EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to present a preliminary response to the Planning Committee resolution passed at its meeting of November 1, 2007 and the recommendations from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) outlined in their letter dated August 21, 2008 regarding the following:

- the location of the Urban Area Boundary as it relates to the 2004 Final Urban Growth Strategy Study;
- the name to be applied to the Boundary;
- the development of density targets for the Urban Area;
- the timing and accommodation of projected dwelling units; and,
- the development of an urban intensification target.

This information is preliminary and is being presented to the Planning Committee for discussion purposes. It is important to note that this report deals only with the residential land use system and does not address the employment lands that are currently under review. The employment lands study will be presented to Planning Committee at a future date.

The 2004 Urban Growth Strategy was based on information and data that was gathered between 2001 and 2003. As a result, the Planning and Development Department has undertaken a series of initiatives to bring forward more current information and data, in order to assist in the consideration of the more recent development and population trends. These trends can have a potential impact on the projected housing need and the projected housing accommodation capacity.

There have been a number of Urban Growth Management reports and memorandums presented to Planning Committee since 2005. Initially, the approach was to develop three independent amendments to the three Official Plans. During the course of this process staff was requested to undertake a supplementary review to reassess the Urban Growth Strategy's industrial and commercial scenarios. This was requested in order to identify and to evaluate a potential growth corridor north of Highway No. 401. Following this reassessment, Council, in May 2006, directed staff to roll the Urban Growth Management Policies into the Official Plan Review. The Official Plan consultant developed the Official Plan on the basis of Urban Growth Management policies that were available at the time of the December 2006 Draft Official Plan. As a parallel process, the Planning and Development Department continued to modify the Urban Growth policies and mapping for the purpose of formulating standard policies to be included in the next draft of the Official Plan.
RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended by the Planning and Development Department:

1. That the Schedule 2 map attached to this report as Exhibit ‘D’ and dated Fall 2008 be incorporated into the next draft of the Official Plan, to show the one boundary concept and the three future growth alternative areas identified in the Urban Growth Strategy Study of 2004;
2. That the adjusted boundary enclosing the defined urban area of the City of Kingston be named the “Urban Boundary”;
3. That the former Rideau Community “Phase 2” and the Clogg’s Road “Special Study Area” be redesignated as “Area Specific Phasing” and be included within the Urban Boundary as shown on the Schedule 2 map and be appropriately recognized by policy;
4. That the following three residential density targets be included as policy in the next draft of the Official Plan:
   - for the existing built up urban area, the existing density of 22 dwelling units/hectare net be maintained where feasible;
   - for greenfield and large scale residential developments, a minimum density of 37.5 dwelling units/hectare net be targeted;
   - for the Princess Street Corridor and Centres mixed use developments, a minimum density of 75 dwelling units/hectare net be targeted for new residential development.
5. That the residential intensification target of a 9% increase in overall density be recognized and incorporated by way of appropriate policy into the next draft of the Official Plan; and,
6. That the strategy involving monitoring and reassessment of the growth management plan be implemented in concert with the review of the Development Charges and Impost Fee By-laws on a regular five year programme or as otherwise required.

CONSULTATION WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS:

| Commissioner Beach, Growth & Sustainability | N/R |
| Commissioner Hunt, Finance & Corporate Performance | N/R |
| Commissioner Leger, Corporate Services | N/R |
| Jim Keech, President, Utilities Kingston | N/R |

(N/R indicates consultation not required)
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OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide a preliminary response to the resolution passed by Planning Committee at its meeting of November 1, 2007 and the recommendations from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) outlined in their letter dated August 21, 2008 regarding the following:

- the location of the Urban Area Boundary as it relates to the 2004 Final Urban Growth Strategy Study;
- the name to be applied to the boundary;
- a number of subsequent minor map and policy adjustments;
- the development of density targets for the Urban Area;
- the timing and accommodation of projected dwelling units; and,
- the development of an urban intensification target.

This information is preliminary and is being presented to the Planning Committee for discussion purposes. It is important to note that this report deals only with the residential land use system and does not address the employment lands that are currently under review. The employment lands study will be presented to Planning Committee at a future date.

2. BACKGROUND

The direction for this report has been taken from the Planning Committee resolution passed at its meeting of November 1, 2007 and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs letter dated August 21, 2008. Both of these items are presented below.

A. Planning Committee Resolution

The Planning Committee resolution passed at its meeting of November 1, 2007 reads as follows:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that it be recommended to Council that the proposed Urban Growth Management Strategy, dated October 25, 2007 and the attached map entitled "City of Kingston, Urban Growth Management" be endorsed as the approach to Urban Growth Management that will be used in the development of the new Official Plan and the Zoning By-Law it being understood that staff be directed to review the following:

a) Exhibit A map for the urban planning area that the legend title "urban planning area" be changed to the July 2004 Final Urban Growth Strategy report "Urban Settlement Area Boundary";
   - and further --

b) That the boundary itself be changed to the boundary of the "July 2004 Final Report" with the exception of the adjacent infrastructure area in Westbrook that was agreed to be an oversight in the July 2004 Final Report.

c) That the intensification target of 37.5 in the Urban Boundary be sought after."

B. Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Letter

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs letter, dated August 21, 2008, was submitted in response to the circulation of the April 2008 Draft Official Plan. This report is intended to respond only to those parts of the Ministry's One Window Review letter which relate to the management of urban growth. The pertinent sections of the letter are attached as Exhibit 'A'. The Ministry's comments were originally reported to Planning Committee in Report No. PC-08-088 which was considered at the October 16, 2008 meeting. The principal urban growth management matters that are outstanding in the Ministry's letter were to be
reviewed and reported back to Planning Committee. The urban growth related matters recommended to the City by the Ministry are as follows:

- to utilize a one boundary approach and to rename the “Committed Infrastructure Area Boundary”;
- to rename the boundary around the defined urban area;
- to establish clear density targets (jobs and dwellings per hectare) for both the entire urban area, as well as specific density targets for the Centres and Princess Street Corridor; and,
- to establish and implement intensification targets for the urban area.

3. METHODOLOGY

The review of the City’s urban growth management strategy involved considering the information recently available from the 2006 Statistics Canada data. It also involved TeraTrends, a demographic consultant, J.L. Richards consulting firm and the Planning and Development Department. All of these contributions are discussed as follows:

A. 2006 Statistics Canada Data

The 2006 Statistics Canada data release was provided to Planning Committee through Report No. PC-08-043 at their meeting of May 15, 2008. This report presented the 2006 information on the existing population numbers, the number of dwellings, as well as the type of dwellings within the City. All of this information is pertinent to the urban growth management review. The 2006 Census Data showed:

- the City of Kingston population increased from 114,195 persons in 2001 to 117,207 persons in 2006 reflecting an increase of 2.6% between 2001 and 2006 (average yearly growth rate of 0.5%);
- the total number of private dwelling units in the City in 2006 was 53,838 for an increase of 6% between 2001 and 2006 (average yearly growth rate of 1.2%);
- single family dwellings made up 49.2% of the occupied dwelling units while the remainder were such higher density forms of housing as semi-detached dwellings, town/row houses and apartments.

It should be noted that only a portion of the extensive Statistics Canada data was included in this report.

B. TeraTrends

TeraTrends, a demographic consultant, worked with the Planning and Development Department to produce the 2003 Population and Housing Projections. The 2003 projections had been based on the 2001 Census Canada data. They were also used by J.L. Richards in the development of the 2004 Urban Growth Strategy Study.

On September 2, 2008 TeraTrends provided the City with an updated model based on an analysis of the current social and economic trends and the 2006 Census Canada data. TeraTrends provided an updated projection for the population, the number of dwelling units and the types of dwelling units using a three scenario growth approach. This approach projected low, medium and high population and housing growth scenarios to the year 2026. This time period corresponds to the 20 year time horizon for the Official Plan.

The results of the TeraTrends analysis were reported to Planning Committee at their meeting of September 18, 2008 through Report No. PC-08-083. Essentially, the results of the projection showed a slower growth rate than was originally anticipated by the 2003 projections.

