sense. Privileged to others. Shouldn't be accommodated - big building housing, housing, the wealthy are “welcome”.

It’s quiet, active; the historic value of many of the buildings and homes; many sightlines do not look that much different than they did a century ago; its importance as an officially designated village that is well and fully preserved by the custodians of these homes is a rare find in Canada (unlike, for instance, Portsmouth Village that has been swallowed up by stores, modern buildings etc.); its location on - near the UNESCO site and its connection to the military base and RMC - it is from the parcels of land in question that troops left for Passchendaele; St. Mark’s Church.

The true historic houses, all relatively small - it's green spaces and its view of Kingston and its different elevations.

Historical context and preservation; the village tells a story, in fact, it tells a thousand stories about the roots and reasons for how Ontario and Canada developed from the canal to the military to Sir John A. McDonald; a mill, inn, pubs and church; hard workers and homemakers who made Canada; creates an incredible gateway to the city.

It presents to Kingstonians now and in the future, the experience of how a village worked when town planning, and the Rideau Canal was built; it has remarkable old architecture; it presents a community of very mixed income people, who take loving care, not only for themselves but for the city. It is an
invaluable treasure for Kingston, not many cities have a unique treasure like this!

- Only Heritage Village in Ontario; great rural streetscapes; nice; lots of bird species - at least 65
- Barriefield is an appealing village because it is small and quite; the lot sizes are a nice size so that people have yards. It has a nice amount of greenery and established vegetation, unlike newer subdivisions
- Heritage connected to UNESCO sites, example of rural Ontario village, single-family homes with a few (duplex) exceptions. Family oriented.
- Location; history; architecture; layout; community initiatives
- The feel of a 19th century village. The fact older homes are kept to a standard and that materials and design reflect the period. That older homes outnumber new ones. The green space is very important to the village atmosphere
- Unique 19th century village - preserving 19th century layout of streets, many wonderful historic houses, beautifully preserved. Village is self-contained, rural in character, feels ‘remote’ from the city, buffered from the highways, wonderful green spaces, views. Strong community dedicated to preserving unique character of the village
- The extensive green spaces and tree lines that frame this rare example of a 19th century community, the lack of through traffic (i.e. only one entrance), the access to green. "Common", schoolyard, rock garden, (sloped to the west), a high level of restoration and maintenance maintained by the residents
- People like to be in groups of other people similar to themselves. Barriefield is a 19th century style village. People that live here appreciate all that that implies. We are a mix of unemployed, blue-collar, middle-class, educated, hard-working villagers. Each one of us contributing something. Disturbing this balance one way or another affects all. The commonality we all have in the hard work, time and money. We alone have invested in our community. We have all followed the rules laid out by city and historical staff. Some would now upset this, by installing non-19th century, housing?
- Historic, quiet, and a good neighbourhood without any problems with criminals, drugs or vandalism that affordable housing will bring to the neighbourhood. One of the most unique historical villages in Canada. One of the redeeming features of Kingston, heart of its unique heritage
- Community cohesion and heritage. I'm very fond of my supportive neighbours. While we lack institutions such as stores, post office, doctors or dentists’ offices, bank, and soon a school, we managed to overcome the lack of focal points, generally through a shared focus on heritage
- It is a village (small), and both (heritage buildings). We represent the past, which as many people come to see and walk around like a neighbour. History!
- It's beauty, including beautiful surroundings; the community spirit of the people living here; they have made enormous efforts, and financial expenses to preserve or restore the beauty of the village
- Low-density housing-single family in a rural setting, local history and architecture, proximity to UNESCO World Heritage sites
- Kingston lives in history, military and education!
- It is relatively isolated from its nearby urban and institutional neighbours - primarily due to green space around most of its borders. It is relatively homogenous and readily recognizable as having primarily a 19th century architectural style. It currently has a distinct entrance, drawing people into the neighbourhood, distinct from all others in municipality. This entrance would be destroyed by the proposed housing project. It is a closely knit community of people drawn from various walks of life (relatively few are actually wealthy, despite popular opinion!), who have a common desire to preserve the architectural style and village heritage for current use, and for future generations to experience
- It set off by itself, traffic goes around it. Preservation and refurbishment of the old houses and their small-scale. The vegetation (lilacs) and well-kept gardens. For newcomers: proximity to the city centre, views of the river and city, assurance of residential design criteria in the building of new homes, and to share in the ambience of old
- Landscape values are described in Heritage District Plan. Property controls of scale, density, total unit volume (rural village). The fact that in addition to the OP and the zoning bylaw, the Heritage Conservation District Plan gives residents security. The development of any kind would be very difficult and therefore unlikely. Other values are neighbours who know each other. The fact that until this aggressive action by the City was started, crime was very low (seems to be an uptick in the village since)
- The heritage history and appearance of the buildings; neighbours know each other and respect each other
- Green spaces, peaceful working and safe environment, heritage designation, quiet, low traffic
- The term of the houses, the friendliness of the inhabitants. No need to lock doors, etc. The feeling of a small village. It is really a unique place to live
- Old rural feel, mixed levels of housing, security (in 15 years, I have never had theft or vandalism, by contrast, to Union Street, where I used to live)
- Heritage-the first village in Ontario, designated a Heritage Conservation District. Sense of community-we are an island surrounded by DND, highways and the river. The closest civilian community is a kilometer away. We are diverse, but know each other. Any new development should not inject a huge increase in population of our island as a geographically distinct entity within the village. Integration starting with buildings, following HCD guidelines, is critical to success
- Barriefield was designated in 1980 as a Heritage District. The first village in Ontario to be designated; Smallness - we know our neighbors. Quasi-rural character, Barriefield isn't a suburban neighbourhood. Green space-there is some. Just simple unadorned fields
- For the past 30 years, Barriefield has been a Heritage community. First, as a part of Pittsburgh Township, and now more recently as a part of Greater
Kingston. The people who have moved there have a strongly shared commitment to heritage. They have invested their own money into restoring the heritage buildings - they are mostly from the 19th century or in building new homes that meet the stricter regulations of the Heritage District as enforced by LACAC, and now by the Municipal Heritage Committee of Kingston. Living close to each other with shared passions and goals has given the community strong coherence.

- Is relatively isolated from its nearby urban and institutional neighbours - primarily due to green space around most of its borders. It is relatively homogenous and readily recognizable as having primarily a 19th century architectural style. It currently has a distinct entrance, drawing people into the neighborhood, district from all others in municipality - this entrance would be destroyed by the proposed housing project. It is a closely knit community of people drawn from various walks of life (relatively few are actually wealthy. Despite popular opinion!), who have a common desire to preserve the architectural style and village heritage for current use, and for future generations to experience.

- It is very important to protect heritage. Most residents of Barriefield chose to live in a heritage village and willingly comply with heritage guidelines. Heritage must be protected! I have a vision of Kingston, 50-100 years from now, when suburban development has spread all the way to Ganonoque and North. In the middle of all the suburban development, hopefully there will be a wonderful heritage village - close to downtown - known as Barriefield - for all future generations to enjoy!

- Its unique rural character and strategic location to the City: most prized Heritage site in the midst of busy city. It is surrounded by wildlife (deer, coyotes, and fox , who live here, as well as many species of special birds, the lands provide protection to maintain its unique rural 19th century, Living Village and should be added to the City’s Heritage Inventory so that all people can enjoy a special place. We need to be reminded that Barriefield is the opposite half of the Fort Henry Rock Cut. It is an integral part of this historical location.

- Being the first historically designated village in Ontario, I would think that Barriefield should stand to be protected at all costs. Barriefield's rural 19th century living Village with its close historical links to Fort Henry and the Rio Canal are now a world heritage site, are simply rare and should be respected as such. The lands in question that buffer Barriefield from the modern fast paced development of the 21st century should remain untouched by human hands and left for the enjoyment of the many wild animals that move on the land. Green space is a rare thing so close to the city center. The buffer lands are enjoyed by everyone that enters the city off of Highway 15. If we truly believe what we all preach about the history of the city that we need to consider the fabulous sightlines when entering the downtown core off of Highway 15; which means the entire buffers, surrounding Barriefield. Why is it that when my husband and I traveled up Highway 15 to such destinations as Westport, Perth and Merrickville, there are fabulous signs that welcome
visitors to their towns? The only thing that should stand on the land in question. (Parcel #3) should be colourfully, beautifully made sign welcoming visitors and tourists to Kingston with its world. UNESCO designation

1) The look of the village, as it is today; 2) recognition as a heritage conservation District. 3) small in size with one church, one school, old Post Office and surrounding buffer lands, giving it a rural and village look and feel. 4) The fact that it is a unique place and is governed under the Barriefield Heritage organization District plan to ensure its character is preserved. 5) the commitment of the residents to spend their time, energy and money to adhere to certain conditions that ensures Barriefield remains looking like a 19th century village 6) the diversity of wildlife that inhabits the greenspace surrounding the village 7) the commitment of the community to help maintain the Barriefield rock garden. 8) The serenity of the village. Thanks to low traffic volumes, respectful quiet neighbours, and to green space buffers so with trees! 9) Beautiful vistas and sloping lawns and large parcels of green space 10) A large variety of trees, especially lilacs, which border much of the village and are located throughout the green spaces

6. Do you believe that Barriefield could accommodate affordable housing if it reflected the heritage values of the Village?

- It must be done in an extremely careful way; it must complement the existing design of homes; the separation and linkages must be done with extreme care; the residents (I am one) have said from day one, that it must be done in a responsible way
- There are many examples of well-designed affordable housing that reflect and are sympathetic to existing heritage communities. Poundbury, in the United Kingdom is one example of how entirely new housing with a mix of incomes could be built and designed to reflect traditional housing, building values
- It should be accommodated within existing structure and framework of village. Residents have said they would welcome such development
- Affordable housing could be designed to blend into the existing architecture and design of the village. Barriefield claims to be already socially diverse community. Tenants in affordable housing are likewise a diverse group -
many are well educated, hold jobs and can claim a wealth of knowledge and skills that will enrich a community

- I wonder how this can be done
- in Given the nature of the question, how could anyone possibly say “no”? The only reason to deny affordable housing in Barriefield is based on its (weak) heritage characteristics
- Only if it was integrated, rather than by creating a “ghetto”
- If the scale and landscaping is appropriate. For example, “Habitat for Humanity” would provide appropriate buildings
- The village would welcome low-density single-family homes built in accordance with the heritage plan. The housing should also be owned by the residents, as care and maintenance of these homes is crucial
- Sensitive architects could in my opinion, design buildings that would fit in with the existing heritage buildings very well indeed
- If the new housing units are single dwelling or one and a half stories; with large lots and green space - dreaming eh?
- Yes, I just returned from Halifax yesterday. As I walked around that city I was struck by the many examples of old and new structures coexisting in a compatible way. It reflected a sense of caring for history and inclusiveness
- Thoughtful design should solve any problems with making a new development compatible with existing Barriefield village. I assume that affordable housing will not create the ghetto-like housing that used to be built. Development in parcel three should be sympathetic to views of the church
- If the housing is integrated. If it is not all “affordable” housing in one district area. Development of existing heritage homes in Barriefield would best allow for integration and heritage preservation
- Only if it was single-family units to conform to present zoning bylaws
- It should not be built in large numbers, multi-unit dwellings cannot be permitted, and heritage landscapes must be preserved. We are happy to consider integrated housing in existing homes/dwellings/school structures, etc. Or perhaps a few single-family homes in very carefully selected locations on part three providing that green space/sightlines etc., are largely preserved as is
- If incorporated into the existing heritage homes, the scale of the proposed development is too large
- The number of units proposed would vastly change the makeup of the village. You now have people willing to work together, and who believe the extra expense in conforming to heritage standards is worth the price. The longtime residents are up here and appreciate Barriefield; new people have come in a few at a time and welcomed the chance to be part of Barriefield. They were not trying to throw up nonconforming holdings to just get elected
- Barriefield residents clearly don’t want them near them. This is evident, if you read all the letters written by them to City Council. Some people truly believe that the heritage may be compromised. But this is negated by the many new homes that they never fought against
Too many dwellings, altering the very nature of this small village increasing traffic. I really feel that these homes will not be kept up and that tenants will have no incentive to keep their homes well.

