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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Urban Growth Strategy study began in June 2002. It is the first comprehensive review of the growth issues faced by the amalgamated City of Kingston. The Official Plans prepared by the three former municipalities were based upon independent approaches to development. However, with the new City, there is a need for a single, unified concept to guide decisions on City-wide issues. This Strategy provides an integrated approach to coordinated growth management of the City for the next 25 years (i.e. to 2026).

The population of the City of Kingston grew from about 90,000 to 114,000 between 1976 and 2001 and is projected to increase to between 147,000 (medium projection) and 164,000 (high projection) in the next 25 years. The Urban Growth Strategy has evaluated where and how this growth should be accommodated, using a logical step-by-step process:

- it examined how much growth the existing Committed Development Area (CDA) (previously referred to as Growth Alternative 1 in "Revised Draft Interim Report No. 2," dated April, 2003) could accommodate;
- since the CDA contained insufficient land to handle growth to 2026, additional lands (Growth Alternatives) for potential development were considered;
- these lands included the alternatives previously proposed by the former municipalities, along with some additional areas. These are shown on Figure 2.

Evaluation Criteria (Table 1) were established and confirmed through a public consultation program. The criteria were applied to the Growth Alternatives, and Growth Alternative 2 was identified as the most preferred. The criteria were not applied to the CDA since growth there is already considered to be the first priority. The evaluation process and findings were presented to the public in April 2003. This process is described fully in Interim Reports No. 1 and 2.

Council directed that an additional Growth Alternative (GA 1A) be considered and that an additional servicing cost analysis be completed. This analysis examined the impacts of infrastructure costs on municipal revenue sources: taxes, water/sewer rates, impost fees and development charges.

Following the additional analyses, Growth Alternative 2 (GA 2) continues to be preferred for development, in addition to the CDA. Although GA 1A was similarly ranked, GA 1A is federal land and is not currently available for urban development.

The Urban Growth Strategy also examined the issues affecting how development should occur. This included considerations such as the urban boundary, phasing, commercial development, “smart growth,” density, infilling, alternative development standards, Kingston’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction commitments and related issues, many of which were raised by the public during the community consultation process.

The results of this study will be implemented through City decisions on development applications, locations for new municipal facilities and through the four project deliverables which are found in the appendices. They include:
• Water Servicing Concept Plan which identifies the type, cost, location and timing of needed water system improvements;

• Sanitary Servicing Concept Plan which identifies the type, cost, location and timing of needed sanitary sewage system improvements;

• Financial Plan;

• Official Plan Amendments to each of the three existing Official Plans.

Official Plans are policy documents prepared by municipalities under the Planning Act. They provide direction for by-law preparation and public works such as roads, water, sewer, and other infrastructure projects required by the Community. Official Plans are guided by both provincial policy and community needs. The existing Official Plans have not been comprehensively updated since 1997 (Kingston Township), 1991 (City) and 1974 (Pittsburgh Township), respectively, although numerous amendments have been passed to implement specific changes. For example, OPA No. 59 (Pittsburgh) updated substantial parts of the rural policies. The proposed Official Plan Amendments associated with this study will implement the major recommendations of the Urban Growth Strategy immediately. A new, City-wide Official Plan is proposed in 2006.

The 17 numbered recommendations of this study are clearly identified with **bold type** in Sections 4 and 5 of this Final Report. They, in turn, lead to the Urban Growth Strategy which is described in Section 6.

The major recommendations of the Urban Growth Strategy focus on four initiatives:

1. Costly infrastructure improvements and expansions must be managed using all available planning mechanisms to prevent capacity hoarding, premature land development and to avoid unnecessary financial pressures on the City.

2. Kingston’s projected growth rate requires a modest supply of additional urban land to accommodate it. Figure 3 identifies the preferred location and approximate order of future urban growth. It establishes an urban boundary encompassing sufficient land to accommodate development to the year 2026, based on current growth projections, and also identifies potential Future Development Areas.

3. To accommodate projected growth without unnecessary outward expansions will require increased diligence in accommodating increased residential density, mixed land use and additional employment opportunities within the existing Committed Development Area.

4. A new Princess Street transit priority, Mixed-Use Corridor from the harbour to Midland Avenue should be established in the Official Plans to provide a focus for transit supportive, higher density development.

This combination of broad initiatives, combined with the detailed recommendations of the Water and Sewer Concept Plans and the Financial Plan will help the City to implement this comprehensive Urban Growth Strategy.
1.0 PURPOSE OF THE FINAL REPORT

This Final Report presents the conclusions of the Urban Growth Strategy project and provides recommendations (numbered and highlighted with bold print) to guide the future growth and development of the new City of Kingston to the year 2026. It also summarizes the work done to complete Interim Reports No. 1 and No. 2. It is based on the technical work and analyses conducted since June 2002 and draws upon the extensive input received from the public, Council, interested agencies, the development community and City and Utilities Kingston staff. It has been prepared in accordance with the Terms of Reference adopted by Council Resolution on January 29, 2002. It was completed in accordance with the study process illustrated in Figure 1.

The Final Report includes appendices which provide specific direction on water servicing, sanitary servicing, financial planning and the draft Official Plan Amendments which will be used to help implement a coordinated growth strategy, incorporating them into the existing Official Plans of the three former municipalities. These Amendments are considered to be an interim measure, pending the preparation of an entirely new Official Plan in 2006.

Throughout the Urban Growth Strategy (UGS) study, it has been observed that the two separate but interrelated aspects of where and how urban growth occurs both require attention. The City of Kingston Community Strategic Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) were analysed in the early stages of the study in order to extract important local and provincial guidance on urban growth issues. Interim Report No. 2 focused primarily on the issues associated with where Kingston’s urban growth should occur. Throughout the community consultation process, members of the public requested that more consideration be given to the issues that influence the type and nature of proposed development. The Final Report assesses many of the relevant issues affecting how urban growth should occur, links them to the conclusions about where the resultant growth should occur and combines them into an overall strategy. This strategy supersedes the multiple strategies expressed through the Official Plans of the three former municipalities.

2.0 SUMMARY OF INTERIM REPORTS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

“Interim Report No. 1” was prepared in November, 2002 and revised in April, 2004. It was presented to the Technical Resource Group, Senior Management Team, Council, interested agencies and interest groups, and to the general public at an Open House held on November 13, 2002. It explained the planned Urban Growth Strategy preparation process and focused, in detail, on provincial planning policy requirements as expressed through the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) adopted under Section 3 of the Planning Act, and it examined the strategic directions set by the City of Kingston’s Community Strategic Plan. These sources, combined with extensive public consultation, were used in the preparation of Evaluation Criteria to be used during the balance of the Urban Growth Strategy study. These Criteria are presented in Table 1.
### TABLE 1
**SCREENING AND EVALUATION CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening Criteria:</strong> The following criteria were applied prior to development of Growth Alternatives. Land identified by the screening criteria was excluded from consideration for growth and development purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Strategy prevents encroachment onto areas of recognized natural significance.</td>
<td>the PPS requires natural heritage features and areas to be protected from incompatible development.</td>
<td>exclusion of Areas of Natural &amp; Scientific Interest (ANSIs), significant wetlands and identified Environmentally Sensitive Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Strategy addresses natural and human hazards.</td>
<td>the PPS requires development to be generally directed to areas outside of hazardous lands adjacent to river and stream systems impacted by flooding and/or erosion hazards.</td>
<td>exclusion of known hazard lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Strategy prevents encroachment onto prime agricultural land.</td>
<td>the PPS requires protection of prime agricultural land for agricultural purposes.</td>
<td>exclusion of Classes 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land or lands designated agricultural in an Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Criteria:</strong> The following criteria were applied to the Growth Alternatives which were developed following the screening of non-development land using the above criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Strategy facilitates enhanced use of the downtown</td>
<td>PPS and CSP stress the importance of the downtown area; proposed Downtown Action Plan and North Block CBD Study further emphasize this importance.</td>
<td>increased opportunity for redevelopment, intensification, and revitalization of the area within a two kilometre radius of lower Princess Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Strategy enables enhanced use of existing and planned water and sanitary sewer infrastructure</td>
<td>PPS stresses the importance of optimizing the use of existing infrastructure; infrastructure investment is costly and public dollars need to be spent wisely.</td>
<td>opportunities for new development to use existing trunk and pumping facilities; opportunities for new development where trunk and pumping facility improvements are imminent; opportunities for new development where sewage treatment plant capacity exists or is planned by the City; opportunities for new development where water treatment plant capacity exists or is planned by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Strategy enables enhanced service delivery, public safety, and operational efficiencies</td>
<td>the public has emphasized the importance of core services; equates to better, more cost effective services to the benefit of the community.</td>
<td>opportunities for new development within 1 km of major parks, recreation centres, schools, and libraries; opportunities for development that result in improved operational efficiencies for services such as waste collection, snow removal, and road maintenance; increased development in locations more accessible to fire protection and ambulance services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Strategy enables enhanced use of existing and planned roads</td>
<td>stresses the importance of optimizing the use of existing and planned infrastructure.</td>
<td>increased opportunities for development where roadway capacity exists or is planned by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Strategy enables increased use of alternative modes of transportation</td>
<td>reflects values expressed in PPS, CSP and during the TMP consultations.</td>
<td>opportunities for higher residential density near jobs, transit nodes, and major transit routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Strategy provides improved housing affordability and choice</td>
<td>reflects values expressed in the PPS and CSP.</td>
<td>increased number of dwelling units near jobs and transit nodes; increased number of locations where housing can be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>cost must be reasonable; emphasis will be placed on the most cost effective alternative for the City.</td>
<td>present value analyses of cost to implement the proposed strategy over 25 years, in 2003 dollars; present value analyses of incremental cost associated with growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPS = Provincial Policy Statement  
CSP = City of Kingston Community Strategic Plan  
CBD = Central Business District  
TMP = Transportation Master Plan