The following describes the differences between the 2003 population and housing projections and the 2008 population and housing projections:
The 2003 population projections were based on the 2001 Census Data, with employment projections of 200, 600 and 1,000 jobs per year combined with other data and assumptions. This projection resulted in low, medium and high population projections of 130,677, 147,682 and 163,218 persons to the year 2026. As well it projected the occupied dwelling units as 59,418 (low), 65,466 (medium), and 71,560 (high) to the year 2026.

The updated 2008 model projection was based on the 2006 Census Data, with employment projections of 400, 600 and 800 jobs per year combined with other data and assumptions. This change in employment projections resulted in new low, medium and high population projections of 122,000, 133,100 and 144,900 persons to the year 2026. As well, the new occupied dwelling units are now projected at 55,900 (low), 59,700 (medium) and 63,800 (high) to the year 2026.

The twenty year population projections are based on a cohort survival technique along with immigration/employment factor and are tied to the dwelling unit projections necessary to house the anticipated 2026 population.

C. J.L. Richards

The Planning Committee resolution of November 1, 2007 directed staff to review the urban boundary approach as shown on the Urban Growth Management schedule dated October 25, 2007 as it is related to the J.L. Richards 2004 Urban Growth Strategy Study Figure 3 map schedule. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing one window review provided comments regarding the urban growth management strategy. As part of the April 2008 Draft Official Plan public consultation, the City received a number of public comments and concerns regarding the Draft Official Plan as it related to the Urban Growth Strategy Study. Some of the comments suggested that the City should proceed on the basis of the 2004 Urban Growth Strategy as prepared by J.L. Richards. In light of the fact that Mr. Hannah of J.L. Richards was the original author of the Urban Growth Strategy Study reports, the Planning and Development Department approached him to update his 2004 report findings. An update was requested because a significant number of factors had changed since 2004 and new information was available from the 2006 Census data. Mr. Hannah was specifically asked to:

- compare the policies and schedules of the April 2008 Draft Official Plan with the Urban Growth Strategy completed in 2004;
- comment conceptually on the boundary lines in the context of the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement;
- evaluate the current approach to the policies, designations and schedules and whether or not the approach could be supported; and
- discuss and recommend the boundary and policies that the City should consider implementing in light of the 2004 Study and new information.

The memorandum regarding the review of the Urban Growth Strategy Review prepared by Mr. Hannah of J.L. Richards is attached hereto as Exhibit 'B'.

It should be noted that the accompanying mapping (Exhibits 'C' and 'D') are being circulated by the Planning and Development Department, under a memo of separate cover as the mapping has been reproduced in the original colour format at an 11 by 17 inch size to ensure that they can be easily read. As well, the 2004 Urban Growth Strategy Final Report and Interim Report No. 2 are located on the City's website at the following address http://www.cityofkingston.ca/residents/development/urbangrowth/.

The update and its findings should be read in its entirety but briefly is summarized as follows:

- This review of the urban growth strategy is consistent with Recommendation No. 16 of the Urban Growth Strategy Final Report which was to monitor the strategy at least once every 5 years, especially when detailed growth indicators such as Census Canada data becomes available;
At best a municipality can only monitor, estimate and revise its projections as it takes into account the many constantly changing conditions;

- Census 2006 data used by TeraTrends to update the model projected lower growth than was anticipated during the UGS Study;

- The Urban Growth Strategy Study concluded that the high growth projection should be accommodated in the City's planning to address housing affordability, choice, flexibility and uncertainty. This continues to be appropriate, especially considering that the high growth category is now based on a lower job creation assumption;

- Building permit data to the year 2003 was presented in the UGS and there is now an additional four and a half years of data available;

- City staff have undertaken a more detailed, up-to-date estimate of pending and committed residential land supply that shows there are fewer vacant land development opportunities than were identified in the UGS report;

- Calculations are theoretical as some land may remain vacant for many years and not be available within the 20 year time frame of the Growth Management Strategy;

- At an average of 667 building permits per year (1998 to 2007) there is a potential for unfulfilled growth even if all of the units are built;

- The original recommended urban boundary may not encompass sufficient land to satisfy projected residential growth;

- Based on current knowledge the residential shortfall theoretically could be addressed in three ways or some combination of the three:

  1. By adding more land (this option eliminated by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs):
     - The original UGS areas that could accommodate future growth (Growth Areas of GA #1A, 3, 4 and 5) were referenced;
     - Growth Alternative No. 5 should be shown as a Future Development Area as it was identified during the Urban Growth Strategy Study which is acknowledged by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as constituting a comprehensive review as defined by the PPS;

  2. By adding more development within the originally recommended boundary:
     - If projected growth is to be accommodated without including additional growth areas, more units would have to be available within the urban boundary. This would involve a variety of infill, intensification and redevelopment initiatives as recommended in the UGS reports;
     - An overall target of 37.5 dwelling units per net hectare (25 dwelling units per gross hectare) for future development;
     - A residential density of at least 50 dwelling units per net hectare will be encouraged for the Princess Street Corridor; and
     - Clearer commitments and intensification targets should be established.

  3. Shortening the 2026 planning period:
     - If a shortened time frame is selected, it is strongly recommended that a more complete review of the City's growth strategy be undertaken when the 2011 Census Canada data becomes available.

Mr. Hannah notes in his update "it will easily take ten years to complete the necessary analysis, policy planning, zoning implementation and development approval required to bring new land to the building permit stage". The report also provided a brief summary of the recommendations of the 2004 Urban Growth Strategy Final Report and some general comments on how they have been addressed in the April 2008 Draft Official Plan.

D. Planning and Development Department Review

In order to address the matters raised by the Planning Committee and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and because some of the information on which the Urban Growth Strategy was based is now dated, the Planning and Development Department have undertaken a series of initiatives to provide current information and data.
The Planning and Development Department were involved in formulating the following reports:

a) Report No. PC-08-043, the 2006 Census Canada Data which included the population profile and housing statistics;
b) Report No. PC-08-083, the TeraTrends demographic update of the population and housing 20 year forecasts based on 2006 Census data and current trends;
c) The J.L. Richards report attached as Exhibit 'B', comparing the current April 2008 Draft Official Plan with their original 2004 Urban Growth Strategy;
d) Report No. PC-08-084, updating the inventory of dwelling units identified through submitted applications. This report also included information on recent building permit activity (1998 to June 2008).

The Planning and Development Department has continued to undertake research and statistical analysis in order to provide a more extensive evaluation. This has included:

- reviewing the recently released 2006 Census Canada data on population and housing counts;
- reviewing the updated TeraTrends population and housing projections and the assumptions;
- mapping in detail the 27 existing urban residential areas (refer to Exhibit 'E');
- mapping in detail the proposed new urban boundary on Schedule 2 of the Fall 2008 Draft Official Plan (attached as Exhibit 'D');
- developing the urban residential statistics involving housing mix, overall density, numbers of dwelling units and the land area;
- researching and assembling a residential vacant land inventory;
- detailing of any development proposals and calculating land areas;
- reviewing the Urban Growth Strategy Study 2004 figures and confirming the overall density calculation;
- reviewing the ratio of gross density to net density in terms of land lost to infrastructure;
- calculating the numbers and types of dwelling units built per year using building permit data;
- using building permit data to calculate the dwelling unit supply over time;
- calculating the number of years of dwelling unit supply;
- comparing the dwelling unit supply to the population projections to check number of units required;
- calculating the difference between the overall current density and future density;
- developing intensity targets based on density change over time; and
- testing the sample urban residential areas for density and housing mix.

All of the information gathered has been analysed and the results have been incorporated in this report to formulate a basis for the Planning and Development Department recommendations to the Planning Committee.

4. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The Planning and Development Department undertook the preliminary analysis to determine the implications of the adjusted Urban Boundary in terms of its location and name, the status of the Future Development Areas and Area Specific Phasing, the residential development potential, the density targets, the timing and accommodation of dwelling units, and the housing mix and intensification target. Each of these factors is discussed below.