I definitely do not believe any kind of housing in a block of some sort can work in this setting without destroying the character of Barriefield. We already have some affordable housing - it needs to be done with a view to balance and proportion. It is small village; one should not plunk a large chunk of any sort of housing.

A nice idea, but I do not trust council to establish and enforce building standards that will result in housing that reflects these values. When I hear from the Kingston Housing Corporation, that there are 1,000 housing units vacant because they are too damaged to be repaired, I worry that even if these units should be built. Would these standards be maintained?

Definitely not - this is not the proper location. Build them somewhere else. For example, where the police station was. There are many other locations in Kingston.

Already the tipping point of “new” homes has been reached and the traffic flow is already a problem. There is only one way into the village. How would social housing be maintained with the heritage values? All new owners have to conform to heritage guidelines for maintenance, etc. Would all understand the need to reflect heritage VALUES? - Let alone know how?

Not in the manner it has been presented with multiple high density dwellings.

The placement of “proportional” affordable housing should benefit the population of Barriefield as well as the different number of houses and the number of historical housing units. Culture and lands represent an enormous area and therefore a greater proportional impact on the residents would not be cost-effective.

Absolutely not, you only have one chance to preserve a heritage site. As the owner of an 1820 house, I find it disrespectful and “pandering” to a heritage site to suggest that density of housing can in any way reflect the heritage values. By building units on that parcel of land at the entrance to a small village, you will have destroyed heritage values. They are what we are so proud of. The assumption that “pretty” fronts or gates or whatever you think is heritage is very disrespectful.

I cannot see how one can construct “instant heritage”. This is a contradiction in terms. The cost alone, 1) building homes in the same style would be prohibitively expensive - and not efficient. For example, restrictions (currently affected in Barriefield in a specific case) prohibit replacement of single glazed with double glazed. Would the new housing have the double glazed?

Affordable housing is already accommodated in Barriefield. It is a mixed socio-economic neighbourhood. What no neighbourhood should ever be accommodating is a concentration of affordable housing that will effectively ghettoize residents. That is a social model that has been proven failure and recognized as such for over a decade.
A small number of units might be integrated into the existing village, thereby preserving the green spaces. I don't think the development of housing any kind should be added onto a small heritage Village.

Land should not be developed at all, not an issue with affordability of housing.

The size of this neighbourhood/subdivision would not support/accommodate affordable housing, despite heritage values being reflected.

Could not be cost effective, affordable. Single-family homes could be appropriate; four-plex units are outrageous! There are no such units in the village.

The question does not have adequate detail. It is essential that any new housing reflect the heritage values of the village. Affordable housing in an appropriate % of the overall housing stock would certainly be desirable.

Who would maintain it and what the cost?

Location on rim of village represents no challenge - sizing and design can be appropriate. Definitely the buildings with green buffering can buffer the villages from the traffic. Can be built using the environmental innovations that could help the village bridge past and future.

If it is crucial – Hughes Downey client does not. Must preserve green spaces “view-scapes”, new residents must share commitment to and be prepared to invest in heritage.

The question is wrong. You can't reflect the village heritage by more than doubling the density. You should know this. Not as proposed. Only if mixed in with existing housing stock.

It should be people who can be integrated in every respect, and fully. Many past experiences prove that this does not work out, to put people in isolation (here = at the edge of the community) and leave them to themselves.

The issue is scale.

You don't want to be landlord!

Where is the city's official social housing plan? Why is this being done before updating the Barriefield Conservation District plan? The city has agreed to update the plan as per the 2005 Ontario Heritage, which has stricter guidelines on development in heritage conservation districts. The consultants have to be given a data plan!

The people that this would attract would not fit into the quiet neighbourhood that is here now!

The plans do not and cannot reflect the heritage values of the village. As a Kingstonian, this also does not make economical sense.

Any new build will swamp the village if it is affordable housing, or any other kind of housing. As Barriefield is an enclosed community, affordable housing is located here should be in proportion with residences there.

How can it? How can heritage housing be affordable? Maintaining even the humble dwelling in the village like mine is costly. How can people who have trouble making ends meet be expected to share this commitment to stewardship?

We are talking black and white. I am an artist. Mixed black and white, and you get mud!
To reflect the heritage values of the village would require more than the few historical design features on the new buildings. Need to preserve green space/buffer zones, views, street layout, etc. New residents would need commitment to heritage to preservation of the village’s unique character. Given the quality of Kingston’s existing affordable housing, I am very skeptical that a project in Barriefield would be a success.

The architectural details necessary would add considerably to the initial cost as well as the ongoing maintenance of the properties. Is this the best reason or investment you can come up with? I think not. You can do far better than $240K/family in nearby residential developments.

It does not seem economically feasible to provide low density housing that could still be affordable, given the lack of services on the land, the bedrock which would need to be removed to allow basements/ foundations.

Use school for community purposes.

The answer to this question very much depends on the contemplated scale of the project.

Any affordable housing must be integrated within the existing village - not exist as a segregated ghetto. The number of units should be in proportion to existing housing, construction and styling. Must conform to LACAC specifications and approvals. Mixed use and private ownership are essential to ensure pride of ownership similar to that demonstrated by existing residents.

The density required is inappropriate to the values of the village. The architectural style and potential future maintenance, as evidenced by other projects will devalue the entire concept, particularly in light of the UNESCO designation. The number, density, cost to build here versus elsewhere in the city etc. Would have to be given before I could answer, if affordable housing would be suitable.

Barriefield already accommodates affordable housing. The proportion has changed over time, but still has the services. There is no longer a shop or library, even the school is soon to close. Barriefield could utilize existing building stock for the purposes of affordable housing. Is there the political will and the farsighted planning to make this happen?

Believe the costs would be too high. Did not see any mention what it would cost to build!

Barriefield is attractive now, because of the way it is. Not because of the way it could be. Many people would like to live here, because what we have all done makes it attractive. To reflect the heritage values, we as Kingstonians all appreciate. Means holding to standards set by the Historical Society. This housing project should be affordable. Following these historical standards, takes away affordability.

Affordable housing could unlikely meet the cost requirements of being "heritage-sensitive"; affordable housing generally necessitates a multi-unit or multi-family configuration to make construction costs affordable. However, even if "affordable construction" were possible, the increased population density caused by sheer number of units proposed would throw the...
population density "out of balance" with the existing population base. It is also proposed to be constructed on significant green space, which would destroy the entrance to and indeed the village setting of Barriefield.

- The village has and could support affordable housing if it is done by buying and renovating some of the existing houses. Therefore achieving true integration. Since it is not clear the development of any kind will enhance the HCD village, it seems entirely unlikely that "development" of new affordable housing would fit well. Based on the concept of integrating about 4% of all housing in any area as "affordable", and "development" would tip this balance out of proportion, while providing pressure to force significant development. Rather than completing the overdue HCDP update without potentially inconsistent pressure.

- I liked the initial Hughes-Downey housing concept: the lower front façades, paid tribute to the historic architecture of the village; their backs with two floors of South/Southeast facing windows or solar warmth. Look to a desirable future. The sun-seeking windows with eight to the solar panels on the other side of the highway. The attached units also save heat. The design concept reflects the Kingston motto "Historic Past, Promising Future". In the setting, at a major intersection at the entry to the city center, we have the opportunity to tell the world what kind of city we are: we value our architectural heritage, but live in the present as the considerable new development in Barriefield shows. We are moving to more intense development and redevelopment, where there are services and vacant land, and along major arteries as opposed to sprawl. We have made the provision of decent affordable housing a priority in what has traditionally been a tight housing.

- If it reflected the values of the village - however, it will cost an incredible amount of money. More than $1.00, something which seems to be conveniently overlooked. Where will the money miraculously come from?

- But do not isolate those in affordable housing - there is a long distance to stores and services, especially when one partner is working and has the family car or if there is no car. Public transportation is limited to certain days and hours. Do not penalize those in need of affordable housing. Consider weather conditions that those forced to walk past RMC on Highway 2.

- Not with the present proposal. This is not feasible at this “one dollar” location.

- But perhaps only 10 at the most. The existing community should not be overwhelmed.

- My concerns: 1) building on parcel one would destroy the Main Street/St. Marks Streetscape. 2) Are funds available to “reflect heritage values”? Can this be assured in advance i.e., before major funds are expended on planning? I fear that once the city has this process and related expense under way. It will build regardless of whether or not he can follow through on affecting heritage values. 3) combining Parcels two and three and the J.E. Horton School property, which seems a real possibility, could result in more area/units/population devoted to affordable housing into the heritage houses in Barriefield, thereby radically changing its character, especially when
combined with the unfortunate development of housing already found on the Eastside of the northern block of Main Street (in part due to very wide road allowance there).

- If you mean buildings following the Heritage Conservation District Plan, then yes. Mostly, 1 ½ story detached dwellings, less than 10% duplexes, no mini apartment buildings and a built form reflecting this same little building density as currently exists. Parcels one and two of the DND land are not suitable for affordable housing!

