

From: [Bolognone,John](#)
To: [Doucet,Michelle](#)
Cc: [Leger,Denis](#); [Snow,David](#)
Subject: Fwd: June 21st meeting of council answers to questions from council
Date: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 8:17:22 AM

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF:

June 21, 2016

For tabling and distribution.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

COMMUNICATION

No: 17-549

From: Helm [REDACTED]
Date: June 22, 2016 at 5:05:15 AM EDT
To: <jbolognone@cityofkingston.ca>, <mayor@cityofkingston.ca>
Cc: <rallen@cityofkingston.ca>, <kgeorge@cityofkingston.ca>, "Osanic,Lisa" <losanic@cityofkingston.ca>, <lturner@cityofkingston.ca>, <lschell@cityofkingston.ca>, <acandon@cityofkingston.ca>, <mrholland@cityofkingston.ca>, "McLaren,Jeff" <jmclaren@cityofkingston.ca>, <jneill@cityofkingston.ca>, <pstroud@cityofkingston.ca>, <rhutchison@cityofkingston.ca>, <RNBoehme@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: June 21st meeting of council answers to questions from council

The City of Kingston, the rulemaker, is unfairly changing its own rules, to favour its own business. There is no need for a runway extension, and no business reason to invest the taxpayers' dollars - why are you doing this to kill our family business? It seems to us that killing our business will support your own marinas.

The City is the "public policy rulemaker" at the same time as the City is the developer of the proposed project. There seems to be a conflict between your idea of the best interests of the City airport and the proposed development impacts upon neighbouring lands. We have read the existing Official Plan provisions with respect to the Airport as well as the proposed changes, and cannot help but come to the conclusion that the City has written its policies about the airport without regard to the impact of any development upon its neighbours. Every statement in the Official Plan is made from the one-sided perspective of protecting the airport from the neighbours and there are no statements that the City is going to consider the impacts on the neighbours of any proposed airport expansion by the City.

If this were a private developer, the City would be taking a very different approach and making every effort to protect the citizens of the City. This seems to be a conflict for Council: do you support the people and a real business in our city or some airport runway expansion with adverse

effects on the people? Please stop and support the health of real people. Do not sacrifice the audio health of people in the area by accepting a flawed noise study. please read the Official Plan and consider the impacts of any adverse effects of the airport expansion on the neighbours' health?

1. As a result of this Peer review the City has admitted that the use of INM (U.S.A. software no longer in use) for calculating noise contours was incorrect and has now changed to NEFCALC (Canadian software). If City Council is going to rely upon this latest report to move ahead then you will be destroying our family business. You need to reconsider your decision based on the facts.

2. Amec informed us that with two park up bays it could give the airport the theoretical capacity to have one jet an hour subject to runway length. With this sort of capacity, it is horrifying to us that you are only studying 2 additional jets a week. We believe the full and relevant truth is missing. Our consultants have told us that this latest study is still flawed. If the MMM noise report is used it will mislead council and the citizens of Kingston about the true adverse effects. If you are using this sound study to justify expanding the airport then you are killing our business.

3. Itinerant vs Local aircraft movements – The city has again failed to consider the effects including the local movements which appear to again be ignored in the latest report commissioned by the City. Over 11,479 local movements were not included in baseline year of 2012.

4. Chronic noise exposure from the airport from the airport expansion is detrimental to the health and wellbeing of our family, customers and neighbours. Our Marina and nearby residential areas are within the 25 NEF contour where, as Transport Canada states "Sporadic complaints may occur. Noise may interfere occasionally with certain activities of the "resident" and the "significant negative effects to aircraft noise start at NEFCAL 25 and higher" Amec have concluded that noise exposure at our Marina will increase as a result of the expansion. If the noise impact is too great our customers can move out of our marina and go to the marinas owned by the City and this will kill our family business. Those willing to stay will find a deterioration in their amenity and loss of enjoyment in our facilities. Amec shows that a Boeing 737-800 could result in maximum noise levels of approaching 100 dB(A) when they come into land over the Marina. They state that maximum noise levels above 70 dB(A) have the potential to interfere with conversation both indoors and outdoors and this is likely to already be occurring. We believe with this level of noise, customers wont want to stay at our family marina, so you are choosing, which business are ok, killing our business is not being "open for business"

5. . . . Reduced aircraft movements to reduce NEF contours means that original expansion Master Plan and Business Plan may deserve reconsideration. If the new growth demand is no longer there why expand? City officials seem so focused on minimizing NEF contours by reducing the numbers and types of aircraft that they have forgotten to look again at the 2007 Master Plan and 2011 Business Plan. The 2011 Business Plan clearly states that Runway 01-19 must be extended to accommodate Code C jet aircraft. Why then is there no analysis of the impacts of possible Code C jet aircraft for some future date? Why extend the runway at all? If development facilitates a new or change in noise generation, these should be considered to determine impacts. Amec clearly shows in their report that when Code C jet aircraft are introduced, the size of the NEF contours are immediately affected and when 4-8 movements are considered per day the 30 NEF contour, which has been used as a measure of impact by the City will begin to extend into the Marina and other community locations around the airport.

We would like to point out that Kingston Official Plan for the airport (Section 3.7), says: “future development of the airport designated lands...provides the opportunity to introduce new employment opportunities while **maintaining** airport operations...” there is no mention of expanding airport operations. There is no mention of expanding the runway.

Therefore if the City passes a bylaw to expand the airport it is not complying with section 24 of the Planning Act:

“24. (1) Despite any other general or special Act, where an official plan is in effect, no public work shall be undertaken and ... no by-law shall be passed for any purpose that does not conform therewith.”

If you have passed any bylaw that affects the expansion of the airport, **it is illegal**. According to the Planning Act