**Note:** Evaluation Criteria 1 to 7 are not listed in order of importance
“Revised Draft Interim Report No. 2, Evaluating the Growth Alternatives,” was prepared in April, 2003. It was presented to the Technical Resource Group, Senior Management Team and to Council. It examined the historical growth of the City of Kingston using a variety of data sources, growth projections prepared by Stevens Associates to the year 2026 (used as the basis for the Transportation Master Plan as well), and projected the amount of land needed to accommodate that anticipated growth. It examined the development yield that would result from the Committed Development Area and determined that it was insufficient to meet the projected growth to 2026. Screening Criteria were applied to the lands in and surrounding the urban area to arrive at a set of Candidate Areas for potential development. Candidate Areas were further narrowed to a series of five (5) Growth Alternatives in the central, west, north and east parts of the amalgamated City. The Evaluation Criteria were applied to the Growth Alternatives and preliminary conclusions were reached on a preferred alternative. This information was presented at a Public Open House on April 30, 2003. Interest was expressed in separately analyzing the potential for development on vacant lands at Collins Bay Penitentiary and underdeveloped lands at CFB Kingston. This became known as Growth Alternative 1A. In accordance with Council’s direction of August 11, 2003, extensive additional work was done to ensure coordination with the Transportation Master Plan and the Development Charges Study. Interim Report No. 2 was then revised. The revised conclusions indicated that Growth Alternatives 1A and 2 both ranked very high, followed by GA 5 and GA 4, with GA 3 ranking the least preferred.

3.0 PLANNING AND SERVICING ISSUES AFFECTING GROWTH ALTERNATIVES

3.1 General Comments

Each of the Growth Alternatives (see Figure 2) is subject to a set of unique planning and servicing factors that relate to its geography, existing land use, current local and provincial policy and the factors represented by the Screening and Evaluation Criteria. These key factors associated with each Growth Alternative are summarized below, in order to acknowledge the interrelated planning and servicing issues which influence the ultimate decisions on how, when, and where future development will occur.

The Committed Development Area (referred to previously as Growth Alternative 1 in Revised Draft Interim Report No. 2, April 2003) is considered to be integral to all of the Growth Alternatives and consists of:

- all of the land located within the boundaries of the former City of Kingston, south of Highway 401, most of which is already developed; and

- the land classified as Development Area 1/Stage 1, as designated in the Official Plans for the former Township of Kingston and the former Township of Pittsburgh, substantial parts of which are already developed.

The Committed Development Area contains all of the City’s existing urban development and is described in more detail in Section 9 of Interim Report No. 2. This land is designated and available for development on full municipal water supply and sanitary sewer systems, subject to detailed planning requirements associated with subdivision approvals, stormwater management, site plan control, servicing, lifting of holding provisions and similar implementation measures.
The central and east portions of the Committed Development Area are served by the Ravensview sewage treatment plant. This facility has very little reserve capacity and an Environmental Assessment Update is currently being completed to facilitate the addition of secondary treatment and an expansion of its overall capacity. Central and east growth will depend on careful management of the available capacity over the next five years. The Kingston West sewage treatment plant was expanded in 2003 and now has sufficient capacity to accommodate most of the westerly part of the Committed Development Area. If development slows in the central and east areas due to sewage treatment capacity constraints, the pace of westerly development may increase, using up the reserve capacity of the Kingston West facility more quickly.

There is substantial water capacity available in the west and central treatment plants, but there are currently some system constraints in the west part of the City. Additional storage capacity in the west end and proposed interconnections between the two systems can largely resolve this issue.

The Transportation Master Plan identifies the need for additional road capacity to service the Committed Development Area. Of particular importance is the need for additional capacity across the Great Cataraqui River, generally referred to as the Third Crossing.

Growth Alternatives 1A, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are the additional areas which were assessed. All are assumed to be developed on full municipal services. The numerals assigned to identify them are not intended to imply their priority or the sequence of development. Because they vary in size and context, the development yields potentially achievable also vary. Table 2 provides a summary of development yields.

### Table 2
**Summary of Development Yields**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Growth</th>
<th>Committed Development Area</th>
<th>Growth Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Projection</td>
<td>311 ha</td>
<td>1A 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Projection</td>
<td>239 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>295 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>242 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>18,856</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,950</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,405</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>31,083</td>
<td>12,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,724</td>
<td>12,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,965</td>
<td>20,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>7,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A complete description of the development potential of the Growth Alternatives summarized in Table 2 is found in Interim Report No. 2. The land areas noted for each Growth Alternative are those that were evaluated. This Final Report recommends that GA 2 and GA 3 be extended north to Creekford Road, slightly increasing the areas, as shown on Figure 2.

### 3.2 Growth Alternative 1A

Growth Alternative 1A (GA 1A) was identified for further analysis in April, 2003 during the review of Draft Interim Report No. 2. Although the affected land is physically located inside the Committed Development Area, it is not currently planned for extensive urban development due to federal ownership. GA 1A was examined in more detail in order to understand the servicing and other planning implications of developing these areas, if the current uses are ever phased out or converted.
The west portion of GA 1A consists of approximately 211 ha of land on the Collins Bay Penitentiary site. It is projected to be capable of accommodating a population of 8,510 persons, based on a density of 25 units/gross ha (the density used to calculate potential development in all of the Growth Alternatives) and 2,520 jobs. The land is designated predominantly Institutional with some Environmental Protection areas corresponding to watercourses and wetlands in the northwest and easterly parts of the site. The land is identified within the Service Area boundary delineated by a dashed line on Schedule B to the Official Plan of the former Township of Kingston. It is excluded from the Development Area 1 boundary delineated by a hatched line on the same Schedule. No Development Area number has been assigned to this property. Important considerations that are relevant to these lands include:

- it is the most central of the Growth Alternatives, surrounded by urban development on all sides;
- it is relatively flat, easily developed land;
- it is adjacent to Little Cataraqui Creek, providing access to an attractive natural heritage resource. Buffer areas will be required adjacent to this Provincially Significant Wetland and will be determined by a study of the adjacent lands as part of the Secondary Plan or Class EA process; and
- it provides an opportunity to be planned and developed with mixed-use, transit supportive densities along three major roads.

Significant transportation costs are projected for the west part of GA 1A due to the need to widen Bath Road and Days Road and to extend Henderson Boulevard and Centennial Drive. If the Federal Government contemplates disposal of a significant portion of these lands, secondary planning should take the road capacity issue into account and determine whether there is a slightly lower threshold of development which can be achieved without triggering the need for all of these costly road network expansions. This study would help facilitate the timely construction of the necessary road works.

The easterly portion of GA 1A consists of 100 ha of land in the Private Married Quarters (PMQ) area of Canadian Forces Base Kingston. This very low density residential area was determined to be capable of accommodating an additional population of 4,140. The approved Official Plan for the former Township of Pittsburgh designates this area Institutional on Schedule A. There are no staging plans or phasing plans that apply to this area. It is fully serviced. Proposed Amendment No. 59 to the Official Plan would re-designate this land primarily as Low Density Residential (Military). Proposed Amendment No. 59 would require a further Official Plan Amendment if redevelopment is proposed on land that ceases to be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Other important considerations include:

- it is already developed, although at very low density and, therefore, contains a school, parks and some support services;
- buried infrastructure is considered to be near the end of its useful life and in need of replacement;
- some of the dwellings are considered obsolete and are being removed;
• discussions have occurred between the Department of National Defence and the City of Kingston concerning the transfer of servicing responsibility to the City, along with adequate funds to achieve infrastructure replacement. This could provide an opportunity to redevelop the land at higher density and integrate it with the rest of the City; and

• it is located in an attractive setting close to extensive waterfront open space.

The easterly portion of GA 1A may be constrained by a lack of available sewage treatment capacity for the next five years. It may also exacerbate transportation bottlenecks on the LaSalle Causeway until additional transportation capacity across the Great Cataraqui River has been achieved.