- It's not just “the look” but the density. Barriefield is small and has fixed physical boundaries: Water, CFB Kingston. Any proposal for any development that didn't conform to the heritage guidelines and that increased the size of population significantly overnight would be overwhelming (as it would be to any community)

- If the affordable housing, reflected the heritage values of the Village and the type of housing - over 90% single-family homes - that exists in the village, with very few nonconforming buildings (including the school) built before it became a Heritage District. There might be an opportunity to open a dialogue with residents on this issue

- Affordable housing could unlikely meet the cost requirements of being "heritage sensitive"; affordable housing generally necessitates a multi-unit or multi-family configuration to make construction costs affordable. However, even if "affordable construction" were possible, the increased population density caused by the sheer number of units proposed would throw this population density out of balance with the existing population base. It is also proposed to be constructed on significant green space, which would destroy the entrance to and indeed, the village setting of Barriefield

- Yes, I believe low scale density affordable housing is okay - but ALL heritage guidelines must be complied with, just as current residence have to comply too. I totally disagree with for 4-plex units - maximum size should be a duplex

- Only if it can be incorporated into the existing buildings in the Village. Building NEW, according to Heritage Standards, is simply NOT affordable! The Horton School property should have been dealt with first (since school will be closing soon.) Before anything else, so there was some cohesive place for the whole area

- No I do not believe that Barriefield could accommodate affordable housing if reflected with the heritage values of the village. Affordable housing should be affordable, not with the huge price tag just because the land was offered to the city for one dollar. The overall cost of the so-called "affordable housing" is simply not affordable

- Not if “accommodate” means adding more structures to the buffer land, green spaces surrounding the village. Reflecting the heritage values as outlined above would entail no more development, period. Any development of any kind would need to be so small in scale and number - it would not be worth running that land

- Hughes-Downey plan has conceived did not respect heritage values. No other massing single apartments in village. Previous applications for quad-
plexes denied by Heritage Committee, and now it is okay? Who will maintain the social housing to reflect the current heritage values in village? What will it look like in 10 years with the city's track record of maintenance? Transitional renters will not have the same respect for heritage with no financial concept.

- But, some development could happen, but only if the structures built it into the rural village character and heritage rules. The same building materials should be used, besides buildings conform, and a variety of styles used. No cookie-cutter approach. The green space must be maintained as well to provide a buffer from the highways but also to maintain the heritage value and beauty of the village.
Please provide any additional comments about this Feasibility Study:

- Having a socially middle class enclave is not the issue – having a middle class neighbourhood is one.
- “Financial viability” is one of the issues for the Feasibility Study. This must include the effects of a public housing project on property values and the assessed value to property taxes. The assessed values have risen dramatically since the village became a Heritage district. This happened because heritage designation gave people the confidence that this investment in heritage would be protected. They moved to Barriefield (and paid high property prices) trusting the city and its planners to follow planning principles to maintain and enhance the assessments on which the city collects taxes.
- I hope the Feasibility Study takes into consideration: (1) The culture of the village; (2) The needs of the proposed group of residents; (3) The scale of the new development vis-à-vis the existing population of the village; (4) The lengthy process of beginning to bring affordable housing to Barriefield; and (5) the legal necessity of protecting a designated Heritage District.
- Is not enough of a Feasibility Study that shows more a number of facts? What is there, not what is possible (feasible!). Transportation, shopping, parking etc.
- The Feasibility Study has been narrow-mindedly railroaded through. Suggestions for land swaps etc. have been stopped at the gate. As an owner I have had trouble paying for needed repairs on my home because of the heritage guidelines. How does the city intend to pay for maintaining properties? Amend heritage regulations? Then throw away 30 years of heritage designation, no doubt? Put on your thinking caps! How about a hospice? How about an old-age home? About single-family affordable homes?
- You talk about Part 1. What about Part 2 and Part 3? We are a Heritage Village now, but if we develop subsidized housing, the weeds will take over and kill the flowers.
- An extension of time should be requested in order that the study may be completed with maximum thoroughness.
- The timeline is far too aggressive and rushed. Public consultation in August is hopeless as many people are on vacation. The date of presentation to the heritage committee is on the same day as the only other public meeting - making it impossible for the heritage committee’s views to be taken into account. I am concerned that the more money you spend on studies, the more the city will feel that it has to proceed. This is too bad. Barriefield is a wonderful asset to the city of Kingston and it is vital not to risk damaging. This is a unique Heritage village. Note: the proposed development is adjacent to the only entrance to the village (by road). So there is a tremendous risk of changing the ambience of the village. This needs careful consideration.
- You have not given timelines for the study of the project. Other than calling it affordable. There is nothing about the value of the proposed development i.e.
The study is a waste of a $200.00 tax payment.

- The disruption/destruction required for such a major building project. Integration/acceptance of the "newcomers" would depend on the acceptance of the final plans that would not "overwhelm" the current villagers by numbers (population), population density, height, loss of green spaces, large parking lots that seems so typical of low income housing projects. Additional housing on this side of the river needs to take into account the additional traffic volumes over the existing bridge.

- Heritage is important – irreplaceable. Affordable housing can be built anywhere.

- This study, must work with the entire Kingston Heritage plan and overall planning for the city. It must be economically viable and not be reflective of a political agenda.

- If this happens, it will be very divisive, not good for anyone! No one wants to address policing in areas of high density affordable housing. I would welcome a “seniors” complex and even long-term care residents in Barriefield. Seniors have a great need for affordable housing and could be successfully accommodated within this village.

- I am concerned that the cost to create affordable housing in Barriefield that meets the standards that the rest of Barriefield is held to will not be cost effective. Also the upkeep of the units will be that much more expensive. I don't see how the housing can be integrated by using available lands. That would create ghettos, not integration.

- I've heard there may be an air quality issue with regard to the heating plant located on the east side of Hwy. 15. Will this air quality be included in the Feasibility Study? I am very concerned that this Feasibility Study is being rushed through to meet Council deadline. Surely a unique heritage site like Barriefield deserves a more careful study.

- Schedule too rushed and lack of time for negotiating likely lead to OMB.

- Affordable housing can be built in many different locations within the city. But there is only one Heritage Village, and once its integrity is lost, it's lost forever. The City is extremely shortsighted in its rush to fill the available DND land. Barriefield Village is an important and unique history, assets for the City and could be included in the marketing of cultural tourism. It is almost beyond belief that the City would willingly destroy the integrity of this village for such a goal easily attainable in other areas.

- Very disappointing process! Having a group of people wandering around a gym looking at unexplained posters, and not knowing who to talk to, or the right person to talk to and hope to get an answer is not consultation. I had a very uncomfortable feeling listening to the landscape consultant that she was looking for solutions to each problem area, rather than remaining neutral and coming through as un-biased. Yes/no answer to feasibility. During most of the tour, she continually talked about things like “where another road could be built”, how far back from the highway units would be built., etc. etc. - as if she was already a certain mindset, because that was what her “client” wanted.
Typical consulting job: Baseline, get public divided and talking, slowly implement plan, fait accompli, poor people get some housing, taxpayer pays, and consultants get their share

Kingston has several high concentration affordable housing developments that are recognized failures. Duplicating the model in an even less accessible location, and within the confines of the strictly controlled. Historical environment is illogical and irresponsible. The Feasibility Study should be taking place, should be around providing fully integrated housing across all areas of the city for the 1000+ households on the waiting list. Instead, we're wasting time squishing a square peg into a round hole

It is massively rushed and cannot be thoroughly and properly completed in the timelines dictated by Council, and I fear the extensive studies and discussion contemplated by City staff in their detailed recommendations to council will be largely adopted. A handful of councillors with personal vendettas against Barriefield are driving this agenda with little regard where concerned that necessary processes to ensure the rights of all interested parties are not compromised. Slow that down. This decision will have an impact on a valuable cultural resource that cannot be undone once it's put into place. Careful and thorough consideration is required, not a massive push toward a specific outcome, supported largely by only a handful of ill-informed councillors with no regard to heritage conservation or due process

The failure to reflect the Kingston model for affordable housing - provided a sense that the Barriefield affordable housing can be at 60 percentile. I sense that you are biased to satisfy the Barriefield residents that they can have people “just like themselves” living in new housing. We can exclude the people on the housing waiting list and still get the land for free. That is not what this city needs. It is not consistent with the Kingston model of affordable housing

Very rushed, plus little opportunity for sending public consultation. Heritage has little scope, city's heritage committee still not consulted, heritage planner are still out of the loop. Public input at one meeting, then the plans presented within one month. Over the summer, when many away. Hardly a way to have genuine community participation

I hope the consultants will find that building affordable housing in Barriefield is indeed feasible. There is - as far as I know, no affordable housing, east of Kingston. I believe that project is not only do-able, but extremely desirable. Kingston must look after its poorest residents

You need not be afraid of public comments. Stand up and get real feedback (pro or con)

I feel this study may already be biased. The photos don't show any new buildings, and don't show the ugly “shed” at the church. I have been involved in municipalities for 40 years and have never seen a worse case of NIMBY-ism!! In fact, someone I know told me she didn’t want her clients living near her. This is mostly NIMBY-ism!

The various people responsible for putting this Feasibility Study together need to be fully informed of the issues and need to share that information with one
another so that everyone knows, what is at issue. A lot of ignorance abounds at present, and also a lot of preconceived notions. Easement from Hwy. 15 is also apparently not been taken into consideration, because there is not much land there between the village and the road

- There was already one home in the area by number 2 and number 15. The William Allen house which had to be moved (now 412 Wellington), because it was too close to the highway. Now we are looking at putting many homes in the same area! Look at history! All the other new residential areas near #15 have green buffer areas approximately the same size as the DND land that presently act as visual and sound buffers. It seems a waste of money to even consider Barriefield for this type of housing. The “Feasibility” Study isn’t feasible - it is a waste of taxpayers’ money. The money being wasted could be used immediately to buy homes under $250,000 that are for sale now. The limestone bedrock is virtually on the surface and will provide a bigger challenge for building and elsewhere. Soundproofing due to traffic noise but too expensive - there are too many barriers! Then there is the archaeological study, which is essential. That costs at least $10,000 for one lot in Barriefield now!

- I believe that Barriefield has been targeted by a number of City Council members and this has been terribly disillusioning. Some of our community members have dedicated too many hours to calculate to the city and its improvement over many, many years. The city's response has been to ignore the voices of these very same citizens, be provocative and discriminating. It is truly a shame to observe and to recognize that we are deserving of so little respect

- Transparency! (1) PDF versions of all material. (2) Clear timelines and dates for deliverables. (3) Description of the details of the DND process, and what this means. 4) A transparent description of the cost for construction in Barriefield versus elsewhere. This includes the costs of feasibility studies and staff time

- The timelines are far too tight. There is not enough opportunity for public input into: (1) the need for affordable housing (2) and the cost of housing that would be needed; (3), alternative uses of the land (4) natural flora and fauna, character and role of DND lands. World Cafés should be on Eastside of River. There are Barriefielders who are without transportation - much money for taxi fares and they will not be able to easily attend the World Café, the Third Crossing World Café was at LaSalle Secondary School - there is no reason this one shouldn't be either

- You should have asked those filling out the questionnaire if they are residents of Barriefield. If the heritage value of Barriefield is only valuable for residents of Barriefield, then there is strong dimension of privilege in play

- I hope that people on both sides of the affordable housing issue can meet and develop a dialogue about what would work best for everyone involved. Stereotypes, myths and prejudices must be set aside, if any progress is to be made. I'm concerned that many have made up their minds and taken a stand before there's been a chance to engage in conversation about affordable
housing. Barriefield is part of Kingston and needs to respond, if any other area of Kingston is expected to respond to wider community needs such as affordable housing

- To a degree it seems to slant towards affordable housing! I think that the actual history and heritage stature cannot be replicated by a new building. The “new” erected near the church have spoiled the heritage aspect already and shouldn't have been allowed! It is unfortunate that the federal land was not turned over to the community when Hwy. 15 was rerouted, but that is too late now. Affordable housing is now a priority to all other considerations because of city has not produced efficient stock for the need and the safe housing of our citizens needs to be allayed. There is a paucity of lands available and the situation for those needing housing is in my opinion more important than the historical aspect. Even saying this, is probably flying in the face of getting affordable housing built here!