A. The Urban Boundary Location and Name

The Urban Growth Study of 2004, Final Report contained Figure 3 entitled “Urban Areas and Staging” for the City of Kingston, which is attached as Exhibit ‘C’. This is the map that is referred to in the Planning Committee resolution of November 1, 2007 regarding the “Urban Boundary”. The resolution calls for the adoption of this Urban Boundary as part of the Draft Official Plan.
The "Potential Outer Urban Boundary" also shown on Figure 3 is to be eliminated. As a result, Schedule 2 (City Structure) to the Draft Official Plan has been revised accordingly and is attached as Exhibit D.

While the Urban Boundary shown on revised Schedule 2 of the Draft Official Plan (Fall 2008) is essentially the same as the Urban Boundary shown on Figure 3 of the Urban Growth Study Final Report, there have been a number of adjustments made to the line as a result of further information and consideration. The boundary adjustments are as follows:

- An area adjacent to Westbrook was added in; that was agreed to be an oversight in the July 2004 Final Report;
- The Clogg's Road area north of Creekford Road was added within the boundary due to its location partially within the serviced area of the former Township of Kingston;
- The CFB Kingston golf course lands north of Highway No. 2 were excluded to recognize the current servicing limits; and,
- The lands located on either side of Bath Road, south of the mainline CNR railway tracks from Sycamore Street to Coronation Boulevard were added to recognize the existing partial serviced area.

The Urban Boundary name shown on Figure 3 of the Urban Growth Study will be maintained on Schedule 2 of the Draft Official Plan (Fall 2008) in accordance with the J.L. Richards study recommendation of 2004. The name "Urban Settlement Area Boundary" was not recommended by J.L. Richards as part of the Urban Growth Study but rather has originated with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) of 2005. There is some concern about using the "Settlement Area" terminology because it was developed as part of the major Provincial Growth Plan initiative for the Golden Horseshoe area. The terminology has also been incorporated into the Planning Act as amended in 2006 and carries with it legal implications supported principally by the Growth Plan.

The issue of the name of the boundary has been discussed with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. While the Ministry suggests in their letter of August 18, 2008 that the terminology "Urban Settlement Area Boundary" be used further discussions with the Ministry have resulted in their acceptance and agreement with the term "Urban Boundary". The Planning and Development Department support the use of the term "Urban Boundary" in order for the City of Kingston to avoid any unforeseen legal or procedural complications that might arise from the use of the term "Settlement Area".

**B. Future Development Areas and Area Specific Phasing**

The Urban Growth Strategy "Urban and Area Staging" Figure 3 attached as Exhibit ‘C’ shows 3 Future Development Areas. These 3 areas include the following in order of preference as identified in the 2004 Urban Growth Strategy Study:

- North of the 401 at Division Street (Growth Alternative No. 5) followed by;
- St. Lawrence Community (Growth Alternative No. 4) followed by;
- Mile Square (Growth Alternative No. 3).

These three areas are included on Schedule 2 (Exhibit ‘D’) in accordance with the recent report prepared by J.L. Richards and in conformity with the comprehensive alternative area analysis of the Urban Growth Study (2004). J.L. Richards felt that Growth Alternative No. 5 should be shown as a Future Development Area as it was identified during the Urban Growth Strategy Study which "constitutes a Comprehensive Review as defined under the PPS". J.L. Richards pointed out in their report that Growth Alternative No. 5 "would also have to be shown as a Future Development Area in order to be consistent with the UGS". These areas were identified in the Urban Growth Strategy Study as lands that are suitable for urban development when long term growth requires and were identified in order to establish a long term understanding of where growth on full municipal sewer and water services should eventually occur.
The Future Development Areas will still be required to prepare a full Comprehensive Analysis prior to any development taking place. The Comprehensive Analysis by policy in the Draft Official Plan will require the preparation of a Needs Analysis, a Secondary Plan, a Master Servicing Plan, a Phasing and Timing Analysis, and a Financial Implementation Plan. This Comprehensive Analysis leading to an Official Plan Amendment is estimated to take some five years to complete prior to beginning to process any implementing subdivision applications or rezoning.

The former Westbrook Future Development Area, the former Clogg’s Road Special Study Area, and the former Rideau Community Special Study Area shown on the "Urban Areas and Staging" Figure 3 Map have been renamed “Area Specific Phasing” lands and included inside the Urban Boundary on Schedule 2 to the Fall 2008 Draft Official Plan. These lands are subject to site specific phasing and development policies within the Draft Official Plan and will require further study and planning approvals before development could proceed.

C. Residential Development Potential

Within the areas identified by the three Official Plans for immediate development there are a number of vacant lands that can accommodate residential development. The Planning and Development Department updated the inventory of the vacant residential lots/units which are either committed for development or where the approval was pending. The residential supply inventory was based upon all forty-five (45) submitted applications for residential subdivisions, residential site plans and approved Secondary Plans and the number of lots/units anticipated by each proposal. The inventory was then refined by deducting the number of residential building permits issued for each approved development resulting in the number of vacant residential lots/units. This detailed inventory, including a map showing the geographic location of each site, was provided to Planning Committee through Report No. PC-08-084 for the September 18, 2008 Planning Committee meeting.

In addition, the Department assembled information on the number of units that were proposed to be developed through discussions with other potential developers. As no applications have been received the results are being treated as confidential with only aggregate dwelling units being used.

The Clogg’s Road area is located north of Creekford Road and could potentially accommodate both industrial and residential uses. The residential area has been estimated at approximately 26 hectares in area and could accommodate an estimated 368 dwelling units at 37 dwelling units/hectare net. These lands were added within the boundary due to their location partially within the serviced area of the former Township of Kingston and could be viewed as an extension of the Cataraqui West Master Plan.

The Princess Street Corridor and the Centres as shown on Schedule 2 to the Draft Official Plan have been reviewed to identify vacant properties. There were 18 vacant properties identified for a total of 12.74 hectares. At the upper end of the medium density range and developed on a mixed use basis, these lands could accommodate approximately 955 residential units at 75 dwelling units/hectare net.

In summary, the number of residential units proposed are 8,712 units for submitted or approved applications with an additional 2,370 units for confidential properties, 955 units for the Princess Street Corridor and Centres and 368 units for Clogg’s Road. This totals an urban area land supply which would accommodate a total of 12,405 units.

The 2004 Urban Growth Study had identified that 16,405 units could be accommodated within the Urban Boundary. A number of factors and conditions have changed since the UGS as outlined in the J.L. Richards memorandum (Exhibit ‘B’) and indicated in the TeraTrends projections regarding employment and immigration. Therefore, based upon the updated 2008 information there is less capacity within the urban area defined by the Urban Boundary of the UGS to accommodate residential units than originally anticipated by the Urban Growth Strategy.
D. Density Targets

Before discussing density and housing statistics, it must be noted that any statistics or data derived from the TeraTrends model and the Census Canada data, which was reported to Planning Committee, included the whole City of Kingston and did not break out the rural and urban areas. Thus both of these sets of data must be approached carefully. In order to overcome the data aggregation, the urban residential area of the municipality was measured by the Planning and Development Department. The Census Canada population data dissemination areas were then used to develop the urban residential statistics for the City. These two data sets have to be approached with recognition of their differences and the implications of those differences.

The April 2008 Draft Official Plan identifies the following 3 ranges of density:

- Low density - 1 to 30 dwelling units/hectare net;
- Medium density - 31 to 75 dwelling units/hectare net; and,
- High density - more than 75 dwelling units/hectare net.

These three density ranges represent a variety of housing types including low density single detached, medium density townhousing, and high density apartments. The density measure is an important factor in indicating the efficient use of land as required by the PPS but the mix of housing types is related and equally important in allowing for choice and differing affordabilities.