Both the east and west portions of GA 1A are located in close proximity to the sewage treatment plants. Necessary expansions and connections to the sanitary sewage systems can, therefore, be achieved less expensively than in other areas.

Growth Alternative 1A ranks first (equally with GA 2) when evaluated under the seven Evaluation Criteria. If these lands actually become available for urban development, serious reconsideration of their inclusion in a Development Area should occur.

3.3 Growth Alternative 2

Growth Alternative 2 (GA 2) also ranks first when comprehensively evaluated under the seven Evaluation Criteria. It consists of a westerly component and a smaller easterly component. Both are designated as Development Area 2/Phase 2 in the existing Official Plans.

Approximately 196 ha of developable land are found in the west part of GA 2. This study presents an opportunity to rationalize the boundary of this potential Growth Area. The northerly limit of GA 2, as evaluated, is a line roughly parallel to Creekford Road and located approximately 300 metres to the south. Provided a gravity sanitary sewer collection system can be effectively designed to handle sewage flows from this area, there is very little reason to prevent this area from expanding northward to Creekford Road. This would add approximately 19.6 ha to this Development Area increasing the total area to about 216 ha.

The Draft Final Report (May 19, 2004) had noted the possibility of considering a small northerly extension of this Growth Alternative to include some of the land on the north side of Creekford Road that might be serviced by gravity sewers and provide additional employment lands in a very accessible location. This resulted in two additional requests by landowners to extend the boundary further north to include all of the land south of Highway 401, east of Collins Creek. Since there has been no opportunity to conduct the necessary analyses to assess the impacts of these requests, it is proposed that this land be placed in a Special Study Area. See Section 3.7.

Additional considerations relevant to this area include:

• it abuts existing development to the south and east;

• it is relatively close to a large, growing employment cluster centred on Gardiners Road and abuts the Core Area identified on Schedule “C” to the existing Official Plan;
infrastructure to support this area is partly in place; and  

it is adjacent to Collins Creek, providing access to an attractive natural heritage resource.

The easterly portion of GA 2 consists of 43 ha of land on the east side of the Rideau Community, bordering Butternut Creek. This land was originally placed in a Phase 2 category due to an expectation that the Highway 15 trunk sanitary sewer servicing would have to be twinned or replaced to accommodate the projected sewage flows. Another key factor in the opening up of Stage 2 lands, as set out in the Official Plan of the former Township of Pittsburgh, is demonstrated availability of capacity at the Ravensview sewage treatment plant. Other relevant issues include:

- the lands are a logical, minor extension to the built up area of the Rideau Community which is designated in the Official Plan and covered by a Secondary Plan;
- they are adjacent to and include an expansion to the existing business park; and
- they are located beside Butternut Creek, providing an opportunity for a recreational pathway, subject to appropriate buffering.

3.4 Growth Alternative 3

GA 3 consists of the Mile Square lands and Westbrook expansion area, identified as Development Area 3 in the Official Plan of the former Township of Kingston. An active landowner group has done some initial conceptual planning for the Mile Square portion of the area. The most recent concept was submitted to the City of Kingston in October 2003 and consisted of primarily single detached dwellings oriented to a proposed golf course.

Important considerations for this area include:

- it has a mix of well treed areas and open agricultural lands with varied topography;
- the Mile Square portion abuts Loyalist Township to the west;
- some existing development is located near the southwesterly end of this site;
- it abuts the west side of Collins Creek, providing access to an attractive natural heritage resource;
- Collins Creek has the most restrictive stormwater discharge quality requirements in the City;
- there are some existing employment opportunities to the west in Loyalist Township; and
- it is further from existing employment opportunities within the City of Kingston than any of the other Growth Alternatives.

At such time as urban development is considered for this area, consideration should be given to rationalizing the northern boundary, perhaps using Creekford Road.
GA 3 is least preferred, based on the application of the seven Evaluation Criteria. In spite of this, the servicing costs are competitive with other Growth Alternatives based upon the projected density of 25 units per hectare (gross).

GA 3 is substantially larger than the other Growth Alternatives and provides an opportunity for future comprehensive secondary planning to accommodate mixed-use, employment and the combination of elements that can help achieve a more complete, integrated community.

3.5 Growth Alternative 4

Growth Alternative 4 (GA 4) is comprised of several parcels of land located in the St. Lawrence Community in Kingston East. The land is currently subject to servicing policies which require large lots on private individual services north of Highway 2 and smaller lots on piped municipal water and private individual sewage disposal systems south of Highway 2. There are several reasons why this servicing approach should be reconsidered:

- the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) discourages development on partial services (i.e. water or sanitary sewer without the other service);
- the PPS also states that development and land use patterns that would hinder the efficient expansion of urban areas are not permitted in adjacent areas (Section 1.1.1(d));
- existing water supply infrastructure in the St. Lawrence Community is currently underutilized, sometimes causing problems maintaining adequate residual chlorine levels. Increased usage as a result of denser development would help alleviate this problem;
- a water tower already exists at the east end of the municipal system, providing water service reliability in this area;
- hydrogeological studies indicate that groundwater quality and quantity is substandard in this area, as noted on the constraint mapping included in OPA No. 59; and
- the lands are in close proximity to the Ravensview sewage treatment plant which is currently undergoing an Environmental Assessment Update for an expansion project which will improve its treatment quality and hydraulic capacity.

For these reasons, it is concluded that full municipal piped water supply and sanitary sewer services are a more appropriate approach to servicing this area.

Other considerations include:

- the area could accommodate a population of 13,110 at urban densities of 25 units/ha (gross) but the transportation analysis suggests this amount of growth would trigger the need for two additional lanes of capacity on Highway 2. It may, therefore, be preferable to examine, as part of the secondary planning process for the area, the threshold for development which can be accommodated on the existing two-lane Highway 2; and
existing, lower density development in the area is relatively recent and provides only very limited opportunities for infilling and intensification.

Like development in the easterly part of GA 1A, GA 4 would put substantial additional pressure on the LaSalle Causeway and should not proceed before additional transportation capacity over the Great Cataraqui River has been initiated.

Ravensview sewage treatment plant capacity may constrain potential development until any necessary expansion project has been completed.

GA 4 does not rank as high as either GA 1A or GA 2 but can currently develop on partial or private services. Pursuing this servicing concept is not the preferred approach from a long range planning perspective. It is, therefore, concluded that GA 4 should be given reconsideration for fully serviced urban development, but only after sewage treatment plant capacity has been added and the Third Crossing has been initiated. Development on private individual services should not be permitted in the meantime. Development on partial services (piped water and private sewage disposal) should be discouraged unless measures are implemented to permit lot splitting when the sanitary sewer service becomes available in the future.

3.6 Growth Alternative 5

Growth Alternative 5 (GA 5) has a total area of 242 ha and is located north of Highway 401, straddling Division Street. The portion located on the west side of Division Street has an area of 38 ha, is owned by the City of Kingston and is currently used for a snow dump, a storage area for the receipt of dredged materials from the Cataraqui River Crossing project, and is being considered for use as a permanent yard waste composting site. This western area is, therefore, unavailable in the short term but may be available in the future if these uses are terminated.

Under the seven Evaluation Criteria, GA 5 ranks behind GA 1A and GA 2. Considerations, which are relevant to the potential development of GA 5, include:

- it has the greatest potential to make use of existing and planned capacity of Highway 401 and the Division Street corridor;
- it is highly accessible from Division and Montreal Streets and very accessible to the City of Kingston’s various surface operations which are located in the Division Street and Counter Street corridors;
- McAdoo’s Lane forms the northern boundary of GA 5 and is the location for numerous businesses which generate truck traffic, noise, dust and vibration from quarrying. It also contains a former municipal waste disposal site. This mix of uses would result in land use compatibility problems for new residential development on the northerly part of the site;
- noise considerations along Highway 401 may also be an impediment to residential development due to grade considerations on the westerly part of the site;
- it is currently outside of the urban area designated in the Official Plan; and
• a north to south electrical transmission corridor bisects the site and would impede some forms of development.

Once the various constraints to development are considered, the size of the resulting residential development, presumably in the easterly part of the site, may be too small to permit a reasonable range of convenient, cost effective supporting services. It may be concluded that the residential potential of GA 5 is less than in the other Growth Alternatives. However, the land has good potential for providing relatively large sites to accommodate employment uses. It may also have greater long-term future development potential if combined with additional redevelopment lands on the north side of McAdoo’s Lane and/or if the City makes the westerly part of the area available for urban development.

3.7 Special Study Area

As a result of the final public consultation activities in June, 2004, several submissions requested that the land bounded by Creekford Road, Gardiners Road, Highway 401 and Collins Creek be included within the Urban Boundary. The land has a total area of 84 ha. It includes several dwellings; most of the land is vacant. It includes City-owned land, part of which is to be used for a new water tower. The land slopes significantly, northwesterly towards Collins Creek.