- I hope the consultants will start from scratch and take heritage factors seriously. The current council has a majority that is determined to build this (and more) developments, on the ideological grounds that it's “our turn” for public housing. Led by Councillor, Steve Garrison, they have rejected upgrading. Kingston's Heritage Plan with respect to Barriefield, because (to paraphrase Garrison), if they updated it, that would finish this project.

- During a walking tour, it was mentioned that Regent Street, could be extended through parcel three. This would divide the village in two parts, without mentioning the congestion caused by the traffic. I think that I am talking for many people in the village, when I say that we are not against affordable housing. On the contrary, our community is very involved in volunteer work of all kinds. We are against any development - period. This would change the face of the village forever (no matter the type of buildings).

- It's well done, but for those of us who want to influence the kind and number of dwellings, I doubt it will keep us

- The plan, originally presented of multiple units, single bedroom units does not suit the character and nature of the village area, transitional housing makes no sense. It needs to focus on families. As such density will be appropriate.

- Please don't build these units in Barriefield. This area is the prettiest in all of Kingston. It would ruin that area entirely. All these houses are historical. There are other buildings for low income residents - these just don't belong in this area. I do not live in Barriefield, but still live in East Kingston. I jog and ride my bike in Barriefield and thoroughly enjoy it. I see deer, fox, and porcupines. It is beautiful as it is. It would be huge mistake building these units here

- The concerns of developing housing on particularly part three are many: housing should be developed as an integral part of the village, not as a separate and isolated development; any new housing on part three should not require additional north/south streets - access from George Street only. Houses from the intersection of Highways 2 and 15. A real problem and should leave a substantial tree buffer along Hwy 15. Hwy 15 is an important entrance to the Village. And whatever happens on the lands in question,
should support it as an alternative route into the City and not just a row of backyards. Wellington Street at Hwy 15 is the only village entrance – it needs to be regarded as such, and be landscaped appropriately - not just backyards from #5. It’s a cross section of people who appreciate the history of the village and wish to conserve its historic fabric. The concept of all one type of housing for part three is folly - it should follow, if developed, the general mix of existing housing

- Broad circulation of the information provided today along with a range of options would be helpful in the decision-making process. Further examples of how new housing can be integrated with existing housing in a small-scale, low-rise community, which further illustrates the opportunities for a well-designed addition to the community. Some clarification of the proposed mixed-income nature and the style of management and operation would be helpful

- I know several people who need affordable housing. They don't want to come to Barriefield. They are being forced here because they need affordable housing. If they don't want to be here, how are they going to keep the heritage value alive? It is not inexpensive to live here. Mostly, above all else, I don't believe that the City of Kingston should be exempt from the heritage rules that the current residents live by. The city has once again proven that amalgamation was and is an ongoing disaster

- As consultants, I urge you to make your recommendations based on the needs of Kingston's poorest citizens and not be unduly influenced by the vociferous expectations from Barriefield residents. Of course heritage and practical issues also need to be addressed, but it would be a scary day if NIMBY-ism stopped this project

- Affordable housing, where 30%-50% are single transitional units' breeds crime and disrespect for property. Do you want this as the entrance to Kingston from the east? The sense of history and military will fail in the community. If you want to make a genuine city, feel free… but it benefits no one. For Kingston to be something, it has to be different - do not destroy what you have. Affordable housing is a Canadian social imperative - but it should be affordable and not in everybody's face. There's cheaper, and available land elsewhere

- When I requested to know more about those responsible for putting together so inaccurate a description, no one was forthcoming with the information. The consultants involved, were either not present or failed to identify themselves. The questions seem to be in favour of tapping into pro or anti-affordable housing awareness. This is not what we need. We need to find creative, acceptable propositions, not kick around the political football which is becoming a forum for division among citizens, not comity of purpose

- As an Assistant Deputy Minister in the Alberta Government. I was instrumental in introducing in the mid-1970s, the process that has been variously known as INTEGRATED land-use planning, INTEGRATED land management and INTEGRATED resource planning. (My uppercase). What we are doing here in Barriefield with the problem or challenge is how to
integrate “affordable housing” into a historical, heritage area. This is virtually impossible. The way to accommodate affordable housing is for the city to purchase modest homes (in modest neighbourhoods) that have seen better times. Individual house by individual house. Give the “needy” residents of direct incentive to fix the place up. They will soon develop pride of ownership and will be well-placed to INTEGRATE into the street with their neighbors. Edmonton has done this very successfully. My wife and I have delivered Christmas gifts to the children in many such houses under the Santa’s Anonymous program. The alternative is to develop whole developments for affordable housing, as it is being considered here. The result is a ghetto, which can easily become dreadfully run-down and slum-like. Integrating fully, as the “micro scale” is vital, be it for those with modest incomes or other identifiable groups a society, and as groups with specific ethnic backgrounds. The days of “Chinatown” and "Little Italy", may sound quaint, but do not reflect a vibrant integrated society

➢ In addition, the city has a very poor track record of maintaining its affordable housing units elsewhere. We pay A LOT of money to maintain our heritage houses according to standards set for us in the designation. The city, my city, demands that of the residents of this village. I am responsible for adhering to heritage guidelines. I have NO confidence that the city will be able to afford to maintain these units accordingly... and their track records prove this. I also have no confidence that the city will commit money and effort into maintaining this Village’s integrity - should the development proceed. I feel unsupported by my City Council

➢ Did not understand why there were any diagrams if the information has not been gathered. It seems that the information has been gathered without Public Consultation. Did not feel like we were able to contribute anything – it seemed already laid out

➢ There should not even be a study! a) is not affordable to build in Barriefield b) according to our own council and city staff, Kingston has room for those that need to live in "geared to income" housing. Apparently, those units are in a state of disrepair. The logical conclusion would be to repair those existing units, and not waste millions of dollars on building a few units in the wrong place. c) Barriefield Village is casual walking distance from downtown, but not in the heat of July-August or the cold of winter. Crossing the causeway is the shortest way to the grocery stores, and other amenities. If I am in "geared to income housing", I would like to save my money where possible. Not driving, taking a cab or bus is one way to do that. So if I lived in Barriefield, I have to walk over 4 km, across the causeway in February to buy my groceries? No thank you!

➢ The City of Kingston should be ashamed proceeding with development of affordable housing on the three land parcels identified. As residents and current custodians of Barriefield history, we have been bound (through building permit issuance) by the rules of LACAC (which is the City of Kingston) throughout the restoration of our heritage property, yet the restoration was completely self-funded, no public funding, municipal or
otherwise was provided to assist us. In short, we jumped through the City’s “hoops” to ensure that Village would have a relatively homogenous, 19th century architecture and cultural “feel” and now the City is simply out to destroy all that we have worked so hard for (and have paid for). It is a clear, unabashed case of a “Do as I say, Not as I do” message coming from the City of Kingston; this is unjust!

- It is a shame that the current City Council care so little about this important village that is pushing their social engineering project forward rather than putting the horse that had the cart and doing the overview HCDR update first -without an agenda of any kind influencing the end result. It seems impossible for heritage to really get a fair shake. Under these circumstances, and it is very clear from activity to date that the City simply doesn't see their responsibility here. Just one more of the many important ways in which the amalgamated city has failed the once independent communities.

Furthermore, if the current consultants have an opportunity to bid on the future work that falls out of activity that is suggested as a result the first phase, then the entire process is weighted against Heritage. This is truly ironic in a City, where those Village LACAC members with an interest in common have been told by the city legal department that they have a conflict, while the city hires a LACAC member firm to provide the first proposal (which may or may not remain on the table for discussion)

- The landscape designer drew our attention to the wall of vegetation along George Street, as did Hughes-Downey. The wall of vegetation does serve to provide a boundary for the old village and I think it should remain with the addition of a wide (but not so wide that a car might be tempted to use it) pedestrian walkway formed as an extension of Regent Street. My imagination sees the vegetation-covered arbour and its greenery could provide the illusion of uninterrupted greenery to the corner houses and others opposite and shield from view in the parking that might be located there in the development. At the same time, if you down Regent Street opens up access and reduces isolation. Hughes-Downey, I think looked at the possibility of a single street from Wellington to James. This would provide direct access in the grass around the periphery of the village rather than through it. A number of people at the information meeting noted the fine view of St. Mark's from the parking lot east of the school. There is a sweeping downward slope of green from the back of the church that is particularly visible in the evening light. It's a view that is presently unseen but might be considered in locating a street parallel to #15 in the parcel under consideration and in any development of larger property. It might also work in any future extension of George Street. I don't favour more of the same on the property next to the school. Twenty-eight or thirty-two units are plenty for this area. Amenities: there appear to be bus stops almost outside the door; Canex is across the street for anyone stuck for a grocery item; McDonald's and Tim Hortons are nearby places of refuge; there are two dentists, a family medicine practice in the Rideau Town Centre that was accepting patients last year; a druggist, a library, tuition free adult education in music and computer skills at La Salle High, Food Basics on
Barrack Street; Value Mart at the Rideau Town Centre, convenience stores associated with gas stations on #15, a new Dollar Store in the Town Centre

- Can't believe the speed with which study is moving ahead. Villages were told all material leading up to study would be given to consultants. Yet they never received or seemed aware of letters written to council last November. Consultants were asked about further work to design project is City votes to go ahead - they said they would put Bid in - how unbelievable that a "neutral" body could run study fairly, knowing they might have further work - so in best interests to make sure project succeeds!

- The timeline for the phase 1 division seems rushed. Forgetting something that could potentially impact the city and the residents of Barriefield, irreversibly

- The feasibility study is a joke! The consultants hired by the city have had little time to understand this complicated matter and are going to do whatever it takes to make the city happy, not the residents in East End and elsewhere. This expense of study is just another example of why we have such an embarrassing standing. Second worst managed city in Ontario

- The City of Kingston should be ashamed of proceeding with development of affordable housing on the three land parcels identified. As residents and current custodians of Barriefield history, we have been bound (through building permit issuance) by the rules of LACAC (which is the City of Kingston) throughout the restoration of our heritage property, yet the restoration was completely self-funded, no public funding, municipal or otherwise was provided to assist us. In short, we jumped through the City's "hoops" to ensure the village would have a relatively homogenous 19th century architectural and cultural feel, and now the city is simply out to destroy all that we have worked so hard for and have paid for!

- Is a clear unabashed case of: “do as I say, not as I do” message - coming from the City of Kingston; this is unjust!

- Given the Heritage designation, the reasonable expectation of people moving to Barriefield how that character would not be radically changed, should in my view, honoured by the city. This is especially so given heritage requirements that current residents have to meet.