The Urban Growth Strategy Study (2004) used MPAC assessment data to determine the existing residential area and the number of dwelling units. The Study found that the current overall density for urban Kingston comes in at 22 dwelling units/hectare net. The Planning and Development Department mapped the residential areas and aggregated the dissemination area statistics that were used to recalculate the density. As a result, the overall current density of 22 dwelling units/hectare net was confirmed. The conversion factor from a gross density to a net density which discounts lands required for infrastructure was presented as 33% of raw land in the Urban Growth Study. In discussions with J.L. Richards and through the Planning and Development Department’s analysis it was found that this figure was more accurately reflected by a factor of 35% of raw land. This means that 35% of the land area is lost to infrastructure.

The Urban Growth Study recommended the following:

- A development density of 37.5 dwelling units/hectare net in order to provide for transit supportive development. The Ministry of Transportation through its studies had determined that a density of at least 37 dwelling units/hectare net was required to make a transit system operate efficiently;
- A minimum density of 50 dwelling units/hectare net along the Princess Street Corridor and in the identified Centres. This is in the range of a mid-point in the medium density category. After further consideration in assessing the Princess Street Corridor and Centres, the Planning and Development Department encourages the upper end of the medium density category yielding a rate of 75 dwelling units/hectare net; and,
- A density of 22 dwelling units/hectare net be maintained as a minimum.

The Planning and Development Department recommends the following density targets:

- For the existing built up area the existing density of 22 dwelling units/hectare net be maintained where feasible;
- For greenfield and large scale residential developments a minimum density of 37.5 dwelling units/hectare net be targeted; and,
- For the Princess Street Corridor and Centres mixed use developments a minimum density of 75 dwelling units/hectare net be targeted for new residential development.

The relevance of applying these densities on some of the vacant land areas is the identification of the 12,405 potential units could be realized if all of the lands in total were to be developed.
E. Timing and Accommodation of Dwelling Units

The 12,405 dwelling units are all to be contained within the proposed Urban Boundary shown on Schedule 2 (Exhibit 'D') to the Fall 2008 Draft Official Plan. The rate of construction between the years 1998 and June 2008 averaged 667 dwelling units per year. Using the average number of dwelling units per year as indicated by building permit data, the supply of dwelling units can be calculated in terms of the number of years it would take to fully develop all 12,405 dwelling units. The bulk of this development potential involves infill and intensification.

Between 2006 and June 2008, there were approximately 1,766 dwelling units constructed and completed. As a result, the calculation of timing as it relates to the horizon year of 2026 must consider the 2 years of actual construction that has already occurred between 2006 and June 2008. Therefore, the 12,405 dwelling units that have been identified for the vacant lands are to be applied to construction taking place between July 2008 and 2026.

Based on a 100% build out of the total dwelling unit supply within the Urban Boundary (12,405 dwelling units), at a rate of 667 dwelling units per year, it is anticipated that it would take 18.5 years to fully develop all of the lands. This timing would carry construction through to the year 2026. However, it is very unlikely that there would be a theoretic 100% build out of the vacant land inventory. There are a variety of reasons as to why property does not develop including such factors as financial constraints, poor topography, changing market conditions, site accessibility and most importantly the personal decisions of the owners.

Based on an 80% build out of the total dwelling unit supply within the Urban Boundary (12,405 dwelling units), it is anticipated that approximately 9,924 dwelling units would be developed over 14.8 years. This would take the build out to almost the year 2023. This is a more reasonable expectation in terms of dwelling units coming on stream but does not recognize the diversity and the ranging levels of difficulty that some of the identified properties have experienced and will continue to experience.

The most reasonable anticipated build out level would be 75% or three-quarters of the total land inventory. This build out rate would result in approximately 8,683 dwelling units being constructed over 13 years. This would result in the land inventory build out being realized by the year 2021. As a result, there is an anticipated shortfall of approximately 6 years based on approved developments, sites where approvals are in process or known sites where applications are pending. Should other sites come on stream this shortfall would need to be reassessed.

It is important to note that the J.L. Richards report attached recognized a land inventory shortfall of approximately 3 years of residential growth at a rate of 100% build out. The J.L Richards report was based on an initial land inventory figure and did not take into account some of the additional lands identified over the course of the Planning and Development Department's analysis.

If the TeraTrends dwelling unit projections to the year 2026 for the medium (13,300 dwelling units) and the high (19,600 dwelling units) growth scenarios are taken into account, then there is a shortfall indicated of between 895 and 7,195 dwelling units. This is based solely on the land inventory of 12,405 dwelling units located within the Urban Boundary.

In order to meet the terms of Sections 1.4.1 a) and b) of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005, a municipality is required to “maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of ten years” and “to provide at least a three year supply of residential units”. As indicated in the J.L. Richards report, “it will easily take 10 years to complete the necessary analysis, policy planning, zoning implementation and development approvals required to bring new land to the building permit stage”. The ten year time period in advance of actual construction required for the planning process would put planning in the 75% build out scenario having to commence before 2011 in order to have units on stream by 2021. This will require consideration by City Council of its planning programme and the resources and timing required.
F. Housing Mix

Density and housing mix are often used as indicators of the level of urban sprawl in terms of greenfield development recognizing that compact development forms make efficient use of existing infrastructure and reduce land consumption. Density is a reflection of the level of efficiency applied to the use of land in terms of numbers of dwelling units and people that are supported within a prescribed land area. Housing mix is a reflection of the efficiency of land use as well as the municipality's ability to provide people with a range of housing and lifestyle choices and a range of affordability. Housing mix is as important a factor to consider as is density.

The City of Kingston current residential housing stock contains a good mix and variety of housing types. According to Census Canada data, there is less than 50% of the housing stock tied up in single family detached dwellings. There is more than 28% of the dwelling units located in apartment buildings. The medium density semi-detached and rowhouse dwellings make up only 16.8% of the current housing stock and is less than what would be expected.

At full development potential (12,405 dwelling units), within the Urban Boundary the housing mix of the current housing stock is not dramatically changed. The single family detached dwellings in fact drop slightly to 43.5%. The apartment units climb slightly to 30% and the medium density semi-detached and rowhouses increase to 18.4%.

The City of Kingston has a number of what Census Canada terms "unoccupied dwelling units". These dwelling units were identified by the Census takers in May 16, 2006 after the bulk of the post-secondary population had left Kingston for the summer. The TeraTrends analysis found that the bulk of the unoccupied units were located east of Sir John A. Macdonald Boulevard and south of Concession Street. This would appear to corroborate that the unoccupied dwelling units are student housing. This figure stands at 4,913 dwelling units and is held constant over the course of the dwelling unit projections by the Planning and Development Department staff and J.L. Richards.

This housing mix both current and projected are shown on the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OR CATEGORY</th>
<th>Census Canada 2006 Statistics</th>
<th>Urban Area Vacant Land Inventory</th>
<th>Princess Street Corridor Mixed Use Potential</th>
<th>Full Development Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Units</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No of Units</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DWELLING UNITS</td>
<td>53,838*</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>66,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family units</td>
<td>23,960</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>4,809</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiples (semi's, rows, duplexes)</td>
<td>9,055</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment units</td>
<td>15,490</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied units</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*due to rounding

1Pending & Committed units, Confidential units and Clogg's Road units
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ORIGINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OR CATEGORY</th>
<th>Census Canada 2006 Statistics</th>
<th>Urban Area Vacant Land Inventory</th>
<th>Princess Street Corridor Mixed Use Potential</th>
<th>Full Development Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Units</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No of Units</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWELLING UNIT TOTAL</td>
<td>53,838</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to compare the housing mix of the City of Kingston with the housing mix of the Province of Ontario, and of some eight other cities in Ontario from the Census Canada data. Compared to the eight cities and the provincial average, the City of Kingston has the lowest percentage of single detached dwellings. The City of Kingston also has the highest percentage of housing stock in apartment dwelling units. Refer to Exhibit 'F'. This is dramatically different from such places as Vaughan where 68.9% of the housing stock are single family detached dwellings. Even Peterborough which is considered similar to Kingston has 58.7% of the housing stock as single family detached dwellings. Places like Pickering have only 11% of their housing stock devoted to apartment dwellings. It is interesting to note that Guelph, a university town, also has a high number of unoccupied dwellings which would further indicate the student factor in the gathering of the Census data.

