



**City of Kingston
Planning Committee Meeting Number 08-2016
Addendum
Thursday April 7, 2016
6:30 p.m., Council Chamber, City Hall**

Correspondence

- a) Correspondence received from B. Schlafer, dated March 29, 2016 regarding the Canadian Information and Notification Service Report.

Schedule Pages 1 - 3

- b) Correspondence received from J. Blunden, dated April 6, 2016 regarding the application for a Zoning By-Law Amendment for 14 Garrett Street.

Schedule Page 4

Blumenberg,Catalina

From: Agarwal,Sukriti
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 3:06 PM
To: 'Barbara L Schlafer'
Subject: RE: Radiocommunication Facilities - Information Report to Planning Committee

Hello Barbara,

Radiocommunication facilities could include free standing or building/structure mounted facilities for emergency responders (fire, police, emergency medical services), cellular service, Wi-fi, radio, Citizens Band radio (CB), television, taxi companies, pager services, couriers, wireless local area networks, weather radar, satellite communications, etc.

Thanks,

Sukriti

Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Senior Planner, Policy Planning
Planning, Building and Licensing Services
City of Kingston
(613) 546-4291 x3217

From: Barbara L Schlafer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: Re: Radiocommunication Facilities - Information Report to Planning Committee

Thank you, Sukriti, for your reply. I am wondering if you could explain a bit further. What is included in "radio communication facilities"? Is it limited then to the sort of radio communications used by fire, ambulance and other emergency responders?

Barb

On 2016-03-29, at 11:22 AM, "Agarwal,Sukriti" [REDACTED] > wrote:

Hello Barbara,

This work is a result of a previous motion from Council for staff to undertake a best practices research with respect to radiocommunication facilities. This is not related to any proposal for tower relocation as indicated in your email below.

Thanks,

Sukriti

Sukriti Agarwal, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Senior Planner, Policy Planning
Planning, Building and Licensing Services
Community Services
City of Kingston

Phone: (613) 546-4291 x3217

Fax: (613) 542-9965

Mail: 216 Ontario Street, Kingston, Ontario, K7L 2Z3

Location: 1211 John Counter Boulevard

From: Barbara L Schlafer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 11:15 AM
To: Agarwal,Sukriti
Subject: Re: Radiocommunication Facilities - Information Report to Planning Committee

Dear Sukriti,

Does this have anything to do with the proposal to move the communications tower from Wolfe Island to the top of one of the towers proposed to be built downtown Kingston?

Barb Schlafer

On 2016-03-29, at 10:57 AM, "Agarwal,Sukriti" <sagarwal@cityofkingston.ca> wrote:

Good morning,

An information report will be presented to the Planning Committee on Thursday, April 7, 2016 outlining the process utilized by the Canadian Radiocommunications Information and Notification Service / Service d'Information et de notification en radiocommunications canadienne (CRINS-SINRC) for the review of radiocommunication facilities. CRINS-SINRC is a not-for-profit organization that acts as a designated representative to receive and process applications for radiocommunication facilities on behalf of participating member municipalities and provincial government agencies. A representative of CRINS-SINRC will be in attendance to provide an overview of the services provided by the organization.

The Planning Committee meeting will be held from 6:30 p.m. onwards in Council Chambers at City Hall located at 216 Ontario Street, Kingston. The information report will be available to the public on April 2, 2016 on the City of Kingston's website at <https://www.cityofkingston.ca/city-hall/committees-boards/planning-committee>.

Thank you,

Sukriti

Blumenberg, Catalina

From: Barbara L Schlafer [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 5:04 PM
To: Paterson, Bryan; Boehme, Ryan N.; Allen, Richard; Holland, Mary Rita; Hutchison, Rob; McLaren, Jeff; Turner, Lacia; Schell, Elizabeth; Osanic, Lisa; Neill, Jim; Candon, Adam; Stroud, Peter; George, Kevin; Agarwal, Sukriti
Subject: Health Canada rpt re electromagnetic exposure

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/hoc/Committee/412/HESA/Reports/RP8041315/hesarp13/hesarp13-e.pdf>

This report is long but worth reading through to the end. Unfortunately, its many cautionary recommendations were never acted upon due to the 2011 election. It is worth reading for several reasons:

- Kingston is installing Wi-Fi in public places such as downtown
- one might want to reconsider Wi-Fi in schools
- Council will be receiving communication tower applications re siting
- the evidence accumulates regarding possible/probable health effects
- children are especially vulnerable
- as I understand it, Council may be considering handing off the siting process to a third party.
- This report clearly questions the protective adequacy of section 6

Whatever happened to the precautionary principle?