- Barriefield is unique and important to the history of Kingston and Canada, proven. Its designation as a Heritage Village 30 years ago. It is not just another suburb, nor is it a mono-culture of just rich people. It is a diverse community. Unlike other areas of Kingston, there is a special set of rules guiding new construction and renovations. The overall historical character of the village is as important as the character of the individual. The residents of the village have been the main caretakers of the village. They have abided by the rules. The same set of rules and guidelines must apply for any new development, or else this whole process is a sham. I take issue with the timelines of this study. The summer months are difficult, public input with better timelines. Another piece could have been done in recognition of the extreme difficulty for people to attend July 6th because of the enormous traffic jam downtown. The "go" or "no go" recommendation smells of being
weighted to "go", regardless and Phase 2 camps begin, while it is critical for a proper decision

- The affordable housing is to be built in Barriefield - I hope it is a development that everyone can be proud of for future generations. I don't want to see a "blight" on the landscape as one enters Barriefield. Please – NO – 4-plex development. Maximum duplex! And please mix the affordable housing with "market" housing. To avoid creating a ghetto.

- If you have already decided to build, what is the feasibility study all about? There are vacant lots in all areas of the City of Kingston where 2 to 3 units can be built in each of these areas. Buying already standing houses (duplexes/row houses) would be quicker and cheaper

- This whole process has been so obviously RUSHED and continues to be even more rushed now. Some of the consultants were poorly informed on the complexity of the issues and only confirmed the rushed nature of this whole process. Once again, the question arises, how objective, fair and honest report can be provided by a consultant when hired by the City of Kingston, especially a report to be completed in such a very short period of time. Is this Consulting Firm linked to just back up what they City wants them to do? I am interested in knowing how the setbacks or easement allowances will factor into the Highway 15/Wellington Street/George Street parcel of land. By the time you allow for this setback from a major highway #15, and one for Wellington Street and George treat as well as the Steam Bunkers, will there be any land left to build anything? The consultants should know that the Rock Garden has become a frequent place for wedding party photographs, since they can no longer go on to RHC grounds, adding more interest to the village.

- If City Council had been open and above board. In addressing and proposing this venue, a great deal of shock and antagonism. Would have been avoided. It's time Council recognized the city DOES exist, east of the Cataraqui River. We, who live here, present that blatant disregard. Transportation seems to be a non-concern all-around. Ask the proposed inhabitants how they expect to shop

- We were blind-sided by the Hughes-Downey proposal in October, 2009, having had absolutely no consultation or part in the process. It was a bad process, which exacerbated the tension and poor relations between Council and many ratepayers. So far this process is marginally better, but not much. This is not a dialogue, in which we as citizens can comment on what is happening. To date the process is completely one-sided. Moreover, the plan gives us exactly one opportunity to comment on the eventual proposal on August 9, and this again doesn't sound like a dialogue, but the presentation we can agree with, or lump it. According to housing studies in 2005, Kingston has many properties available for development for affordable housing. Why does this Study, focused solely on these DND lands, and not compare this possibility to an alternative site elsewhere? Surely this is simply best practice for using our tax money. Council report, 10-061 shows that this site, even at one dollar is a relatively very expensive piece of land, requiring costly reviews
and modifications to existing law. The lack of comparison to another site, like for example, 80 Barbara Ave., makes this study appeared to be another foregone conclusion, like Hughes Downey. You can't blame us for feeling like pawns in a game, whose opinion counts for nothing.

- Report 10-061 states that: “consulting the public is important to this and any other public policy deliberations that Council undertakes. The consultation process will offer meaningful opportunities for interested parties to become informed. As part of the feasibility study, it is recommended that focused consultation take place with respect to specific uses for the property and there may be an opportunity to provide some clarity on issues related to the properties... Council has directed staff to hold at least one public meeting with a suitable panel of expertise to provide briefings and then to hear public comment and discussion...” The PIC. On July 6, did not offer anything resembling a "meaningful opportunities for interested parties to become informed". The July 6 PIC has done nothing to alleviate the fiasco in lack of trust between the public and the Council on this issue. That was created by the handling of the Hughes Downey proposal. Report 10-061 states that: "development on the subject land is made more expensive, time-consuming, and risk prone than a typical housing development because of: a) the requirements for meeting a high threshold of analysis and investigation under the Ontario Heritage Act and other land-use policies and statutory regulations; b) the potential for archaeological discoveries of high importance." And further, "There are sets of inter-related policies in the Official Plan. And in the Barriefield Conservation District Plan (excerpts in Exhibit F & G) which are intended to protect the heritage aspects of the village, guide the type of residential use is permitted, protected view planes, and incorporate buffering (yes. These may severely hinder the economical creation of affordable housing." These statements leave me speechless as to why Council isn't exploring other options - ones that cost less and can be built sooner. The "land for one dollar" mantra is popular in the press and a great piece of marketing, but it isn't true (as report 10-061 shows). So what is the driver of this proposal? Because there is no affordable housing in Kingston East? Is that so important a goal at this time that the City is willing to finance a development that will be more expensive and time-consuming than many other options? That Council doesn't even want to consider other options?

- Our chief concern relates to the northernmost of the three plots, the one directly attached to the north of St. Mark's. Many people appreciate the view of St. Mark's coming from the north on Hwy. #15; as you know is a heritage building and one that is appreciated by many in the community. The building is to be built on this plot, we would appreciate being in consultation with the planners, to ensure that the view remained unimpeded

- The cost of penetrating the limestone for foundations and utilities will outweigh the cost savings of acquiring this property. Increasing population will expose Barriefield Gardens to the additional vandalism. Once diminished or destroyed, the image of the source store village will never be recaptured. Have some respect for the unique value of this designated community.
Current residents have been forced to pay a high cost premium to maintain their dwellings. The cost of which the City of Kingston continues to avoid throughout its jurisdiction and no doubt will continue to do in Barriefield. There are many more properties or sites in Kingston closer to amenities, better suited to affordable housing development.

Please accept the following as some of my additional comments about this Feasibility Study. Just to say something about my own background and concerns; I have lived in Kingston for the past forty-six years, thirty-five years in the Old Sydenham district and 10 years in a subdivision in the former Pittsburgh Township. I have never lived in Barriefield village. For a number of years, I have been strongly involved in heritage conservation in Kingston, Frontenac County, and Loyalist Township of Lennox and Addington County, and it sat on the board of the Frontenac Heritage Foundation for the past seven years, four of these years as president. First, let me thank the City of Kingston for shifting to a process of consultation of the public on this issue. Instead of continuing with the secretive process that they took, this resulted in the Hughes-Downey proposal sprung on the public without consultation in October 2009. It certainly represents a much more open and suitable approach to public planning. However, I was sorely disappointed that they Heritage Planner and the Municipal Heritage Committee for the City of Kingston. Still have had no input to the process: the Heritage Planner was not at this evening's meeting. Nor was there report from him made available. This seems inexcusable to me. Has the heritage planner been asked to write a report on this project and its impact on designated Heritage Districts (both existing and planned) within the City of Kingston? If not, why not? Second, my concern is the preservation of heritage nature and natural setting of Barriefield Village and the maintenance of the Heritage Conservation District Plans of this and any other heritage districts that may come into existence in the Greater Kingston Area, the Province of Ontario, and Canada. The creation and continuance of heritage districts is a very complex, fragile process. Since most of the conservation of built structures is done by private individuals with their own financing, and often with long-term goals (such as providing a home in which to raise a family which will hold its value over time), it is very important that the regulations defining heritage districts are followed and are seen to be followed on a long-term basis, not subject to the whims, pet projects, or even petulance of mayors, city councillors, or city employees. Barriefield Village came into existence as a Heritage District 30 years ago. Its regulations, the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan of 1992, lays out in detail the style of buildings that may be erected in the District and what changes owners may make to existing property. On the whole, the Barriefield plans have been rigorously enforced by the LACAC, of Pittsburgh Township, and, since amalgamation, by the Municipal Heritage Committee of the City of Kingston. When City Mayors and Councils decide to overrule Heritage Conservation District Plans that they themselves have approved, it calls into question the validity of the whole planning process and creates an atmosphere of distrust. No wonder the residents of Barriefield, who had
invested both financially and socially in their heritage homes (or in their new homes built to heritage regulations), and supporters of heritage throughout the Greater Kingston area became exceedingly upset when the City of Kingston released the Hughes Downey proposal to build a substantial (within the context of the village) number of units on land bordering the only road into the heritage Village. This appeared to contradict Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan of 1992 and seriously undermined the long-term trust between the residents of Barriefield and the Kingston City government. This creates an atmosphere of distrust and instability that makes it very difficult to have people buying into the work and expense involved in creating and maintaining of this or any other historic district, because it contradicts stable long-term planning and commitment. Third, it is my understanding that the consultants have been hired by the City of Kingston to put forth a proposal for affordable housing to be built on the site of the lands owned by the Department of National Defense on the west side of Highway 15. Frankly, I would prefer to have the consultants recommended this land be purchased from the DND, and public housing built on a more appropriate public land in the City of Kingston, but that does not seem to be the issue under discussion. Fourth, the consultants now involved in this potential project have entered into a situation in which the City of Kingston has created what some people involved in human relations would call a "poisoned atmosphere." Trust between the residents of Barriefield and the Mayor, many of the counselors, and the administrative officers of the City of Kingston has reached a dismal level, with at least one Counselor viciously and publicly attacking the residents of Barriefield for having to temerity of defending their heritage District and the community that they have worked so hard to create. The plan is that the status of law for 30 years and has been modified to bring it up to date to adjust to the change in jurisdiction. Exchanges of opinion in the local press, especially the *Kingston Whig Standard*, has often given over to the worst sort of name calling, rather than to a calm discussion of issues. It will take considerable thought and talent on the part of the consultants to attempt to build trust with the residents of Barriefield again, to overcome the hostility generated by the actions of 2009. Fifth, the issue of building "affordable housing" in Barriefield must take place within the context of an established heritage community, that consists of around 81 single-family homes, for duplexes, a school, a heritage church (of great architectural merit), a school museum (in a heritage building), and some lovely green spaces with great vistas, all regulated by the plan. This community has existed as a very successful, long-lasting (30 years) legally established heritage District. This context places considerable limits on future development. For example, the only street into Barriefield passes through the major portion of the land on which it is proposed that affordable housing be built. How can one claim to have a viable heritage District, if that area were to undergo development out of character with the existing buildings in the village? The issue of the relationship of anything built on this portion of the property to the existing heritage Village is a very important one that needs careful study. Equally
important is the relationship of the type of housing proposed for this area versus the type of housing already existing (i.e., over 90% single-family dwellings); in order to begin a dialogue with the residents of Barriefield, both the heritage context and the village context needs careful consideration. It is my understanding, that the most successful affordable housing projects are relatively small in scale in relation to the community in which they are located and need to have support from the existing residence. Putting together a proposal that builds trust, receives the support of the Barriefield community, and preserves the heritage character of this well-established, socially healthy community will provide a considerable challenge.
Barriefield Village

Consultancy on the Potential Acquisition of Federal Surplus Land

Public Information Centre #2 – August 9, 2010
The purpose of the feasibility study is to assess the viability of developing the federal surplus lands in Barriefield Village for affordable housing.