The City of Kingston appears to have a relatively well balanced mix of housing types. This housing mix is maintained in the dwelling unit projections. Given the housing mix along with the identified current residential density, it could be reasonably argued that overall there is very little in the way of disproportionate urban sprawl. The City appears to be well positioned as the majority of the potential 12,405 dwelling units constitute infill development (refer to Report PC-08-084, Pending and Committed Residential Development, September 18, 2008). The Future Development Areas as shown on Schedule 2, will be subjected to a full planning process and are targeted to meet a density of 37.5 dwelling units/hectare net which puts them in the medium density range and able to offer a range of housing types.

G. Intensification Target

Intensification is intended to increase land consumption efficiency. However, this must not be done at the expense of an appropriate and balanced housing mix. The municipalities of the Golden Horseshoe Area have developed an approach to intensification based on the provincially developed Growth Plan that assigned growth targets. The Growth Plan was specifically developed for the unique growth circumstances of the Golden Horseshoe Area. The municipalities located outside of the Growth Plan area, such as Ottawa, appear to have adopted an intensification target based on utilizing vacant lands in key areas where the density can be increased. A modified version of the Ottawa approach has been used for this report.

The current 27 residential areas which were mapped and shown on Exhibit 'E' and the accompanying Census Canada dissemination area statistics provided the basis for developing the current residential density at 21.61 dwelling units/hectare net. A number of large scale and key urban land inventory properties were identified. Five of the vacant properties were projected at a dwelling unit density of 37 dwelling units/hectare net. Three of the properties were projected at 75 dwelling units/hectare net and the Cataraqui West planning area was projected at the approved rate of 25.8 dwelling units/hectare net (Cataraqui West Master Plan, page 17, table 3).

The five properties identified above are vacant lands that will be subjected to the subdivision and zoning processes and are large enough to offer a range of housing types that could bring the development up to a transit supportive density of 37 dwelling units/hectare net. The three higher density properties represent areas where an intensification of residential use could
be reasonably anticipated. This is particularly so for the Princess Street Corridor and Centres area (shown on Schedule 2, Exhibit ‘D’) which have been targeted as areas of increased mixed use residential development and density increase.

When the eight targeted properties are added to the current number of dwelling units within the mapped urban residential area, the overall density increases to 23.58 dwelling units/hectare net. This is an increase of 1.97 dwelling units/hectare net over the 21.61 dwelling units/hectare net density calculated for the mapped urban residential area. This represents an increase of 9.1% in projected density over the current density. Based on the current information and analysis, it would be reasonable to adopt a realistic intensification target of 9% over current density. This intensification target will continue to maintain the current and projected housing mix balance and meet the terms of the Provincial Policy Statement that supports residential intensification, redevelopment and an appropriate range of housing types.

5. STRATEGY

There have been a number of Urban Growth Management reports and memorandums presented to Planning Committee since 2005. Initially the focus was to develop three independent amendments to the three Official Plans. During this process staff was requested to undertake a supplementary review to reassess the Urban Growth Strategy’s industrial and commercial scenarios to identify and evaluate a potential growth corridor north of Highway No. 401. Following this reassessment, Council, in May 2006, directed staff to roll the Urban Growth Management Policies into the Official Plan Review. The Official Plan consultant developed the Official Plan on the basis of Urban Growth Management policies that were available for the December 2006 Draft Official Plan. As a parallel process, the Planning and Development Department continued to modify the Urban Growth policies and mapping to develop standard policies to be included in the Fall 2008 Draft Official Plan.

The implementation strategy for the growth management policies is to incorporate the recommendations of this report into Section 2 of the Fall 2008 Draft Official Plan. In doing so, it is recognized that a shortfall in dwelling units to the year 2026 is anticipated if the development is limited to the lands within the Urban Boundary shown on Schedule 2. As a result, monitoring and reassessment of the growth management strategy will be necessary over the life of the Official Plan. The monitoring is intended by policy to coincide with the regular five year review and re-establishment of the City’s Development Charges and Impost Fee By-laws. The monitoring will also be undertaken in conjunction with the most current Census Canada data available every five years.

It will be necessary in the future to assess the development potential and development locations in terms of financial ability, density and housing mix, policies and mapping within the Official Plan. This would be done in conformity with recommendation No. 16 of the Urban Growth Strategy Study 2004.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended by the Planning and Development Department:

1. That the Schedule 2 map attached to this report as Exhibit ‘D’ and dated Fall 2008 be incorporated into the next draft of the Official Plan, to show the one boundary concept and the three future growth alternative areas identified in the Urban Growth Strategy Study of 2004;

2. That the adjusted boundary enclosing the defined urban area of the City of Kingston be named the “Urban Boundary”;

3. That the former Rideau Community “Phase 2” and the Clogg’s Road “Special Study Area” be redesignated as “Area Specific Phasing” and be included within the Urban Boundary as shown on the Schedule 2 map and be appropriately recognized by policy;

4. That the following three residential density targets be included as policy in the next draft of the Official Plan:
   - for the existing built up urban area, the existing density of 22 dwelling units/hectare net be maintained where feasible;
for greenfield and large scale residential developments, a minimum density of 37.5 dwelling units/hectare net be targeted;

- for the Princess Street Corridor and Centres mixed use developments, a minimum density of 75 dwelling units/hectare net be targeted for new residential development.

That the residential intensification target of a 9% increase in overall density be recognized and incorporated by way of appropriate policy into the next draft of the Official Plan; and,

That the strategy involving monitoring and reassessment of the growth management plan be implemented in concert with the review of the Development Charges and Impost Fee By-laws on a regular five year programme or as otherwise required.

EXISTING POLICY/BY LAW:

The existing Official Plans of the former City of Kingston, former Township of Kingston, and the former Pittsburgh Township currently contain policies related to development, transportation and infrastructure that were developed from their individual jurisdictional perspectives. The Official Plans for the three former municipalities contain policies on growth, services and utilities, transportation, public works, and land use that were prepared by the three former municipalities for the development lands within their own boundaries.

NOTICE PROVISIONS:

Not applicable.

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS:

This report is available in different formats upon request from the Accessibility Coordinator.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this information report.

CONTACTS:

George Wallace, Director, Planning & Development Dept. (613-546-4291, ext. 3252)
Cherie Mills, Manager, Policy Planning Division, Planning & Development Dept. (613-546-4291, ext. 3289)
Hugh Gale, Special Projects Planner, Planning & Development Dept. (613-546-4291, ext. 3288)
Wendy Carman, Policy Planning, Planning & Development Dept. (613-546-4291, ext. 3186)

OTHER CITY OF KINGSTON STAFF CONSULTED:

Not applicable.
EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

Exhibit ‘A’  -  Excerpts of the letter of August 21, 2008 from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing


Exhibit ‘C’  -  Figure 3, Urban Areas and Staging Map from the J.L. Richards Final Report, City of Kingston, Urban Growth Strategy dated July 2004

Exhibit ‘D’  -  Schedule 2, City Structure, contained in the Fall 2008 Draft Official Plan

Exhibit ‘E’  -  Urban Residential Areas

Exhibit ‘F’  -  Community Profile Comparison – Population and Housing – 2006 Census Canada Data
August 21, 2008

George Wallace, Director
Planning and Development Department
City of Kingston
216 Ontario Street
Kingston, Ontario  K7L 2Z3

Re: Draft Comprehensive Official Plan for the Amalgamated City of Kingston
MMAH File No.: 10-DP-0049-08001

Thank you for providing this Ministry with the opportunity to preconsult on the City of Kingston’s draft Official Plan (April 2008) which has been released for public consultation and comment. We would like to commend the City for the hard work and effort that has gone into this exercise so far. Early consultation with a broad number of stakeholders will assist the review process and continue to shape the appropriate direction for the Official Plan.