Barb Schlafer

Adams,Alex

From: julie blunden [REDACTED] m>
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 12:36 PM
To: Adams,Alex
Subject: 14 Garrett St.

Hi Alex,

Thank you again for taking the time to explain more fully the aspects of the proposed parking lot.

I suppose you're up against the NIMBY objection in lots of cases, non the less, our small city is under a siege of development that can undermine it's desirability as a place where one can enjoy a quality of life, not subject to the trends of revolving developers, city Councillors and Planners. No offences intended. These are just are the circumstances in which we find ourselves. Our Official Plan is turning out to be not very official. 14 Garrett is an appropriate site for a small ground level parking lot, which is what it's presently zoned for. A parking structure is not an acceptable intrusion in this densely populated neighbourhood. In addition to the objections in my first letter I'd like to outline some more concerns that I and neighbours have.

Although the plan has been changed to put the car elevator in the front of the lot, there remains the matter of distance to tenants on that side of the development. I believe they're equidistant or closer than my tenants which brings into bearing the acceptable noise levels.

Has the sound level of the cars themselves been accessed? We have all experienced the echo and reverberations that emanate from parking structures. Compounded, in this case, by line ups of idling cars and/or the sound of restarting engines while waiting for the elevator. There will be line-ups during higher use times of the day. I'm sure there is data to support this. I worked across the Street from the Brock St. Parking lot at Wellington. I know first hand how loud it is. I can also remember the sense of being asphyxiated by fumes while waiting in line to get out around 5:00. It could take 20 minutes and that's without a car elevator.

What about Kingston's commitment to being Canada's most sustainable city? What does that mean if we jump on the band wagon of development over a sustainable, livable solution? In this, case there is enough lot space for a structure that precludes an elevator and could retain the same amount of parking spaces by extending the size of the structure over the whole lot. After all, we aren't a big city where necessity rules out. In fact, our population is projected to decline in about 15 years. We should be concentrating on making Kingston an attractive destination for families, tourists and retired people. Our Historic neighbourhoods, walkability and waterfront are our strengths Downtown. We should play to them.

I've been a Landlord for 30 years and I've listened to my tenants and I know what they want. They value an outdoor space and quiet enjoyment of the property. Ironic as that might sound, there's a big difference between the mutual sounds of the students and a constant mechanical noise. There will always be students who view living in an older house near campus as part of the quintessential experience of going to Queen's. I don't see the large, student oriented condos as changing that, ever. I remind my tenants that they need to show respect to our city by keeping their yards free of debris and to respect the houses that they're in. In return, I'm attentive to their needs and they start

figuring out the principal of reciprocity. The city needs to show respect to these students, who deserve comfortable living situations. There are probably close to 100 people that will be within earshot of this structure. Right now the students absolutely love the immediate neighbourhood because it supports their needs so beautifully. I take pride in being part of a what makes this a happy time for them. The Brooklyn Bar is a favourite gathering place for them. Isn't that part of our sustainable, livable objective? This neighbourhood has a unique dynamic that is functioning well. Why add this intrusive element of dysfunction?

Ask yourselves. would this be an acceptable development in your neighbourhood? Would it be asked of any neighbourhood other than a student neighbourhood? You get what you give with the student population. Jeff McLaren had it right in his recent editorial in the Whig. We must preserve the spirit of our city. The Podium, Varsity group are resourceful and creative and own lot of property citywide. I wish them all the best but maybe they have to back off of their profit expectations somewhat. They're making plenty of money in this town. What is the cost to us?

Respectfully Yours,
Julie Blunden