This Public Information Centre (PIC) will:
- Provide an overview of study findings to date
- Identify development constraints and opportunities
- Review preliminary site concept plans

Please provide input by completing the comment sheets located at the back of the hall.
Project Team, Deliverables and Schedule

The City of Kingston retained the following firms to prepare a feasibility study for the federal surplus lands:

**MHBC Planning**
- Planning Rationale; Analysis of Built and Cultural Heritage, and Visual Impacts

**Mark T. Brandt Architect & Associates**
- Site Concept Plans

**SHS Consulting**
- Financial Viability Analysis (Affordable Housing)

**MTE Consultants Inc.**
- Preliminary Servicing Overview (Civil Engineering)

**Aercoustics Engineering Ltd.**
- Noise Impact Analysis

**Paradigm Transportation Solutions Ltd.**
- Traffic Impact Analysis

**Williamson Consulting Inc.**
- Public Consultation Overview

These studies and analyses will form the recommendations of the feasibility study together with the input received throughout this project.
The consulting team has completed the following tasks to date:

- Technical staff pre-consultation
- Public Information Centre #1 (July 6, 2010)
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of public comments
- ‘Kitchen table’ meetings with the Barriefield Village Association and Kingston Poverty Roundtable
- Presentation to the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee (August 9, 2010)
- Completion of servicing, traffic and noise studies

After consideration of the feedback received at this meeting and the findings from the specific studies, a recommended option will be presented to City Council through the feasibility study.

- Wednesday, **August 18, 2010**: final day to submit comments on the site concepts and study
- Tuesday, **September 7, 2010**: the feasibility study is presented to City Council for direction
• Existing watermains and sanitary forcemains are located on the western side of Parcels 2 to 3 running in a north-south direction.

• A separate watermain from the Department of National Defence (DND) lands crosses Parcel 3 in an east-west direction as well as a steam system line that is used to heat buildings at the Royal Military College.

• Utilities Kingston and the DND will require easements over this infrastructure (no permanent structures will be permitted on these easements; see pink areas on map).

• Connection to local watermains along George Street and Wellington Street for Parcels 2 and 3 is possible. A water demand analysis will be required during detailed design to ensure adequate serviceability.

• Connection to the existing sanitary sewers for Parcels 2 and 3 is possible.

• An existing hydro circuit and overhead fibre-optic telecommunications line could be adequately extended to service Parcels 2 and 3.
The acoustic impact of road traffic from Highway 2 and Highway 15 was predicted as part of the analysis.

The predicted noise impact at the worst-case outdoor amenity area (15 metres from the centreline of the highway) exceeds the limits established by the Ministry of the Environment.

To mitigate noise impacts from the highway, dwelling units should be oriented such that outdoor amenity areas are shielded from the highway by the units themselves.

Noise from stationary noise sources was not observed to be significant which is likely due to low levels of activity and high levels of ambient noise.

There is a potential for significant noise impacts from stationary sources from the DND Base that will need to be comprehensively analyzed in Phase 2 (should Council proceed with Phase 2).
Traffic (Paradigm Transportation Solutions Ltd.)

- The existing traffic levels in Barriefield Village and the surrounding area were analyzed in the context of the federal surplus lands.

- The intersection of Wellington Street and Highway 15 is operating at a good level of service and traffic control signals at this intersection are not warranted due to low traffic volumes relative to capacity.

Additional traffic resulting from generalized background growth and potential development on the surplus lands can be accommodated on the existing road network with acceptable levels of services.

- Internal road access to Parcels 2 and 3 would be best accommodated on the western limits of the parcels where existing entrances are located.

- The sightlines for a driveway on the western limits of the parcels with access to Wellington Street are satisfactory for safe operation as the minimum stopping sight distances are exceeded in both directions.
The Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan and Study (1978):

- The Ministry of Culture and Recreation approved the Barriefield Village Heritage Conservation District Plan in January 1980.

The aim of the Study and Plan were to preserve and enhance the 19th Century character of the Village through the use of guidelines.

The Study recommended that new development generally continue the existing traditional building pattern of Barriefield regarding its type, density, scale and location.

Low density single family dwellings were preferred for new residential development while medium density semi-detached or row housing was contemplated in locations along Main Street.

- New construction was to reinforce the visual character of Barriefield while ensuring compatibility with the village.

- The maximum height of new construction was identified as $2\frac{1}{2}$ storeys.
Parcels 1, 2 and 3 are identified in the Study’s plan as “future low density residential – see appendix”.

The appendix contains a Special Motion of Council pertaining to the federal surplus lands:

“Moved by Hans Westenberg seconded by V. Maloney that Council advises D.N.D. and M.T.C. that it is its intention to zone the sections of severed National Defence property, which will be situated between the Village of Barriefield as it exists now and the new so called “Barriefield By-pass”, as part of Barriefield Village, suitable for residential development under the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act for designated heritage conservation district.”

(March 9, 1978)
The Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan (1992):

• The 1992 District Plan amended the original Heritage District Plan.

“This plan recognizes that Barriefield and its residents are not static entities. The plan is founded upon the basis that change in Barriefield’s unique built heritage and natural environment is to be expected. Of critical importance is that the changes in Barriefield’s heritage environment must be managed in a manner that recognizes and respects that special character derived from its heritage building stock” (The District Plan Rationale).

• The objective of new development is to encourage it only where it respects or otherwise complements the prevailing low profile and built character of existing buildings and structures within Barriefield.

• Building height of new structures must maintain the building height of adjacent properties and the immediate streetscape and should be neither excessively higher or lower.
Parcels 1, 2 and 3 are identified as ‘Landscape Unit 4: Grassed Open Space’ in the 1992 Plan:

- “Within this landscape unit it may be possible to allow low profile development to the south of the church, adjacent to Highway 15 and still retain major views”.

(Specific Recommendations for Improvement)
The present landscape in Barriefield is made up of developed and well-maintained residential properties, natural areas with a mix of vegetation associations, open fields and an orderly system of village streets.

The edges of most individual properties in the village are generally well-defined with a combination of plant material and decorative wood, chain link or stone fencing.

The shallow building setbacks and the large number of tall hedgerows defining the edge of the street create a cohesive and intimate visual setting.
Built and Cultural Heritage

- St. Mark’s Anglican Church is the most prominent building in the village and is visible throughout the village and surrounding area.

- The landscape features on the church’s property including the decorative stone walls and pillars create an inviting approach to the church.
Viewshed Analysis

St. Mark's Anglican Church:

- The areas shaded with green are locations where the top of the church's steeple is visible.
- Areas that are not shaded green do not have a direct view to the top of the steeple due to vegetation, topography and/or existing structures.
Viewshed Analysis

St. Mark’s Anglican Church:

• The areas shaded with green are locations where the base of the church’s steeple is visible

• Views from the north along Highway 15 continue to have a direct view of the entire steeple and roof-line while views to the south and east are obstructed
Parcels 1, 2 and 3 are designated Residential in the City of Kingston Official Plan. The following uses are permitted on lands designated Residential in Barriefield (Policy 7.3.C.7.):

- Detached dwellings and limited numbers of semi-detached dwellings
- A church, publicly-funded school, or other community facility, and a senior citizens home may be permitted subject to a rezoning
Parcels 1, 2 and 3 are zoned Institutional in the Township of Pittsburgh Zoning By-law. The following uses are permitted on lands zoned Institutional:

- an accessory dwelling house; an animal hospital; an auditorium; a cemetery; a church; a clinic; a hospital; a nursing home; a private club; a public use; and a school.

The Institutional Zone permits a maximum height of 12 metres (39.4 feet).
Affordability

Demand for Affordable Housing:

- Within Kingston, one third of renters (about 6,000 households) have an income of roughly $20,000 or less; however, the current average rent for a bachelor unit is almost $600/mth. At this level of income, renters can not afford rent more than $500/mth.

- More than 1,000 households are currently on the waiting list for social housing (about 10% are seniors).

- Kingston has the lowest overall rental vacancy rate in Ontario (1.3%) and within the City, the zone in which Barriefield is located is even lower (0.8%).

- With the aging population, seniors are becoming the most rapidly growing age group of the population.

Supply of Affordable Housing:

- While roughly 20,000 units of rental stock exist in Kingston, only about 8% is affordable to low income households.

- In the Barriefield area of the City, rental accommodation accounts for approximately 4% of all private housing stock.

- Despite continued growth, there is no social or affordable housing situated in Kingston east of the Cataraqui River.
Affordability

What is Affordable?

Where a household’s accommodation costs are not more than 30% of their gross income, having regard for the household income profile of the regional market area (Official Plan).

Based on the City’s Official Plan definition, this means that:

(a) Rents are deemed affordable where:
   • Rent does not exceed 30% of a household’s annual income; OR
   • Rent is at or below average market rent for the regional market area (whichever is lower)

Average market rents in Kingston are $753/mth. for a one bedroom apt. and $895/mth. for a two bedroom apt. (2010)

(b) Ownership prices are deemed affordable where:
   • The purchase price results in accommodation costs that do not exceed 30% of annual household income for the lowest 60% of all incomes in the regional market area; OR
   • The purchase price is 10% below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area (whichever is lower)

The average resale price in Kingston less 10% is $236,131 (2010).
Potential Development Concepts

Parcel 1:
Developed as public parkland

Parcel 2:
2-storey seniors apartment (32 units)

Parcel 3:
Single detached dwellings (13 units) and a semi-detached dwelling (2 units)
Parcel 3 Site Concept

LOW DENSITY DWELLINGS:
SINGLE FAMILY: 13 units*
SEMI DETACHED: 2 units
TOTAL: 15 units
(*Including 2 Universally Accessible units)

LEGEND:
- FRONT PORCH OR ENTRY AREA
- 1:2 STOYRE SINGLE
- 1 STOREY (Universally Accessible) UNIT
- BUILT FORM
- 2 STOREY SEMI DETACHED
- NEW SIDEWALK
- NEW ROAD AND DRIVEWAYS
- EXISTING VEGETATION ROW
- NEW LANDSCAPE OPPORTUNITY

NOTE: UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, BUILDINGS ON PARCEL 3 ARE TO BE 2 STORYRE SINGLE FAMILY HOMES.