We also appreciate the importance of an effective official plan in addressing economic, urban and rural issues in the City, and the importance of balancing these needs with the priority of protecting and preserving environmentally sensitive areas, natural heritage features, water quality and agriculture.

Recently, the Province has undertaken a number of initiatives that are key to planning for the expected population growth in the Province of Ontario. The revised Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 (PPS) includes enhanced policies for managing growth and for promoting efficient land-use and development patterns, such as infilling and the re-development of brownfields. These types of development represent the best use of municipal resources, infrastructure and public transit. Intensification initiatives such as this will also ensure that land resources, which are currently designated for urban use, are being used efficiently and will remain the focus and direction of the official plan.

Additionally, under the Places to Grow Act, the Province enacted a Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. This provincial plan is designed to address the management of growth and to control urban sprawl. The Growth Plan was created to ensure the effective use of infrastructure in order to create a more efficient style of urban development in the Greater Golden Horseshoe area.

Visit us at www.mah.gov.on.ca/OnRAMP
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Recognizing the City’s anticipated growth over the next 20 years, it would be appropriate to assess and review this Province’s policy direction, including the intensification, density and employment targets that have been clearly articulated in the Growth Plan.

In keeping with our “One-Window” inter-ministry protocol, we have contacted and received comments from the Ministries of Natural Resources (MNR); Environment (MOE); Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA); Transportation (MTO) and the Conservation Authorities (CA’s). Through our comments contained below and in Appendices A and B to this letter, we are taking the opportunity to present a detailed summary of matters of provincial interest raised throughout the One-Window review of the draft Official Plan. We are hopeful that, through continued dialogue, all matters of provincial interest can be implemented as required.

By providing detailed comments at this early “draft” stage, it is our intention that matters of provincial interest may be addressed prior to the City’s adoption of the new Official Plan, allowing for a streamlined approval by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Attached you will find the Province’s One-Window comments, which should be reviewed in addition to the comments previously submitted directly to the City by the Catarqui Region Conservation Authority (CRCA) and by Parks Canada.

The following is a brief summary of some of the larger comments addressed in Appendix A and Appendix B as attached to this letter:

**Urban Settlement Area Boundary**

We are very pleased to see that the City has undertaken a number of steps to create policies that will direct growth to the Settlement Area. This is an important initiative to ensure that development occurs in a logical, efficient development pattern. The modifications requested herein are requested in order to strengthen the draft policies and to be consistent with the PPS.

In the attached appendices, MMAH has asked for a number of policy and schedule changes that are required in order to ensure that development is directed to the urban area and to ensure that the appropriate Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement policies are considered when reviewing development applications in various designations. In this regard, the attached appendices request that “Committed Infrastructure Area Boundary” be renamed the “Urban Settlement Area Boundary” and that the “Urban / Country Boundary” be removed entirely. This modification will provide a clearer understanding of the order of development policies outlined in section 2.3.3 of the Draft Plan.

Additionally, this modification will ensure that proposals for development in the “Future Development Areas” are considered under the most rigorous of tests as established in the Provincial Policy Statement and Official Plan. While acknowledging the previously existing designations that were established in the former Township Plans, it is important to recognize that orderly development is key to the implementation of the policies stated in section 1.1 of the PPS.

Specifically, section 1.1.2 of the PPS requires that “sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and, if necessary, designated growth areas, to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of employment opportunities, housing and other land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 20 years.”

Visit us at www.mah.gov.on.ca/OnRAMP
Veulliez nous visiter à www.mah.gov.on.ca/OnRAMP
**Intensification Targets**

The attached modifications request that the City develop and implement intensification targets for the urban settlement area. This modification has been requested in order to ensure that the Official Plan is consistent with section 1.1.3.5 of the PPS which states that “planning authorities shall establish and implement minimum targets for intensification and redevelopment within built-up areas.” Additionally, section 1.1.3.6 of the PPS states that “planning authorities shall establish and implement phasing policies to ensure that specified targets for intensification and redevelopment are achieved prior to, or concurrent with new development within designated growth areas.” By establishing and implementing specific intensification targets, the City will ensure proposed development makes efficient use of existing infrastructure and public service facilities.

**Prime Agricultural Areas**

In reviewing the draft Official Plan, MMAH and OMAFRA are supportive of the City’s initiative to identify and protect Prime Agricultural Areas. We also appreciate the City’s initiative to identify additional lands as “Agricultural Reserve Overlay” while recognizing the previous land use designations assigned to those areas. However, in the attached Appendices A and B you will note that OMAFRA and MMAH are requesting the City take additional steps to designate some further areas as “Prime Agricultural Area” instead of “Agricultural Reserve Overlay” as is currently shown on the land use schedules. This initiative will ensure that these areas are protected for long-term agricultural use.

**Natural Heritage Areas**

In reviewing the draft Official Plan, it is noted that the City has identified and protected natural heritage resources in accordance with section 2.1 of the PPS. In this regard, MMAH and MNR appreciate that the information gathered in the City’s Natural Heritage Study has been implemented in the draft Official Plan. However, upon reviewing the draft policies and schedules, a number of modifications have been requested.

Largely the modifications requested are minor in nature and are required to correct errors or omissions in the Plan. However, modification 67 requests additional consideration for situations where the protection of locally significant wetlands may conflict with policies protecting aggregate resources. While we support the City’s initiative to protect locally significant wetlands, it is important to also consider developing policies to deal with such situations.

Finally, a number of mapping changes have been requested to ensure that features identified as “Natural Heritage Area ‘A’” are also accurately reflected in the “Environmental Protection Area” designation.

**Mineral Resource Area (Wollastonite)**

The City’s initiative to identify and protect the “Mineral Resource Area” known as the Wollastonite Deposit is strongly supported by partner ministries. As you know, strong Official Plan policies will ensure that the site is protected from incompatible uses, but will also recognize the important economic development, employment, and tourism opportunities that are associated with the extraction of this resource.

Visit us at www.mah.gov.on.ca/OnRAMP
Veuillez nous visiter à www.mah.gov.on.ca/OnRAMP
15) **Section 2.3.8 – Comprehensive Analysis Studies: Needs Analysis (page 21)**
   It is suggested that, in subsection a) the following new bullets should be inserted which state:
   
   - "an analysis and review of alternative directions for growth including a determination of how best to accommodate this growth while protecting provincial and local interests;"
   - "consideration of cross-jurisdictional issues; and"
   - "protects provincial interests."

   Note: this modification has been requested in order to address the requirements of the section a)-1. of the PPS definition of a Comprehensive Review.

16) **Section 2.5.4 – Urban/Country Boundary (page 27)**
   It is recommended that the title of this section be deleted and renamed as "Urban Settlement Area and Future Growth Areas". Accordingly, the policies in this section should be rephrased to identify that the Urban Settlement Area will be the focus of growth and that development in Future Growth Areas is subject to policies outlined in section 2.3.3 of the Official Plan.

17) **Section 2.7.5 – Distance Separation (page 34)**
   It is recommended that this section be amended to reflect the minimum separation distances for Class I, Class II and Class III uses established in the MOE’s Guideline D-6: Compatibility Between Industrial Facilities and Sensitive Land Uses and OMAFRA’s Minimum Distance Separation Formulae (MDS).

   Note: This modification has been requested by the MOE, the MNDM and the OMAFRA. For ease of use, the City may wish to also consider defining Class I, Class II and Class III uses in section 1.4 of the Plan by using the definitions included in the D6 Guideline.

18) **Section 2.8.2 – Protection of Waterfront Areas (page 36)**
   It is suggested that in the second sentence, in the fifth line, following the words "of a natural area setback" the words "of 30 metres" should be inserted.

19) **Section 2.9.1 – Economic Development Strategy (page 37)**
   It is recommended that in item (c) of this section, a new bullet should be added to recognize the economic development opportunities associated with mineral aggregate extraction and mineral resource extraction.
From: Peter Hannah, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
J. L. Richards & Associates

Re: Urban Growth Strategy Review

1. Purpose of Report

This Report has been prepared in response to your June 17, 2008, request to review the April 2008 Draft Official Plan's growth management policies in relation to the 2004 Urban Growth Strategy (UGS). The specific tasks were refined during follow-up discussions with you and your staff. The initial focus of these tasks was the amount of land required to meet Kingston's growth requirements and the implications for the urban boundary.