Because the land was not identified for consideration earlier in the study process, it has not been subject to detailed sanitary sewer and water servicing analyses, transportation analysis or financial analysis that the other Growth Alternatives have and has not been evaluated using the seven Evaluation Criteria developed in the earlier phases of the work program. The Study Team is not in a position where it can recommend its immediate inclusion within a Phase 2 area, inside the proposed Urban Boundary. It is acknowledged that the land is in a very accessible location and may provide an opportunity for development in the future. It is, therefore, included within the Potential Outer Urban Boundary.

If a comprehensive evaluation of the servicing, access, land use, transportation, environmental, financial and other relevant issues is undertaken by the landowners, consideration should be given to whether earlier development of the land is warranted.

4.0 LINKAGE TO OTHER STUDIES

4.1 Transportation Master Plan and The Cycling And Pathways Study

The Urban Growth Strategy (UGS), the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and the Cycling and Pathways projects have been closely linked in order to feed outcomes from each of these studies into the others, ensuring coordinated results. Some highlights of this process include:

• the November 13, 2002 Public Open House was a joint event involving presentations and displays from all three studies;

• the Consulting Team preparing the TMP provided a transportation evaluation of the Growth Alternatives (presented in Interim Report No. 2, April 2003);
the results of the evaluation of Growth Alternatives contained in the UGS Interim Report No. 2, April 2003, were used as the basis for the preparation of the transportation strategy described in the August 2003 Draft TMP Report;

the conclusions of the Cycling and Pathways Study, August 11, 2003, were considered in the final evaluation of the Growth Alternatives;

additional transportation analysis of the Growth Alternatives, including GA 1A, was completed (as well as coordination with the Development Charges study) as part of the process of completing the final revisions to Interim Report No. 2 and this Final Report; and

the recommendations of this Strategy may require adjustments to the travel demand model of the Transportation Master Plan, in order to finalize that project.

#1 The transportation conclusions and recommendations that have an impact on the major conclusions and directions of the Urban Growth Strategy include:

- the establishment of a new strategic direction that emphasizes walking, cycling and public transit over automobile trips and, therefore, requires development forms which support this approach;

- the establishment of high frequency transit in strategic corridors. An initial focus on the Princess Street route would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the success of this concept in an ideal location; and

- the need for the Third Crossing of the Great Cataraqui River. The preliminary conclusions of the TMP had suggested that some Growth Alternatives might be accommodated without the Third Crossing, but further analysis has concluded that it is needed now to accommodate growth and for community safety reasons.

4.2 City-Owned Industrial Land (COIL) Development Strategy

The Phase 1 (February 19, 2004) and Draft Phase 2 (March 2004) Reports, prepared as part of the COIL Development Strategy, have concluded that more than sufficient land is available to meet the City’s industrial needs to the year 2026. The Phase 2 Report also notes that the KEDCO job creation target of 2000 net new jobs per year contained in its 2004-2006 Business Plan would place additional pressure on the use of this industrial land inventory. No change to the current industrial designations is recommended at this time.

Interim Report No. 2 of the Urban Growth Strategy had noted the possibility of redesignating some employment lands for residential use in order to contain growth within a smaller urban footprint. Now that the COIL Study has been advanced, no redesignation of the industrial lands for residential use should be considered at this time.

#2 In view of the COIL Report’s recommendations and KEDCO’s emphasis on increased job creation, no redesignation of industrial land for residential purposes is recommended.
5.0 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW GROWTH OCCURS

5.1 Kingston’s Growth

Sections 4 and 5 of Interim Report No. 2 provide detailed information on Kingston’s historical and projected growth.

The existing Official Plans of the three former municipalities contain very little current information about population and housing projections. The former municipalities jointly prepared the Population Projection Model and Growth Trends Study in 1994 and updated it in 1998. The model was further refined by Stevens Associates in 2003 and included high, medium and low growth projections based on potential employment growth of 1000, 600 and 200 net new jobs per year, respectively. The resulting population projections are now substantially lower than the 1998 projections but are reflective of actual growth trends experienced in Kingston since 1976.

When selecting a growth projection for planning purposes, it is important to build in flexibility to address the many uncertainties which exist. The medium growth projection prepared by Stevens Associates may be the best representation of potential growth but removes this flexibility. For example, some land may remain vacant for many years and not be available to actually achieve growth in the 25-year period. In addition, a healthy, competitive market is needed to provide residents and businesses with choice and to encourage affordability. An arbitrary allowance of 50% (or some other number) could be added to the medium growth targets to achieve this competition and compensate for land which is not developed. Another choice is to determine the City’s land requirements if the high growth rate was to occur. It is for this reason that the high projection has been used in the balance of this study.

Growth projections are an uncertain exercise. In early 2004, the City of Kingston and KEDCO were considering measures to substantially increase the City’s job creation targets to 2000 net new jobs per year. The high growth projection prepared by Stevens Associates is based on 1000 jobs per year and has been used to project land needs in this Urban Growth Strategy. If the new initiatives achieve a doubling of growth, the land requirements and this strategy will have to be reconsidered.

It is concluded that the projections on which this Strategy is based remain valid but that the flexibility to react to changing conditions should be built into the Strategy as much as possible.

| #3 | The Urban Growth Strategy identifies those lands beyond the Urban Boundary which have the best potential to satisfy increased growth, should they be needed before or beyond the year 2026. |

5.2 Service Areas and the Urban Boundary

The Terms of Reference for the UGS project contained Map 1 which identified the “Urban and Rural Split as per Official Plans”. This line is also shown on Map 19 in the third edition of City Facts, November 2000, a document prepared by the Planning Division. This boundary line encompasses an area consisting of:

- the entire former City of Kingston, excluding the small area north of Highway 401;
• Development Areas 1, 2, and 3, and the Collins Bay Penitentiary lands in the former Township of Kingston; and

• Phases 1 and 2 of the Rideau Community, the St. Lawrence Community and the developed part of CFB Kingston in the former Township of Pittsburgh.

This line is identified as the “Urban Area Boundary” on Figure 2 in Interim Report No. 2.

The Terms of Reference also required an examination of the urban development potential of lands located immediately outside of the urban boundary. Schedule B to the Official Plan for the Township of Kingston also identifies a Service Area Boundary within which development “is intended to occur primarily on full municipal services.” This line is different from the Urban/Rural boundary in several locations. It:

• extends slightly to the northwest of Development Area 3;

• extends north to Highway 401 between Gardiners Road and Cloggs Road, north of Creekford Road;

• includes the area serviced by municipal piped water north of Highway 401 in the vicinity of Sydenham Road and Sunnyside Road; but

• it excludes Collins Bay Penitentiary.

No separate service area boundaries are shown in the existing Official Plans for the former City of Kingston or the former Township of Pittsburgh.

Considerable discussion has occurred in the planning community and in the general public about the establishment of an urban boundary. It is often felt that a firm boundary will:

• help force urban intensification;

• prevent urban sprawl;

• dampen expectations for premature, peripheral development; and

• facilitate better infrastructure usage.

Conversely, establishing firm boundaries too tightly to the City’s edge can:

• prevent long term (20 – 50 years) thinking about where future urban development should occur;

• increase the cost of land and reduce competition between developers, leading to difficulty in achieving other objectives such as more affordable housing;

• lead to continuing pressures by owners of candidate areas outside the boundary to press for premature commitments for their lands; and
result in applications for alternative forms of urban fringe development based on private individual water supply and sewage disposal systems.

This UGS study has concluded that projected growth to the year 2026 can be accommodated within the Committed Development Area plus additional land in one of the two preferred areas: Growth Alternative 1A or Growth Alternative 2. Since GA 1A is not available for development, GA 2 is the logical location to plan for additional growth.

The other three potential Growth Alternatives (GA 3, GA 4 and GA 5) all have good long term potential for urban development, but are not yet needed.

It is concluded that there is considerable merit in establishing a two-part urban boundary.

### The following approach is recommended:

- an **Urban Boundary** that encompasses the lands which are projected to be needed to accommodate growth to the year 2026; and

- a **Potential Outer Urban Boundary** which encompasses additional Future Development Areas and indicates the City’s general, longer term intentions, based on current knowledge.

This approach establishes as much certainty as possible, permitting landowners, City of Kingston, Utilities Kingston and agency staff, the development community, and the public to coordinate their plans for the use and servicing of this land. This planning applies to both of the affected areas:

- land inside the Urban Boundary where Secondary Plans, detailed infrastructure planning and related implementation measures are needed to bring development forward; and

- the Future Development Areas where temporary uses can occur, provided they do not interfere with the long-term potential of the land to accommodate comprehensive, fully serviced urban development.

It will be necessary to review this recommendation at five-year intervals to ensure that actual growth rates, land consumption and other factors have not rendered current conclusions invalid.