Parcel 3 Landscape Plan
Potential Development Concepts

**Density Considerations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hectares</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Units per Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63 ha</td>
<td>1.56 ac</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.35 ha</td>
<td>3.34 ac</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.61 ha</td>
<td>3.98 ac</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.59 ha</td>
<td>8.88 ac</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Parcel 1** is proposed to be parkland
- The seniors apartment proposed for **Parcel 2** is 2-storeys, which is not out of character with existing buildings in the area (school and church).
- Medium density uses are defined as being 30 to 75 units per hectare in the Official Plan (3.3.B.1). The **Parcel 2** proposal is relatively low at 24 units per hectare.
- Development on **Parcel 3** represents a density of 9.4 units per hectare – the density of the area bounded by Wellington-George-James-Main (‘the four corners’) has a density of 9.3 units per hectare with a mix of single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and limited commercial uses.
Potential Development Concepts

Site Design and Built Form Principles

Parcel 2:

- Keep form to south as much as possible to optimize views to the church
- Maintain low profile – maximum two storeys
- Optimize use of infrastructure easement for lane and parking
- Provide for pedestrian connection with Parcel 1
- Cross-connect vehicular access to Parcel 3
- Use ‘pocket’ spaces derived from varied form
- Breakup groupings of cars
- Use soft landscape to ‘buffer’ built form and Highway 15
- ‘Break down’ scale and massing to ensure a residential identity
- Ensure compatibility with built form qualities of adjacent buildings (school and church)

Parcel 3:

- Maintain low profile – maximum two storeys
- Optimize use of infrastructure easement for trails, open spaces and landscaped buffer
- Use soft landscape to ‘buffer’ built form and Highway 15
- Maintain existing dense vegetation row along George Street
- Orient front of buildings to Highway 15 to buffer noise
- Provide low density, street-oriented housing forms
- Provide improved public access for pedestrians
- Emulate the use of the village’s outbuildings where possible
- Improve continuity with the rock garden to the south
- Use simple geometric forms and roof slopes
- Harmonize porches and other architectural features with the principal forms
- Provide for random occurrence – avoid stifling repetition
Potential Development Concepts

Parcel 2 – Seniors Apartments Concept Massing – Overall of Village
Parcel 2 – Seniors Apartments Concept Massing – Looking North East
Potential Development Concepts

Parcel 2 – Seniors Apartments Concept Massing – Building View from South West
Potential Development Concepts

Parcel 2 – Seniors Apartments Concept Massing – Building View from North West
Potential Development Concepts

Parcel 2 – Seniors Apartments Concept Massing – Entry Area Concept View
Potential Development Concepts

Affordability Assumptions:

- Incorporate a mix that provides for a healthy and diverse community while meeting important affordability needs.
- Encourage affordable home ownership as a strategy to break poverty cycle.
  Aim for 25% of units at geared-to-income to incorporate a strong component of affordability while also achieving a balanced and diverse social mix.

Parcel 2 – 2-storey seniors apartment (rental)
- 10 units rent-geared-to-income (rent supplement)
- 22 units below market rents (80% of average market rent)
- 32 units total

All units targeted to meet or exceed renter affordability criteria.

Parcel 3 – Single and semi detached homes (ownership)
- 13 units affordable single detached
- 2 units affordable semi-detached
- 15 units total, all with $10,000 down payment assistance

All units targeted to meet ownership affordability criteria.
Required Development Approvals (Phase 2):

- Possible Plan of Subdivision for Parcel 3
- Zoning By-law Amendment to permit the senior citizens home and single and semi-detached dwellings
- Application for Alteration under the Ontario Heritage Act
- Site Plan Approval
- Issuance of Building Permits

The submission of a Zoning By-law Amendment will require site-specific studies including a servicing brief, stormwater management plan, visual impact analysis, noise impact analysis, traffic impact analysis, planning rationale study, archaeological assessment, natural heritage evaluation, heritage impact statement, conservation plan analysis, cultural heritage landscape analysis and other studies identified through pre-submission consultation.

Potential Development Concepts

• Possible Plan of Subdivision for Parcel 3
• Zoning By-law Amendment to permit the senior citizens home and single and semi-detached dwellings
• Application for Alteration under the Ontario Heritage Act
• Site Plan Approval
• Issuance of Building Permits
Summary of Findings to Date

- **Servicing:** Utilities Kingston and the Department of National Defence will require easements over infrastructure on Parcels 1, 2 and 3 (no permanent structures will be permitted on these easements).

- **Noise:** To mitigate noise impacts from the highway, dwelling units should be oriented such that outdoor amenity areas are shielded from the highway by the units themselves.

- **Traffic:** Traffic control signals are not warranted at the intersection of Wellington Street and Highway 15.

- **Traffic:** The sightlines for a driveway on the western limits of Parcels 2 and 3 with access to Wellington Street are satisfactory for safe operation as the minimum stopping sight distances are exceeded in both directions.

- **Affordability:** In the Barriefield area, rental accommodation accounts for approximately 4% of all private housing stock.

- **Affordability:** Average market rents in Kingston are $753/month (2010) for a one bedroom apt. and $895/month for a two bedroom apt. Affordable home ownership prices in Kingston are defined as being less than $236,131.
SUMMARY OF THE SECOND PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE AND ONLINE SURVEY

FOR THE

BARRIEFIELD FEASIBILITY STUDY

AUGUST 9, 2010

Prepared by

Williamson Consulting Inc.
919 Beauclaire Drive • Ottawa • Ontario • ph. (613) 590-7880
www.williamsonconsulting.ca
Overview of Public Information Centre

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

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

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

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

Public Information Centre Notification Details

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

Online Survey Results

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

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

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

Signed attendance at the Public Information Centre was 86.

City of Kingston staff included:

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

The Project Team members in attendance included:

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

Open House Schedule

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

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

A total of 25 comment sheets were completed on site, and an additional 35 emails/faxes were subsequently received, for a total of 60 comments.

Each comment sheet had a total of four questions followed by an open ended request for additional comments. The first four questions provided for a yes and no response, along with additional comments. The following is a summary of the information received on the comment sheets.

1. Do you believe that the design concept for Parcel 1 at the north end of Barriefield is appropriate?
   
   ____ 34 ___ Yes   ____ 6 ___ No

2. Do you believe that the design concept for Parcel 2 south of Parcel 1 is appropriate?
   
   ____ 16 ___ Yes   ____ 20 ___ No

3. Do you believe that the design concept for Parcel 3 at the south end of Barriefield is appropriate?
   
   ____ 13 ___ Yes   ____ 23 ___ No

4. Do you believe the overall concept is appropriate for Barriefield in its design and scale?
   
   ____ 5 ___ Yes   ____ 21 ___ No
A summary of additional comments provided are listed below with the number in brackets indicating the number of times a similar comment was received:

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

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

- Despite comparisons to the school and the church, the structure seems too massive for this site. Better to put this structure on parcel 3 and spread out over more space.
- 32 units are too many. Who will manage the apartment building? Who will maintain properties and plans?
- Higher density in parcel 2, especially consider co-op.
- The building design is fine. The target group is problematic. The greatest need is for non-seniors, non-specialized social housing. Under the Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA). Also it is universally agreed in this City that 80% of Market Rent is not affordable for low and moderate income housing.
- But the affordability of over $250,000 is inappropriately high.
- Will it remain for seniors only?
- Some of the school land if released, should be allocated to a shopping plaza, so that the seniors are not isolated.
- Only if institutional designation is unequivocal. Preferable that part 2 be family homes like part 3.
- May be - senior housing is needed, but maybe a bit smaller, maybe okay.
- Must be kept for seniors only.
- One bedroom apartment are needed but the city’s own waiting list shows that seniors are not in great need at this time.
- Depending on a very sensitive design, this might work on parcel 2. Buildings need to be pushed further west; with the access road further west is possible because of the easements. Maximum is the given buffer between units and Hwy 15 is essential.
- Should before affordable housing for families, not for seniors only.
- Design looks like a Days Inn type hotel. Welcome seniors – fits into neighbourhood best.
- More and more people are going to drop out of the middle class and the concept of affordability will encompass more and more people.
- No: way too low density. Use the entire parcel for public housing.
- Too many apartments! How would old people with limited energy and limited means be able to be able to maintain this apartment house inside and out? Is this plan leading to a slum area that would help nobody.
- The seniors’ grouping is far too large and too high and takes away advantage of the vistas of the church from Wellington and also from the South and part of Hwy #15. Also the residents would have no view other than Highway 15 with the noise and pollution associated with it.
- It is too close to Highway 15.
- Seniors are not the key priority group, so 10:20 (?) ratio between low income and seniors designation is not good.
- Can a building be designated only for seniors? I thought that wasn’t allowed.
- No. In theory, a seniors’ complex would be fine for being built in the village; indeed, it’s my understanding that this is allowed for under the Official Plan.
The design that has been put forward though is two-stories, and I have a
problem with this, given that my understanding is that 1 and ½ is the upward
limit of building height. Like everyone, I’m concerned about what will happen
to the school property when it goes on the market. Another concern is that
the proposed seniors building might provide a precedent for other such
buildings on the school property with the result of turning the area into a
huge anomaly in the village.

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

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

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

Not enough green space left – takes away the rural aspect of Barriefield

Way too low density

Very apprehensive! The easement along George Street is now covered with trees and location. Will this remain like that? It could create a ghetto situation for the people living behind that. It would hinder greatly the desired interpretation for the new Barriefielders’

This is hardly worth developing. This land for affordable housing with so few units on it – due in large part to the whole network of infrastructure and easements associated with them. Also the units facing Highway #15 are being used as buffers. That is not a fair solution. More people according to good planning principles ought to have their fair share at views (of the church) and lack of noise

This is the design for median price houses in Kingston ($220,000) therefore it is well beyond even the average income household ($1,500 worth by payment would require $60,000 around income, not exactly a low income)

I liked the original design of the single buildings that held 4-1 bedroom apartments each. The minimum could be affordable houses for purchase and the apartments – a true mix

This parcel is key to the feasibility of the whole idea of putting an affordable housing development in the village, it seems to me. As mentioned in your report, there are a large number of constraints on building enough units to merit going ahead with this project. You are to be complimented for being sensitive to the heritage as well as other constraints that this very problematic site presents.

Fifteen units seems reasonable to me, given these restraints, but I’m sure it will not be reasonable to those who are intent on housing all 1,000 people on the waiting list in Barriefield! The design is a good design given the constraints and the pressure to get as many units in as possible.

I think I would have preferred to see houses along George St., but that is clearly impossible to do. The current and future noise and pollution constraints from traffic on Hwy. 15 are as you know considerable. I do share the stated disbelief of others at the public meeting concerning the viability of houses fronting the highway. The trucks that gear up and gear down at that point of the highway are extremely noisy and extremely polluting. If we’re all being honest, this is not the best way to use taxpayers’ money to build affordable housing, even with the land being offered for $1.

I would suggest as an alternative design is to make the proposed new road straight (in keeping with the grid pattern of the village), and to build one row of houses along it (i.e. 6 or 7 single unit, 1 – 1 ½ storey houses). That would leave ample room behind the houses to provide a natural buffer using trees, lilac bushes and other landscaping.

The proposal for Part 3 is quite appropriate, though I would suggest that the street leading from Wellington should be straight, like the rest of the streets in the village, and not curved. The density and proposed form is in keeping
with my understanding of the Official Plan and Heritage Conservation District guidelines.