This review is also consistent with Recommendation No. 16 of the UGS Final Report, which was to monitor the Strategy at least every five years, especially when detailed growth indications, such as the Census data, became available.

This report is deliberately concise and intended to be reviewed by persons familiar with the documents referred to within it (UGS Reports 1, 2, and Final, Population & Housing Forecast Based on 2006 Census, Vacant Land Development Report, Preliminary Draft Official Plan, April, 2008, Provincial Policy Statement 2005, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing letter of August 21, 2008.)

2. Tasks Undertaken/Input Considered

2.1 Data from the 2006 Census is now available. It was used by TeraTrends (Wesley Stevens), the same demographics specialist who prepared the growth forecasts used in the UGS, to update the model and resultant population and dwelling unit forecasts for the Kingston Census Metropolitan Area (CMA). The projections were issued on September 2, 2008 and provided to Planning Committee under Report No. PC-08-083. It projects lower growth than anticipated during the UGS study.

2.2 Potential vacant land development within the Committed Development Area and Growth Area 2 (GA2) was estimated in the UGS and mapped (Interim Report No. 2, Figure 2 and Table 12). City staff have now completed a more detailed, up-to-date estimate of pending and committed residential development land supply.

Building permit data up to 2003 was presented in the UGS (Interim Report No. 2, Table 3). Four and one-half years of additional data is now available.

Details of the residential vacant land supply and building permit data were provided to Planning Committee under Report No. PC-08-084. Fewer vacant land development opportunities are identified than were projected in the UGS study.
2.3 In addition to the 8,712 vacant lots/units identified in Report No PC-08-084, City staff have now compiled a confidential map and table of additional potential lots/units based on preconsultation discussions with various property owners. Due to the speculative and confidential nature of these early discussions, it is prudent to identify only the aggregate number of potential lots/units: 2,370. The total of 11,082 (8,712 + 2,370) is substantially less than the number identified in the UGS.

2.4 After the UGS was completed in July 2004, the Ontario Government adopted a new Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) under Section 3 of the Planning Act. It came into effect on March 1, 2005 and contains new growth management requirements municipalities must address.

2.5 The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing provided comments on the Preliminary Draft Official Plan (April 2008) on August 21, 2008 (addressed at October 16, 2008 Planning Committee Meeting, Report No. PC-08-88). Of particular note were the Ministry comments on the proposed urban boundary, density targets and intensification approaches.

2.6 Many other changes have occurred since 2004, which make precise, direct comparison to the circumstances in late 2008 almost impossible. Some of these are minor, but all contribute in some way to the uncertainties associated with this review. Some examples include:

- completion of new natural heritage resource lands mapping by CRCA in August 2006, resulting in changes to the boundaries of development lands;
- changes to agricultural lands shown on the Draft Official Plan Schedules compared to assumptions made in the UGS;
- other subtle boundary adjustments made to some of the growth areas due to mapping refinements;
- ongoing studies of employment lands;
- City reluctance to accept alternative development standards for technical reasons (less snow storage on narrower road allowances);
- slow progress on Brownfield initiatives;
- development is occurring at lower densities than previously anticipated (an example is Cataraqui West (3,288 dwelling units called for in the Secondary Plan instead of 4,900 projected in the UGS);
- low, medium, and high growth projections are now based on 400/600/800 jobs per year, compared to 200/600/1,000 jobs per year in the UGS;
- adjustments to the boundaries of CFB Kingston;
- changes to the north boundary of Butternut Village;
- adjustments to the boundary of Westbrook; and
- adjustments to the serviced boundary of urban development near Collins Bay.

3. Analysis

3.1 Without essentially redoing the UGS process to thoroughly address all of the major and minor changes which have occurred, it is logical to use known 2006/2008 conditions, updated population and housing projections and develop conclusions which can then be addressed. Alternative solutions can be considered and an informed decision made.
3.2 The UGS concluded that the high growth projection should be accommodated in the City's planning to address housing affordability, choice, flexibility and uncertainty. In my opinion, this continues to be appropriate, especially considering that the high growth category is now based on a lower job creation assumption. This Report, therefore, refers only to the high projection of 14,900 additional dwelling units for the 2006 – 2026 period. This number has been taken from Wesley Stevens' Report.

TOTAL:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.U's</td>
<td>53,900</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>19,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During discussions with City staff, it was concluded that the increase of 4,700 "unoccupied dwelling units" was not realistic and that our projections should not plan for this factor. This is consistent with the UGS methodology. Subtracting these from the 19,600 projection results in 14,900 additional dwelling units.

Building permits for 1,766 dwelling units were already issued in the January 1, 2006 to July 1, 2008 time period. Subtracting these from the 14,900 projected units results in a need for 13,134 units to the year 2026.

3.3 The pending and committed (+ preconsultation) estimate suggests that 11,082 units could be developed on the vacant lands which have been identified. Assuming all of them are built, an unfulfilled demand of 2,052 units remains for the period extending to year 2026. At an average of 667 building permits per year (taken from Report No. PC-08-084, average permits 1998 to 2007) this represents about three years of residential growth.

3.4 These calculations are theoretical. Some land may remain vacant for many years and not be available within the time frame from the present to 2026. Conversely, other development or redevelopment opportunities may present themselves. At best, a municipality can only monitor, estimate and revise its projections as it takes into account the many constantly changing conditions. Based on current knowledge, the following options would address the residential land shortfall:

- add an additional growth area (move the urban boundary out);
- increase intensification and redevelopment within the boundary; and/or
- shorten the planning period from 2026 to an earlier year.

3.5 Additional growth areas were anticipated to be needed, sooner or later, in the UGS. Because projections are uncertain, regular monitoring and recalculation was recommended. Based on the UGS methodology and conclusion, if additional growth area(s) are needed, the preferred choice was GA1A (CFB Kingston and Collins Bay Penitentiary Farm). If this land continues to be unavailable for urban development, GA5 (north of 401 and primarily east of Division Street) is the preferred location, followed by GA4 (St. Lawrence Community) and GA 3 (Mile Square), in that order. If conditions have changed sufficiently that the evaluation criteria used to make this determination are no longer considered valid, an extensive public and technical process would be needed to re-evaluate the City's options. However, new PPS requirements (discussed later in this Report) limit the City in adding more growth areas at this time.
If Kingston's projected growth is to be accommodated without including additional growth areas, more residential units would have to be made available within the urban boundary which is currently proposed. This would involve a variety of infill, intensification and redevelopment initiatives, as recommended in the UGS Reports. To be effective in accomplishing this, the new Official Plan needs to not only encourage but eliminate the disincentives which undermine the goal. Examples of policy initiatives which could be considered include:

- clear encouragement for intensification in all relevant parts of the Official Plan;
- as of right (no rezoning requirement) duplexes, semi-detached, or converted dwellings in all low density residential zones (subject to clear standards);
- consider pre-zoning of medium and high density residential in key locations;
- include clear, integrated transit/redevelopment/mixed use/intensification initiatives for the Princess Street corridor; and
- state minimum density provisions in some designations and zones.

The April 2008 Preliminary Draft Official Plan contains policies which state encouragement for infill, intensification and redevelopment but potentially counter many of these goals with other policies which discourage actual achievement of units on the ground. The Draft Official Plan acknowledges this conflict on page ii, Context:

"It strives to balance the difficult and often conflicting goals of stability and predictability for residents and business investment decisions, while also trying to facilitate beneficial development and change."

By establishing a clearer commitment and intensification targets, the City may be able to achieve sufficient growth within the existing urban area. A lack of clarify inevitably leads to site-by-site conflict between proponents and neighbours which are played out at Planning Committee, Council and the OMB. Policy ambiguity and the need for rezoning undermine the goal of greater intensification.