It is noted that Amendments to the Planning Act introduced in late 2003 would remove the right to appeal Council decisions on urban boundaries to the Ontario Municipal Board. These Amendments were not yet in effect as of May 2004.

### Phasing of Urban Development

During the UGS project, some representatives of the development community suggested that the owners of land located in later phases should have the opportunity to develop their land out of sequence, if the owners of land in earlier phases do not proceed quickly. It is argued that this would have the advantage of providing more locations for concurrent development, increasing choice for consumers and increasing competition between developers, possibly reducing housing costs.
At present, the Official Plans contain clear policies stating the order of development and the criteria for advancing to subsequent phases.

One significant disadvantage of allowing development to occur in more areas at once is servicing cost. The City has a major backlog of servicing needs that will be very expensive to undertake. Undertaking the expansion of the road, sewer and water networks to accommodate all of the areas at once would involve great capital expenditures and increased operations and maintenance costs for larger networks in a low growth community. It is unaffordable.

“Front-ending” is a term used to describe a financing arrangement where the developer pays the cost of infrastructure capacity increases at an early date and recovers the investment over time, as development occurs. Municipalities frequently consider such measures on a limited scale. Increased use of the concept requires caution. If major new areas are to be released for earlier development, the City should carefully consider all of the major improvements necessary to support the new area, including sanitary sewage collection and treatment facilities, the water treatment and distribution works and major roadway expansions. Unless the front-ending covers all of the City’s additional costs, such actions will only dilute what can be achieved using the City’s existing revenue sources (Development Charges and Imposts). These revenues should continue to be directed to the orderly provision of infrastructure in accordance with the City’s planned approach. Revenues from Development Charges and Imposts should not be diverted from the normal sequence of City servicing. The City needs to maintain control of the orderly development of the community.

The analysis undertaken in the UGS study leads to the conclusion that the phasing of urban growth is necessary in order to implement the two-boundary approach. Phasing is also needed to address infrastructure constraints in a technically sound and affordable manner.

#5 The following priorities for the general order of development phasing are recommended:

1. Committed Development Area (CDA)
   The CDA (areas already designated and available for development on full municipal water and sanitary sewer services) would continue to be the first priority to accommodate infill and new development, where infrastructure capacity is available. Within the CDA, growth will depend on the ongoing management of water and sewer capacity constraints. The use of holding zones, temporary use zoning, lapsing of subdivision draft approvals after three years, and lapsing of site plan approvals after two years should be the primary mechanisms for ensuring the capacity commitments are not hoarded.

   Transportation capacity across the Great Cataraqui River will remain constrained until the Third Crossing proceeds, currently planned for the 11 to 15 year time frame.

2. Growth Alternative 2
   GA 2 is the next priority, starting when and where transportation, water supply and sewage treatment capacity is available:
   - the easterly portions depend upon the Ravensview sewage treatment plant
capacity expansion and the Third Crossing being available within the 11 to 15 year period;

- the westerly component depends upon Kingston West sewage treatment plant capacity being available and on interconnections between the two water systems.

Secondary Plans, Master Servicing Plans and financial arrangements to implement needed infrastructure improvements will also be necessary in the western portion.

3. Future Development Areas (GA’s 3, 4 and 5).

If land in Growth Alternative 1A becomes available, development phasing which accommodates this area should be reconsidered. Secondary Plans, Master Servicing Plans, financial plans, including a review of the Development Charge and Impost By-laws would also be required.

The re-examination of the approaches to urban growth expressed in the three Official Plans of the former municipalities was a fundamental reason for undertaking the Urban Growth Strategy. This phasing concept maintains the general order of development from the existing Official Plans, adjusts boundaries and servicing concepts within the urban area where appropriate and recognizes new opportunities which had not previously been considered.

An average of 745 new dwelling units per year were built in Kingston during the years 1980 to 2003, inclusive. The projected average growth rate of 660 to 916 dwellings per year (based on the medium and high growth projections, respectively) can be met in the Committed Development Area over the next 10 years, provided infrastructure capacity is well managed and other constraints are addressed. This meets the requirement for a 10-year supply of designated land, as set out in the Provincial Policy Statement.

5.4 Integrating the Approaches of the Existing Official Plans

The existing Official Plans of the former municipalities contain three independent approaches to urban development:

- the former City of Kingston placed all land in one “phase” because, as an older inner city, nearly all of its land had been previously developed. The Plan encouraged new infill and redevelopment throughout, stressed protection for the traditional downtown and forecast an eventual Third Crossing;

- the former Township of Kingston was a suburban area with mostly “greenfield” forms of development. It placed its urbanizing land in three phases, working gradually north and west, encouraged its own community core, centered on the Princess Street/Gardiners Road intersection, and encouraged mixed-use intensification in the area referred to as “the Loop” (Princess Street / Gardiners Road/ Bath Road). The Township’s extensive growth since the 1960s resulted in a shift of the greater Kingston area’s population and jobs to the west; and
the former Township of Pittsburgh was also primarily a suburban, greenfield development area. It established a small urban area in the Rideau Community with two phases, neighbourhood scale commercial and other support services. The Official Plan has anticipated the Third Crossing for about 30 years. The St. Lawrence community is a lower density, bedroom community with few support services. CFB Kingston is a somewhat separate, mixed-use community, the growth of which is primarily influenced by National Defence policy, which has varied considerably over the past sixty years.

With amalgamation, the new City of Kingston is better able to integrate its collective approach to growth by comprehensively addressing mutual planning and servicing challenges and by objectively analyzing the ways in which the overall community can be improved in an integrated and coordinated manner. Community building is a complex, long-term process which requires the cooperation of many parties. Drawing upon the strengths of the current approaches while minimizing the weaknesses presents the best option for steering growth rather than attempting to abruptly redirect it or simply react to development applications.

The City will be preparing a new comprehensive Official Plan in 2006. As an interim measure, amendments to the three existing Official Plans are needed to help ensure a consistent approach to major, growth related issues. There are two options for achieving this:

• prepare detailed amendments to each document which delete/replace/add policies to address potential conflicts and needed changes throughout each of the texts and on the appropriate maps; or
• prepare common text and map(s) which, as much as possible, address overall strategic issues and incorporate them into an appropriate location, in each of the Official Plans, with a statement indicating that it overrides existing policy.

In view of the impending new Official Plan, the second option is recommended.

5.5 Role of the CBD and the Regional Commercial Study

The Central Business District is the focal area of the City, as noted in the 1998 Kingston Regional Commercial System Study. Its vitality is important for the quality of life of the residents of the City as well as for visitors and tourists. One of the Evaluation Criteria specifically addressed the opportunity for the Growth Alternative to enhance the use of the downtown. GA 1A, GA 4 and GA 5 rated the highest, largely because of their proximity and accessibility to the downtown.

The Central Business District is the top of the commercial hierarchy. It functions as a central place providing the widest range of goods and services, including the higher order commercial establishments. It is also the most mixed-use area of the City and includes a substantial residential population. All of the various uses support the functioning of the downtown and serve to increase the usage of this area. The Central Business District also serves the day-to-day commercial and service needs for the surrounding residential communities. Additional strategically located residential development would further support the downtown businesses and services.

The Central Business District also has an important functional relationship with the other parts of the commercial hierarchy. The second significant commercial node is the Cataraqui Town Centre Core Area. This commercial node also includes a wide range of goods and services and has a regional
draw. Its focus is more automobile oriented and includes a predominance of discount-oriented (big box) retail. It also serves as a central place for much of the former Township of Kingston.

These two major commercial nodes are linked by relatively continuous commercial development along Princess Street. Continued good access along these routes is important for the functional interrelationship of the commercial areas with the communities that they serve. Better transit service, as recommended in the Transportation Master Plan, should enhance the integration of the commercial areas as well as enhance the Central Business District by making it a more convenient destination.

---

**#7 It is recommended that this consideration form a fundamental part of an enhanced strategy to strengthen this important Corridor.**

---

The Kingston Regional Commercial System Study, which was completed in 1998, included various recommendations which are still valid. The study concluded that there was sufficient land designated to accommodate projected commercial growth for the next twenty years. It should be noted that this evaluation of commercial land requirements was based on a population projection which was higher than the one that has been utilized in this Urban Growth Strategy. The study also recommended that the predominance of the highest levels of the commercial hierarchy be reinforced through policies in the Official Plan. It also recommended that new office development be concentrated in the Central Business District, at least in the short term.

Infilling and redevelopment are fundamental components of the Urban Growth Strategy. Careful management of the expansions to the urban boundary is also an inherent part of the strategy. These measures will serve to enhance the function of the existing major commercial nodes. The indiscriminate redesignation of other lands will undermine this balance. It is important that a proper evaluation of any new commercial areas, including cumulative impacts, be undertaken as part of the approval process.