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

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

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

I want to compliment you on giving due diligence to this highly problematic situation. You clearly gave it a lot of careful thought. The Barriefield Village Association Steering Committee (of which I am a member) was very grateful to have had the chance to meet with you. Affordable housing or indeed any housing can be put anywhere, but once heritage is lost or diminished, it can never be regained, as you know. I thus urge you to continue to hold on to the guiding principles of the Official Plan and the heritage plan, and not give in to the pressure you will likely receive to recommend to Council all kinds of zoning and heritage plan changes, to accommodate the aims of those who wish to maximize affordable housing on this unique and sensitive site.

The concept of seniors housing and family dwellings is appropriate. Overall, however the development is too dense. Could the Seniors housing be placed on part 3 and get back further from Highway 15?

Yes, especially design idea for Parcel 3

Absolutely not. The scale is going to overwhelm the rest of the village. As for the design, that was not at all obvious, and yet absolutely crucial in a protected heritage setting. How can the feasibility of the project be completely judged with this huge component missing? It is difficult to respond to a plan with so many major factors not accounted for. The idea that “peaked rooves” or “front porches” is all that is needed for heritage is short-sighted and not acceptable to those of us who live in and care for the preservation of homes from the 1800s.

The concept shows in-depth understanding of the development of Barriefield and mode of living in our agreeable community. The density is in keeping, also, and will not be a ghetto style addition, as was first proposal.

Just part 3. No to part 2 (too big a complex). The village currently has 90 homes. 15 new units is an increase of about 17%. That is already a large change for a land-locked neighbourhood. Adding any more would be an outrageous change.

Barriefield is the village for all intents and purposes, of about 90 dwellings. This proposal would add 47 new dwellings - a massive change in population. Further, the scale and form of the apartment building is simply not appropriate there.

It is difficult to say. As usual, in this process from its inception, we have not seen enough detail. For example, the layout of lots and houses in Parcel 3 presented on August 9 looks okay - but we do not know anything about these.

Ideas for Parcel 1 are good, those for Parcel 2 even better, but the whole business of placing affordable housing on Parcel 3 defies any spatial logic (remote services and facilities even basic ones), and is too costly to think with innovative social thinking. There also noise and safety factors related to proximity to Highway 2 and 15. Two out of three meeting with approval is better by far than I anticipated, but plans for Parcel 3 should be rethought.
With the concern that the concept for Parcel 3 years, crowded. Otherwise, I believe the consultants have produced an acceptable solution - a huge improvement over the hasty Hughes-Downey mess

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

- Where is the parkland for this housing? There is 47% as open space but is there a place for children to play or seniors to walk or sit outside? Parkland is important. Is it realistic to think that seniors want to live on a 2nd floor? Often stairs become difficult. Would there be an elevator? Is there a reason not to flip this and make parcel 3 the senior’s area and parcel 2 for singles/couples? I would prefer to see more integrating with Barriefield. This seems to build a “tack-on” rather than a natural extension of the village. There seems to be a barrier between the existing village and this new development. Maybe a play area could go in part of this part of Parcel 3 and be accessible to Barriefield residents too
- My problem is not with your concepts of design, layout etc., but the focus on having a large number of senior citizens units. The demand is not there. As I understand the demand is for single accommodations space. I am disappointed in the way that this study has addressed the needs of the poor in Kingston
- You need to speak with cooperative housing and adjust your plans to meet the needs of the poor in Kingston! I think it is perfectly possible to meet the requirements of their ages when building affordable housing, and in favour of having affordable housing built in Barriefield
- Please consider mix of ages instead of a seniors only apartment complex
- This is a difficult situation. I think the design needs to be able to accommodate more of a mix of incomes. The school property should also allow for a mix of incomes and housing
- The lack of consultations with key stakeholders fundamentally invalidated your design process. No consultations with city affordable housing committee is particularly appalling
- The process is way too fast for this type of development
- My complaint is not so much with the design concepts which are a big improvement over the 1st proposal offered by Hughes Downey group of architects. It is the location – so close to an increasingly busy Hwy 15 - that is at issue as far as I am concerned
- A remarkable poor (and self interested) display considering how much public money has been paid for this process
- There is generally a basic lack of realization and understanding of what a treasure Barriefield is for the City of Kingston. While house owners will certainly their reward (expensive, if you follow the renting requirements!) Good citizens who add to their City’s assets.
- The designs themselves are fine. It is the use of the land that is deficient. There should be housing across all parcels (there is already much green
space on all sides of Barriefield). It should be duplexes on new housing; it should house the poor, not people who can afford a quarter million dollar home, with or without subsidies. I want my tax dollars (those $260,000 the city will contribute) and the ¾ million dollars the federal government is willing to let go or $1, to go to the neediest in the community, not to people earning $61,000.

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

My main worry is that, though this study is touted as a feasibility study, and my understanding is that you are to advise the city on whether this is a Go or No Go decision on Sept. 7th, it feels as if the Go decision has been a foregone conclusion since the beginning.

A final comment is my concern that, before Phase 2 of the feasibility study is done, the City will, for political reasons, commit to asking the federal government for the land. Phase 2 may well turn up further obstacles to building on this land, which would really make this project unfeasible, if it’s not already, or an extremely wasteful use of taxpayers’ money. Further to this, I feel this is an added pressure for you to make this feasible, come hell or high water.

I welcome a seniors’ home as part of the development of the village. But it must be smaller in scope and with building mass. Perhaps the consultants could consider an alternative structure, embodying, say, a town-house like community of seniors connected by pathways, to avoid the massive structure.

It is evident that the social activist community is not happy with the Barriefield proposal. It was always obvious that the Barriefield project was going to be a deluxe version of social housing due to the constraints of the site and all the planning issues. The location is very problematic due to the noise & pollution from Highway 15 which we believe cannot be eliminated. If the city does not proceed with this proposal, we do not believe the land will sell for private development for the same reasons. The City will get much better value for money from other sites – for example the former (now torn down) Toyota site on Princess Street. This is an expensive, impractical and cumbersome project which should be abandoned.

As planners you have made the best of an impossible situation. You have been presented with a difficult task because: 1) the council did not do due diligence prior to trying to push the project through. They thought a few buildings sketched by Hughes Downey would shut us up. They did not pay attention to the Official Plan or the HCDP. Certain councillors underestimated the sense of heritage stewardship within the village. 2) These same councillors were intent on pushing this through in the summer months so you were given extremely tight deadlines for a task that required thoughtfulness, cooperation & vision.
Due to the fact that the current school of J.E. Horton will only possibly be there for the next few years, my concern is the height of Parcel #2 buildings. And what it could mean for future building of the current J.E. Horton site.

I wasn't able to be at the Aug 9 meeting, but based on what I've read about it, I'm sorry more detail wasn't available.

I understand that the plan states that every building can occur, but surely there is a limit. Already, several new homes have been constructed, and allowed by the city, with no way for villagers to react to size and design. They have already tipped the balance between old and new buildings. When that plan was written, there was no idea that the surrounding DND property would come into play. More consideration needs to begin to the entrance to Kingston at this right at the UNESCO Heritage site.

Cost of building homes appropriate to heritage site would also be a big consideration, and this was not available. There really was, in the end, insufficient information because of the time crunch. But surely that time crunch is also a factor.

The public was never given all the necessary details. The residents of Barriefield are attempting to preserve the village's heritage. If mistakes are made with a large new development, the heritage factor is lost. If the advocates for affordable housing did not get development bills here, they have many other chances. There are other priorities that have been suggested (i.e. beside the Pittsburgh Library, off Highway 15 - lots of land, near stores, doctors, dentists and schools; the Memorial Centre property) and other that have not been scouted out. Or that are being hidden, and for them. This is not a one-shot prospect.

The other question that seems to be ignored revolves around current thinking about how best to house those in need of assistance - large ghettos or individual scattered around the city. I wonder how much real research, the city has done on this question.

I’d like to commend the consultants on the collaborative process that led to this concept wide consultation, good research, thoughtful collection of information, and – vitally - listening has made this a success. If only the City had used this approach from the outset, much resentment and divisiveness could have been avoided. Secret processes will usually arouse suspicion, unnecessary rhetoric, and in us/Them atmosphere. In principle, the design concept is good. It remains to be seen how Council will choose to execute the buildings, how much Council, will adhere to its own Heritage rules and the provincial legislation governing Heritage Conservation Districts.

The consultants need to be commended for a recommendation that respects the constraints of the sites. While I understand from the meeting on August 9 that some in the audience were disappointed that there were not more housing units - they should not have been surprised. Opponents to this proposal have not been opponents to affordable housing, but have been honest in their assessment and recitation that the Barriefield sites are inappropriate - for many of the reasons the consultants have identified. The Barriefield sites are problematic for many reasons related to the physical site.
of the costs involved. If the City truly wanted to quickly and efficiently improve the stock of affordable housing in Kingston. A could stop wasting time and money choosing the “cheap” land in Barriefield (which at the end of the day is anything but cheap) and find other sites that are shovel ready and not riddled with problems

- This proposal is driven by the ongoing myth that the DND lands are cheap ($1). They are not - building here requires a great expense in studies and clearances that other property in Kingston does not. There are other documented sites that are shovel-ready and would house more people and furthermore be much cheaper than this development would be, even including the cheap land.

- The only rationale seems to be to establish more affordable housing, east of the river to fit some unclear sense of balance. This is ironic given how little attention to City has paid to “East of the River” is passed. The major concern is that, if the consultants to come up with a scaled down version of the seniors' complex on Part 2. How do we know it will remain a seniors' only complex? What prevents the city, under pressure from vocal activists, from changing the OP and opening up residences to all, with disastrous consequences like Van Order Drive and Bagot Street?

- Designed for construction and finishing materials. Our fear, as it has been from the start, is that Council (i.e. the majority that has been insisting on developing these parcels) does not actually care about the Heritage concept. They have made that clear from the start. Consequently, when costs start to rise, they are likely to abandon the design and materials standards that village residents are held to. While I'm generally in favour of your concept, it is unfortunate that you haven't been given enough time to present us with a complete picture

- Parcel 3 offers a wonderful opportunity to reinforce the heritage designation of Barriefield by having the consultants think next in terms of increased parkland or recreation there. Or without, given the strategic Gateway to the city concept, establish another Visitors Information Centre here. That way, visitors could walk around, in Parcel 3 refurbished parkland/parking, over to the garden for the BEST VIEW OF US KINGSTON, and then wandered through Barriefield Village before heading into town. I strongly feel that building any kind of housing, save for the brilliant idea of the Seniors Centre, will tarnish the image of a beautiful entry point to a beautiful city

- Heritage Conservation Districts preserve heritage that is centuries old. They are the product of much study, careful reflection and sensitively developed policy. Development in such districts should not be careless or ill-conceived. The rush nature of this initiative has not, sadly, respected the fundamental principles enunciated above

- Cannot believe this is a viable, affordable housing location. Quite apart from expected infrastructure construction costs to meet Heritage standards, the time frame to completion is far greater than it would be to build at other city locations, were much greater value for dollars could be achieved. On the face of it, then this proposal represents an irresponsible waste of taxpayers’
dollars. P. S. the Hughes Downey plan is another example of irresponsible 
use of funds. Totally ill considered. Councillors supporting it should be 
shamed into reimbursing the city out of their own pockets

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