



**City of Kingston
Planning Committee Meeting Number 06-2016
Addendum
Thursday March 3, 2016
6:30 p.m., Council Chamber, City Hall**

The consent of the Planning Committee is requested for the **addition** of Briefing (b)

Briefing

- b)** Ms. Agnew, Director, Planning Building and Licensing Services, Ms. Gareau, Director of Strategic Communications and Ms. Miller, Communications Officer will be present to speak to the committee on Update to Communication to Members of the public regarding Pubic Notices.

Correspondence

- a)** Correspondence received from J. Blunden, dated February 24, 2016 regarding the application for a Zoning By-Law Amendment for 14 Garrett Street.

Adams,Alex

From: Julie Blunden <julieblunden@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 6:21 PM
To: Adams,Alex
Subject: 12 Garrett St

Hi Alex,

Thank you for the prompt response to my email.

There is a lot of information to digest and I'm in transit for the next 2 days. I did a scan and I have two major issues. The first is with the car elevator. The application says that the lot backs onto 367 Brock. It actually backs onto 365, 367 and 369 Brock plus my neighbour to the West. That can mean a lot of early morning disturbance for about twenty tenants. Accessing noise levels by electing an average of 4 cars per hour of usage seems like faulty reasoning to me. There will be much more early morning usage and after work hours usage which is also when the tenants are home. What about their parking customers? Why must they contend with frustrating elevator line ups? Does our City want to set a precedent of degraded service in our parking lots in favour of maximizing the profits of a few? I contend that this concept is too new here to evaluate accurately and inappropriate in residential backyards. I'm quite sure that the applicants will profit quite nicely without an elevator. Then rises the spectre of other noises from the cars.

The structure has been described as two stories in one file and and three stories in another. The inaccuracies are not confidence inspiring.

My second and greater issue is that the proposed plan would create an impediment on my property for future development. That has a direct bearing on my property value. With those noise restrictions, any addition would not be allowable. I see this as an insurmountable objection.

Our Official Plan is under review. Does this application comply with the new plan in process? I need time to have a conversation with my lawyer and friends who have knowledge of these issues. I presume this meeting March 4th is preliminary and there will be time to engage more effectively in the future. Is that true? I'll be back March 10.

I am retired and this is of utmost importance to me because it is my income and I have a disabled dependent to provide for. I apologize for any emotional overtones. I would hope that common sense and reasonableness will prevail.

I trust you can get these additional comments to the committee for me. This will have to suffice until I can focus on this proposal and get professional advice. Anything else I should know Alex?

Thank-you Kindly,
Julie Blunden

Sent from my iPhone