### 5.6 Smart Growth

Smart Growth is a term that evolved from activities in Maryland and in Portland, Oregon to help combat very low-density suburban sprawl (Maryland uses only 3.5 units/gross acre as its smart growth threshold!). It is frequently argued that “smart growth” is really just good land use planning, an activity perhaps more easily facilitated by Ontario planning legislation and Canadian legal approaches to private property rights versus the public good. Although Ontario municipalities have sometimes done a fairly good job of achieving higher densities, mixed-use and transit supportive development forms, there has been less success in much of the suburban development that has occurred in the past thirty years.

It is worth discussing the smart growth concept in the context of the City of Kingston Urban Growth Strategy if only because the public has heard of it, the province has embraced it by setting up regional Smart Growth Panels and because it may be a useful tool in helping to publicize and encourage discussion about what constitutes good planning in the community.
Typical definitions of Smart Growth include elements such as:

- compact development forms that make efficient use of buried services and reduce land consumption;
- higher densities that support higher frequency public transit;
- mixed-use which reduces automobile travel to jobs and encourages walking and cycling;
- incentives to encourage Brownfields redevelopment and infilling of vacant lands in already serviced areas;
- opportunities for conservation of natural heritage resources;
- a more convenient, comfortable, livable community; and
- reduced air and other forms of pollution.

The 2003 Final Report of the Eastern Ontario Smart Growth Panel grouped its recommendations under three headings:

- Safeguarding and promoting our communities’ unique assets and quality of life;
- Enhancing environmental stewardship; and
- Building economic opportunity and prosperity.

5.7 Density Policies

Interim Report No. 2 contained a discussion of density issues in Section 6.1. It described the density ranges established in the existing Official Plans, indicated that Kingston’s current average urban residential density was about 22 units per net hectare, examined higher figures used in various studies promoting transit friendly and cost effective development and concluded that an overall target of 37.5 units per net hectare (25 units per gross hectare) was readily achievable for future development. This figure was used in the analysis of all of the Growth Alternatives.

Implementation of a minimum density target should be done through a zoning provision in order to emphasize its importance. It is recognized, however, that retrofitting existing communities to achieve this density will be more challenging and take longer to achieve. It is, therefore, recommended that this density target be implemented:

- through the secondary planning process and through an implementing zoning standard for all newly developing areas; and
- through a combination of general Official Plan policy and zoning standards in other areas, with a recognition that the greatest density should be directed to the major roadway corridors where it has the potential to support public transit.
The Development Charges/Impost Study is proceeding in parallel with the Urban Growth Strategy and is being prepared by CN Watson and Associates Ltd. CN Watson has reviewed the issue of development density incentives and disincentives and has determined that there is little potential for increasing Development Charges or Imposts for lower density forms of particular types of development due to the negligible difference in calculated municipal capital costs. For example, the direct costs of additional infrastructure to service a lot having a width of 18 m vs one of 12 m, consists of 6 additional metres of water pipe, sewers, streets, sidewalks and electrical lines. These developer costs are passed on directly to the home purchaser. It is, therefore, concluded that Development Charges and Imposts do not lend themselves to effective implementation of increased density goals. This does not suggest that long term municipal costs of low density development are insignificant. It simply means that Development Charges and Imposts are not designed to address the issue.

Official Plans have a direct role in directing different densities and forms of dwellings. All three of the existing Official Plans provide for a mix of several types of lower density dwelling unit types in their Residential designations;

- Pittsburgh Township allows singles, linked dwellings and semi-detached;
- Kingston Township allows singles, 2, 3 and 4 unit dwellings; and
- the former City of Kingston allows singles, semi-detached, duplex, triplex and converted dwellings.

These policies already provide for a general mix of units. No amendments are needed. It may be desirable to consider several changes to the existing Zoning By-laws, however, to help implement very modest levels of intensification:

- the zones which currently permit only single detached dwellings could be amended to allow 2 unit dwellings or apartments in houses, subject to appropriate development standards; and
- conversions of single detached dwellings to multi-unit dwellings are restricted to pre-1941 buildings in the former City of Kingston; conversion of singles to two-unit dwellings is restricted to pre-1956 buildings in the former Township of Kingston. Eliminating these time restrictions could result in greater opportunities for small-scale intensification of larger, newer buildings.

These changes should only be considered where servicing capacity exists or where capacity expansions are imminent.

It is recommended that the zoning by-laws be amended to remove these restrictions where servicing capacity permits it.

5.8 Infilling and Redevelopment

Interim Report No. 2 identified all of the major vacant land parcels within the Committed Development Area and projected their development potential. That Report noted the uncertainty of
the timing of development decisions by landowners and, therefore, the difficulty in relying on development of these lands to achieve overall growth targets.

Small scale infilling and redevelopment in the Committed Development Area is much more difficult to forecast. It is a complex matter determining when a land use will reach the end of its effective service life and be replaced. In any city, there is always unused development potential (the difference between what the zoning permits and what actually exists). In a free market, individuals decide whether they wish to use this potential. Municipalities (and other levels of government) can provide incentives and disincentives to encourage or discourage private sector actions but cannot control them.

The Urban Growth Strategy encourages the continued approval of infill and redevelopment opportunities in order to achieve:

- efficient use of serviced lands;
- cyclical replacement of housing;
- a competitive, affordable housing market;
- vibrant, higher density alternatives that support business and alternative transportation modes;
- locational choice; and
- delay in major infrastructure extensions.

Factors that may influence the achievement of these opportunities include:

- lack of water or sanitary sewer servicing capacity;
- costly Brownfields site clean-ups;
- the current policies of the Official Plans which encourage infill and redevelopment but contain counterbalancing “neighbourhood protection” policies which may largely neutralize the intent;
- competition from greenfields development;
- decisions of individual landowners; and
- adequacy of public transit service.

#10 Where possible, it is recommended that steps be taken to minimize these constraints, enhancing opportunities for infill and redevelopment.
5.9 Alternative Development Standards

The Alternative Development Standards (ADS) concept is a variety of proposals to design infrastructure which is more affordable but still meets the community’s needs. Several provincial initiatives have been launched over the past twenty years to examine alternative approaches to servicing standards that were sometimes considered to be excessively high.

Typically, the focus was on the required width of road allowances required to service residential development. Historically, the planned minimum was considered to be 66 feet (one “chain”) or about 20 metres. This would accommodate not only the road surface but also buried services, street lighting, sidewalks, and snow storage in winter. Changes to standards were sometimes opposed by municipal staff, often with good reasons.

Some reduced standards (18 m road allowances, for example, sometimes combined with reduced yards) have been implemented in the Cataraqui North development. This has resulted in some concerns being expressed by residents and by Council. Follow-up studies of the benefits and costs are essential to informed decision making. The key result sought is a reduction in the City’s long-term operations/maintenance/replacement costs over the long term (as well as a reduction in initial construction costs which are passed on to the home purchaser) while still achieving public safety, convenience and environmental protection. Trade-offs are an integral part of the decisions:

- during winters with heavy snowfall, removal costs will be higher if road allowances/front yards are too small to contain all of the accumulation;
- sidewalks may not be possible on both sides of the street in the reduced width available; and
- less tree planting may be achievable on the road allowance.

Other typical issues examined include curbs, gutters and storm sewers versus open ditches/swales or street lighting versus private front yard lighting.

#11 It is recommended that continued efforts be made to re-examine development standards, taking into consideration the recommendations of the new Cycling and Pathways Study, and consider alternatives which help reduce costs and increase densities while maintaining a reasonable level of public service.

5.10 Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Kyoto) Commitments

The Council of the City of Kingston endorsed the Partners in Climate Protection program of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) through a Resolution passed on April 17, 2001. A further Resolution was passed on May 21, 2002 endorsing the ratification of the Kyoto Accord. The FCM target for community greenhouse gas reduction is 6% over ten years.

Input received from the City of Kingston’s Environment Division indicates that the impact of community transportation is estimated to be 45% of the overall community contribution to greenhouse gas production (National estimates are about 35%). A detailed analysis of total greenhouse gas emissions conducted for the City’s Environment Division provides the following estimate of Green House Gas increases over 2001 levels:
Green House Gas (GHG) Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committed Development Area (CDA)</th>
<th>32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA + GA 1A</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA + GA 2</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA + GA 3</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA + GA 4</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA + GA 5</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the Growth Alternatives result in GHG reductions, but the least increase would occur if development is focused in more central areas. Development on the outer edges of the urban area would result in the greatest increases.

While the UGS Evaluation Criteria do not include a specific category devoted to greenhouse gas reduction, this issue is an important underlying element of Evaluation Criteria 1, 3 and especially 5 of Table 1. Growth Alternative 1A is the only Growth Alternative that ranks consistently high for all three of these criteria. GA 1A is entirely composed of federally owned land used for very low-density residential development at CFB Kingston and for agricultural uses at Collins Bay Penitentiary. Federal government reconsideration of these land uses could substantially assist in meeting the City’s greenhouse gas reduction targets.

#12 It is recommended that the City of Kingston negotiate with the appropriate federal agencies to make these lands available for urban development and redevelopment purposes.

5.11 Mixed-Use

If the City of Kingston is to meet its GHG reduction commitments, it will have to consider alternative approaches to the ways in which development occurs.

Mixed-use development is a concept which encourages residential, employment and support services to be located in close proximity to one another. It is an essential component of modern urban planning and was one of the factors considered when carrying out the evaluation of the Growth Alternatives. Mixed-use development helps to discourage unnecessary travel (reducing the number of “person-kilometres” traveled per day), especially by private vehicle, and has many benefits:

- saves time;
- reduces road requirements and minimizes hard surfaces;
- reduces greenhouse gas emissions;
- encourages healthy alternative modes of transportation (walking and cycling), as noted in Kingston’s Draft Transportation Master Plan; and
• reduces energy consumption (many similar factors are addressed in new Community Energy Planning initiatives being promoted by Natural Resources Canada).

It also results in more active, vibrant communities with more eyes on the street and opportunities for interaction.

Mixed-use is a variable concept which can be implemented in different ways in various parts of Kingston:

• lower Princess Street downtown area encourages many uses and, in fact, currently requires commercial uses to occupy the ground floors of new residential apartment buildings;

• in other corridors, a mix of uses is simply permitted;

• in residential neighbourhoods, home based businesses and, in some cases, small scale neighbourhood commercial uses are permitted; and

• in many employment zones, accessory residential uses are also permitted.

The greatest potential for mixed-used development occurs when secondary planning is undertaken for newly developing areas. This provides the opportunity for comprehensive analysis and design to take advantage of unique site characteristics. This should be a fundamental requirement for all secondary plans.

All of these forms of mixed-uses achieve some of the benefits noted, even if only at a modest scale.

#13 Subject to the need for protective policies to help prevent land use incompatibilities (such as noise, dust, vibration, odours and excessive light that impacts on residents), it is recommended that policies that allow more mixed-uses be encouraged in the Official Plan.

5.12 Brownfields

The City of Kingston initiated a Brownfields Task Force in 2002 to begin addressing the obstacles preventing redevelopment of these contaminated former industrial areas. Sites like the former Davis Tannery and the railway station property are located in serviced, central areas but the cost of site cleanup makes their development uneconomical.

This Urban Growth Strategy emphasizes the importance of developing lands within the Committed Development Area as the City’s first priority. Most Brownfield sites are found within this area. This approach will enhance the downtown area, reduce the City’s footprint, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and achieve other benefits explained elsewhere in this report. This program will allow a higher level of taxation on properties that are currently underdeveloped and, in certain cases, in large tax arrears. Through Council Resolution, brownfield developments are to be exempt from Development Charges and Impost fees in the revised Development Charges and Imposts By-laws. In keeping with the City of Kingston civic sustainable building policy direction, additional funding
opportunities may be provided for buildings where leadership in Energy and Environment Design (LEED) designation is achieved.

City staff are currently undertaking the work required to amend the Community Improvement policies of the Official Plan of the former City of Kingston and complete the related steps to address Brownfields redevelopment. Before the plan can be implemented, all regulations need to be proclaimed by the province.

#14 It is recommended that the Brownfields initiatives be fully supported and that the City consider providing financial incentives to encourage landowners to proceed with these redevelopment opportunities.

5.13 Natural Heritage Strategy

Prior to completing a new Official Plan in 2006, the City is planning a comprehensive analysis of the natural heritage features and the opportunities for connections between them, as required by the Provincial Policy Statement. The Urban Growth Strategy terms of reference did not require an exhaustive new study of these issues by biologists. In order to address this issue, the Study Team reviewed previous natural heritage studies, consulted with appropriate agencies and developed Screening Criteria, which were used to protect all known features at the earliest stages of the Growth Alternatives evaluation process.

When assessing the Growth Alternatives, the Study Team assigned a development density for the lands. This is considered an overall average for the area, but does not imply that all land is to be used for development and roads. Some will be used for buffers adjacent to natural heritage features, parks, utilities and supporting services. These will be determined as part of the Secondary Plan preparation process.

#15 It is recommended that the completion of a comprehensive natural heritage strategy study be expedited in order to have this information available for inclusion in the new Official Plan. In the interim period, as new areas are considered for development, it is recommended that Secondary Plans address natural heritage issues within the affected area, including potential linkages to adjacent areas and appropriate buffers.

This will ensure that these concerns continue to be addressed in accordance with the PPS as development applications are processed, prior to the completion of the new Official Plan.

5.14 Rural Planning

It is outside of the scope of the Urban Growth Strategy to develop recommendations for rural planning. Some observations are offered, however, as a result of the work completed:

- extensive land fragmentation in close proximity to the urban area limited the City’s choices in selecting viable Growth Alternatives for evaluation;

- substandard groundwater quality/quantity areas near the urban area have nonetheless been developed on private individual services; and
• a rural planning study would be an effective next step in completing the background analysis necessary for the completion of the City’s new Official Plan.

5.15 Implementation and Monitoring

The implementation of the Urban Growth Strategy can be most effectively accomplished using a multi-part approach, including:

• initiate Official Plan Amendments to incorporate the key recommendations without delay;

• apply the Strategy, as an additional component of the policy context used to evaluate planning applications;

• use the Strategy as important input into the preparation of the new 2006 Official Plan;

• use the Water Servicing and Sanitary Servicing Concept Plans to provide the framework for the strengthening, management and orderly, strategic expansion of these systems;

• use the Financial Plan to provide overall guidance on the ways in which services will be financed. These concepts will be further elaborated on in the Development Charges/Impost Fee Study;

• use as guidance in the consideration of new City initiatives, including policy development and the locating of new municipal facilities;

• use as a guide to other agencies, utilities and service providers in the logical and timely provision of services;

• use as the City’s comprehensive growth guidance document to those undertaking other studies for the City, such as the Transportation Master Plan, a Rural Planning Study or Design Guidelines; and

• use as a strong indication to senior governments that the City of Kingston has taken into account the important external factors (Kyoto, sustainability, energy efficiency, safe and reliable drinking water, water pollution, economic development) in undertaking a comprehensive approach to planning for the long-term benefit of the community.

#16 It is recommended that the Urban Growth Strategy together with the Water Servicing Concept Plan, Sanitary Servicing Concept Plan, Financial Plan and Draft Official Plan Amendments be used to guide all planning, financial, and infrastructure related initiatives in the City. The Strategy should be monitored on an ongoing basis and, particularly, in five year increments when the detailed examination of growth indicators (such as building permits, City revenue, employment increases, infrastructure use, land consumption) can be compared to Census data and used to assess the effectiveness of the Strategy and the need for changes to it.
5.16 Interim Reports No. 1 and No. 2

As discussed in Section 2, Interim Reports No. 1 and No. 2 were prepared during the course of the study. They provide important data, criteria, analysis and other information which was presented to the public and subject to public consultation and are important supporting documents to the study.

#17 It is recommended that Interim Reports 1 & 2 be recognized as supporting documents to the Urban Growth Strategy.

6.0 THE URBAN GROWTH STRATEGY

Various conclusions and recommendations have been provided throughout Sections 3, 4 and 5 of this Report. Recommendations have been identified using bold type. Based on these conclusions and recommendations an integrated strategy is proposed. The major elements of the proposed Urban Growth Strategy are described in the following subsections:

6.1 Kingston’s projected growth rate is relatively low. The amount of land needed to accommodate it is greater than the Committed Development Area but far less than that which is available within all of the Growth Alternatives combined. Consequently, it is important to manage infrastructure expansion to accommodate the projected growth needs of the overall community while retaining the flexibility to react to changes in actual growth rates.

6.2 Figure 3 identifies the proposed Urban Areas and Phasing. Land within the Urban Boundary is comprised of the Committed Development Area and Phase 2. Figure 3 also identifies Future Development Areas, considered to be the lands with the best potential to accommodate additional urban development, when needed.

6.3 Development phasing should proceed generally in the following order:

Phase 1 is the Committed Development Area. It is currently subject to sanitary sewage treatment capacity constraints at Ravensview and transportation constraints across the Great Cataraqui River. To manage infrastructure capacity now and in the future, it will be important that close cooperation continue to occur between Utilities Kingston and Planning and Development Services to monitor and control servicing capacity commitments. Specific mechanisms that should be used to achieve this include:

- provide for the automatic lapsing of subdivision draft approvals after 3 years if final approval has not been given;

- provide for the automatic lapsing of site plan approvals after 2 years if development hasn’t proceeded;

- attach a holding symbol “h” to any rezoning in order to delay development until capacity is available; and

- combinations of mechanisms suitable for the particular circumstances.
Phase 2 – The eastern and western components of development in the GA 2 areas will be dependent on continued infrastructure capacity being made available. The Third Crossing is considered essential to accommodate growth but it is acknowledged that development could proceed in the interim provided there is a commitment through the Development Charges By-law to ensure it proceeds within the 11 to 15 year period. Increased traffic congestion can be expected until it is constructed.

Because it ranked so highly in the evaluation process, GA 1A would also have to be given consideration if this land becomes available.

Phase 3 – These areas (GA’s 3, 4 and 5) are not currently projected to be needed within the planning period (2026), but appear to be suitable for urban development when needed.

6.4 The GA 3, GA 4 and GA 5 lands should be placed in a Future Development Areas category which will be reconsidered at five-year intervals.

6.5 Development in most of the remaining areas of GA 4 should be delayed until it can occur on full municipal piped services and the Third Crossing has been built.

6.6 The City should continue negotiating with federal agencies to make the Growth Alternative 1A land available for urban development.

6.7 Negotiations with DND with respect to CFB Kingston should be based on the same principles applied to private sector developers. Any services that the City assumes responsibility for should be constructed to City standards. If the City is to own road allowances and buried infrastructure, it should ensure that the land can be used in accordance with the relevant recommendations of this Strategy.

6.8 The Transportation Master Plan has concluded that greater emphasis needs to be placed on walking, cycling and public transit. Supportive development forms are, therefore, required. Key public transportation corridors are proposed along Princess Street (first priority), Division Street and Bath Road. To begin implementing this approach, efforts should initially be focused on one area where significant progress can be achieved quickly. The Princess Street corridor should receive this focus by:

- stating a strong, long term municipal commitment to substantially improve the frequency of public transit in the corridor between Lower Princess /North Block / KGH / Queens and the Cataraqui Town Centre;

- requiring a supportive minimum residential density of 50 units/gross ha within about 150 m of this transit route, increasing to about 400 m near transit stops, wherever appropriate;

- encouraging a greater mix of land uses;

- permitting stand alone residential development, without ground floor commercial uses, except in the Lower Princess Street area;
stating the municipality’s commitment to place its new facilities in this corridor whenever appropriate;
- requiring/allowing reduced setbacks from the streets in the corridor;
- allowing reduced parking standards;
- giving the area servicing priority, where possible; and
- financial or other incentives, if necessary.

6.9 Second priority corridors should be considered along Division Street and Bath Road in accordance with the final recommendations of the Transportation Master Plan and in parallel with other City initiatives, such as the establishment of park and ride facilities.

6.10 The Third Crossing should be completed as soon as possible and not later than the 11 to 15 year period.

6.11 An Alternative Development Standards Committee involving City staff and the development community should be charged with the responsibility to review and update City of Kingston infrastructure standards.

6.12 Priorities for planning and engineering studies should focus on implementation of this Strategy, including Brownfield’s implementation, design guidelines to help encourage effective mixed-use in a transit supportive environment and downtown stormwater management alternatives.

7.0 PROJECT DELIVERABLES

7.1 Water Servicing and Sanitary Servicing Concept Plans

The UGS planning process was modelled on the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA). The City’s intent was to follow a recognized stepped process while engaging the stakeholders and ultimately reaching a reasoned, logical conclusion that was defensible and repeatable. An extensive public consultation program was developed involving public notices, stakeholder contact and interviews, Open House meetings, posting information on the City website and in public locations. A more complete list of the consultation activities appears in Appendix 5.

Screening Criteria and Evaluation Criteria (Table 1) were developed with public input and applied to the Study Area; first to screen out those lands unsuitable for development; and secondly, to evaluate the Growth Alternatives and select the preferred alternative.

The Evaluation Criteria and the evaluation process are reflected in Interim Report No. 2. Two criteria relate directly to the water and sanitary sewer infrastructure. They include:

- Criterion 2: Strategy enables enhanced use of existing and planned water and sanitary sewer infrastructure.
Criterion 7: Cost - the indicators were:

- Per capita cost based upon the total projected population; and
- Comparison of taxpayer versus developer costs (i.e. water and sewer rates plus taxes versus Impost plus Development Charges).

The problem definition for the UGS planning study included the completion of a high level assessment of the water and sanitary systems, to identify the potential impacts associated with each of the Growth Alternatives. The assessment included:

- Calculations of the average and maximum day water demands and sewage flows;
- Identification of future water pumpage, storage and treatment needs;
- Estimation of sewage pumping station and sewage treatment plant flows;
- Comparison of existing versus projected capacities;
- Use of the City of Kingston water distribution network model and the trunk sewer model to identify required improvements;
- Preparation of preliminary cost estimates and an approximate construction schedule for the required works; and
- Identification of the approximate cost split between rates versus impost charges.

The preferred Growth Alternative identified in Interim Report No. 2 is Growth Alternative 2. Growth Alternative 1A ranks highly along with GA 2, however, the lands belong to the Federal Government and are presently not available for development. If the lands were to become available, development of the lands should be given serious consideration.

Appendices 1 and 2 present the Water Servicing Concept Plan and the Sanitary Servicing Concept Plan for GA 2. The Plans:

- list the system upgrades;
- present a total cost and cost sharing summary for the proposed works;
- identify the approximate construction schedule; and
- present mapping indicating the existing systems and the location of future works.

The proposed works are required to service lands already identified within the service areas associated with the existing Official Plans. A majority of the watermain and sewer works are located within existing road allowances and, hence, are considered Schedule A projects under the Municipal Class EA. The other works (booster stations, water storage facilities, sewage pumping stations and plant upgrades) are less clearly defined in their scope and would be Schedule B or C
projects. Many of these latter projects won't occur for several years and, hence, will be subject to further assessment prior to detailed design.

The Water Servicing and Sanitary Servicing Concept Plans also contain recommendations on the implementation of a Water Efficiency Plan. This would have significant benefits in lowering water usage and loss, with consequent reduction in the demand for sewer capacity as well as environmental and financial benefits.

7.2 Financial Plan

C.N. Watson and Associates Ltd. has prepared a Financial Plan to address future financing of the capital works that will be required to service the lands proposed for future development by the Urban Growth Strategy. The Financial Plan is included in Appendix 3 to this report.

The Financial Plan outlines various capital funding alternatives that are available to municipalities and discusses relevant changes pertaining to capital financing as a result of the coming into force of the Municipal Act, 2001 effective January 1, 2003. The plan includes an overview of the City’s finances (summarized from the City’s 2004 Approved Budget) and present financial policy, with the aim of providing a preliminary approximation of affordability within the framework of the City’s current financial plan. A high level financial projection has been prepared to illustrate long term financing of the capital program that is being proposed to service growth within the City of Kingston to the year 2026, and discusses the impact that the addition of the proposed works will have on the City’s current financial plan. The Urban Growth Strategy has determined that the combination of the Committed Development Area, together with Growth Alternative 2, represents the preferred growth alternative. This is the growth alternative that has, therefore, been selected for the purpose of preparing the financial projection analysis.

7.3 Draft Official Plan Amendments

Appendix 4 contains three draft Official Plan amendments, one for each of the Official Plans for the former municipalities. Each amendment contains a common Schedule and specific wording changes that relate directly to the preferred Strategy by establishing overall concepts which supersede existing policy. They also contain changes which support the overall concept by revising conflicting policies and making additions specific to that Official Plan.

8.0 PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THE URBAN GROWTH STRATEGY

8.1 Integrated and Comprehensive Approach

The Terms of Reference for the Urban Growth Strategy (UGS) established a multi-stage process which is illustrated graphically on Figure 1. The comprehensive approach ensured that planning policy changes were integrated with servicing, financial and related factors.
8.2 Public Consultation

Extensive public consultation occurred at four stages of the work program and involved affected agencies, the development community, City and Utilities Kingston staff and the general public:

- initial request for input (summer 2002);
- review of the Evaluation Criteria (November 2002);
- review of the Evaluation Results (April 2003); and
- additional review of the Evaluation Results and Project conclusions (June 2004).

8.3 Requirements of the Planning Act and the Environmental Assessment Act and the Development Charges Act

The draft Official Plan Amendments were made available for review during the final stages of the study in order to show how some of the recommendations would be implemented. These draft Amendments will be revised and presented at a formal Public Meeting held pursuant to Section 17 of the Planning Act.

Additional recommendations will be incorporated into the new Official Plan, intended to be completed in 2006, and will be subject to public consultation under the Planning Act.

On an ongoing basis, Secondary Plans, Community Improvement Plans, rezonings, site plans, subdivisions, consents, and minor variances will be considered using the recommendations of this study and will be processed under the relevant sections of the Planning Act.

The Urban Growth Strategy has been undertaken in accordance with the principles of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA). This process is directly applicable to municipal infrastructure and is discussed further in Section 7.1 of this Report.

The UGS study was integrated with the detailed analyses undertaken as part of the Development Charges/Impost Fee study being completed under the Development Charges Act and the Municipal Act. Projected infrastructure costs related to the forecasted development were studied in detail, permitting a high level of accuracy when analyzing the Growth Alternatives.
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