3.7 The City does not have to plan for a 20-year time frame. The PPS allows municipalities to plan for "up to 20 years." Kingston could select a 15-year time frame, in which case, the projected demand could be accommodated. If this 2021 option is selected, it is strongly recommended that a more complete review of the City's growth strategy be undertaken as soon as the 2011 Census data becomes available. It will easily take 10 years to complete the necessary analysis, policy planning, zoning implementation and development approvals required to bring new land to the building permit stage.

3.8 Some combination of elements of any of these three options could also be considered.

3.9 This analysis has only addressed the residential development aspect of Kingston's growth. The UGS addressed employment lands as well. It is recognized that the City has undertaken several studies related to this issue since 2004 and continues to examine industrial and commercial land needs. This data is incomplete at the present time and has not been addressed in this review.

3.10 In addition to the review of the important intensification aspect of the Preliminary Draft Official Plan, I have reviewed the urban boundary and related growth management issues expressed in the UGS and Preliminary Draft Official Plan. It relates directly to the
Ministry input, which was received in late August 2008, and the 2005 PPS, which is substantially different from the PPS which was in effect throughout the UGS process.

The UGS examined all of the City's peripheral lands through an exhaustive technical and public process. It concluded that five urban Growth Areas (GAs) should be the location for the amalgamated City's future, serviced growth in the following priority order:

- **High GA2** Catawba West/part of Rideau Community
- **GA1A** Collins Bay Penitentiary Farm / CFB Kingston
- **Med. GA5** North of 401, Primarily East of Division Street
- **GA4** St. Lawrence Community
- **Low GA3** Mile Square

Land in the GA1A was unavailable, so GA2 was the logical choice. Calculations at the time indicated that it, in combination with intensification and other approved areas, would be sufficient to meet demands to 2026. In the Final Report, Figure 3 (a copy of which will be included in the staff report to the Planning Committee) proposed an urban boundary which was tightly drawn around the Committed Development Area and GA2. Importantly, Figure 3 also identified the other Growth Areas within a "Potential Outer Urban Boundary" to reflect the analysis which had been done and to indicate the City's longer term growth directions, when circumstances warranted.

Subsequent Reports to Planning Committee and the April 2008 Preliminary Draft Official Plan, continue to propose similar inner and outer growth areas, although the terminology has changed and the proposed policies have evolved. This is shown on Schedule 2, City Structure (also to be included in the staff report).

The Provincial Policy Statement 2005 made significant changes to the planning ground rules. The 1997 PPS contained vague references to densities, efficient land use and servicing, and opportunities for redevelopment, intensification and revitalization which municipalities had to "have regard to." After March 1, 2005, municipal decisions had to "be consistent with" a series of specific requirements:

- sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, designated growth areas;
- development standards ... which facilitate intensification;
- implement minimum targets for intensification;
- phasing policies to ensure intensification targets are achieved; and,
- new development in growth areas shall have a compact form, mix of uses, densities to allow efficient use of land.

Both versions of the PPS use a planning time frame of up to 20 years.

The MMAH letter of August 21, 2008 has focused on the new PPS growth management requirements and proposed several changes, including:

- a tightly drawn Urban Settlement Area Boundary;
- continue to show Future Development Areas;
- add clear intensification targets and implementation mechanisms;
• add minimum density targets for new areas; and
• add density targets for the entire urban area, Centres and Princess Street Corridor.

Considered against the 2005 PPS, it is clear that the City will have to reconsider its growth management approach, especially the intensification aspects of the Official Plan.

We strongly disagree with one aspect of the MMAH letter and attached Appendix A. Item 4 acknowledges that the UGS constitutes a Comprehensive Review as defined under the PPS but then arbitrarily states that only the development areas identified in the former Official Plans of Pittsburgh and Kingston Townships can be shown as Future Development Areas. The UGS ranked GA 5 ahead of these areas. It would also have to be shown as a Future Development Area in order to be consistent with the UGS.

4. Conclusions

Based on the approaches taken in the UGS, new population projection and residential vacant land capacity data indicates that the originally recommended urban boundary may not encompass sufficient land to satisfy projected residential growth.

In theory, this shortfall could be addressed in three ways: by adding more land, adding more development within the originally recommended boundary, or shortening the 2026 planning period.

The 2005 PPS and MMAH letter of August 2008 has virtually eliminated the first of these options. The Preliminary Draft Official Plan will need substantial reworking to address the MMAH concerns.

A substantially reworked Official Plan may provide sufficient encouragement to both widespread and targeted intensification that it becomes unnecessary to shorten the 2026 (20-year) planning period.

The 2004 Urban Growth Strategy Final Report contained 17 recommendations. For your convenience, the attached Appendix A provides a brief summary of those recommendations and some general comments on whether the Preliminary Draft Official Plan has addressed them.

Prepared by:

J.L. RICHARDS & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

T. Peter Hannah, MCIP, RPP

TPH:lb

Attachment
APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM UGS FINAL REPORT, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Summary of Recommendations</th>
<th>Preliminary Draft O.P. Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Link to Transportation Master Plan &lt;br&gt;• new strategic direction (walking, cycling, transit)/supportive development forms &lt;br&gt;• high-frequency transit corridors/initial focus on Princess Street &lt;br&gt;• need for Third Crossing.</td>
<td>– incorporates the wording several times/weak in expanding on development implications or providing encouragement &lt;br&gt;– weak; little commitment/Schedule 4, Transportation, makes no mention of transit included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Keep employment lands available, don’t redesignate as residential before COIL study has determined whether they are needed.</td>
<td>– employment land studies are ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Identify future growth areas beyond the urban boundary.</td>
<td>– most have been shown, with the exception of GA 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Establish a two-part urban boundary: land needed to 2026 and future development areas.</td>
<td>– included, although terminology is different (new PPS and MMAH comments will preclude an “outer” boundary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Prepare amendments to the three Official Plans to implement UGS quickly.</td>
<td>– approach was started, then abandoned when new OP began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Enhanced transit service to strengthen and integrate the Princess Street commercial areas (Two pages of suggested policies were included in Appendix 4A).</td>
<td>– minor references in Sec. 2.5.10 and 3.4.E.5; suggested policies not used and no alternatives presented; Schedule 12 shows it as a Future Planning Study Area instead of addressing it now; Section 9.7.7 makes no commitment to any studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Implement minimum density targets (also required by 2005 PPS).</td>
<td>– none included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Amend Zoning By-laws to immediately allow 2-unit dwellings or apartments in houses to encourage intensification (the three OPs currently permit this).</td>
<td>– makes some encouraging general statements but largely neutralizes them through various restrictions; no clear commitment to intensification as a fundamental element of the OP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Enhance opportunities for infill and redevelopment by removing policy and other constraints.</td>
<td>– similar to 9 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Consider alternative development standards to reduce costs and increase densities.</td>
<td>– not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Negotiate with federal agencies to encourage development of underutilized land.</td>
<td>– ongoing process; GA 1A is recognized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Summary of Recommendations</td>
<td>Preliminary Draft O.P. Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Encourage mixed-use development in new and existing developed areas.</td>
<td>– concept is mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encourage brownfields redevelopment, including financial incentives.</td>
<td>– although there are policies for contaminated sites and brownfields are mentioned, there are no comprehensive policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Complete a natural heritage strategy.</td>
<td>– done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Implement the UGS and its components; monitor on ongoing basis.</td>
<td>– partially addressed; monitoring is occurring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Interim Reports 1 &amp; 2 be recognized as supporting documents.</td>
<td>– no specific action required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit ‘C’ - Figure 3, Urban Areas and Staging Map from the J.L. Richards Final Report, City of Kingston, Urban Growth Strategy dated July 2004

Exhibit ‘D’ - Schedule 2, City Structure, contained in the Fall 2008 Draft Official Plan

Forwarded to Mayor & Members of Council in a memorandum dated October 31, 2008
City of Kingston - Urban Residential Areas
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## Community Profile Comparison

### Population and Housing

#### 2006 Census Canada Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>Kingston</th>
<th>Peterborough</th>
<th>Pickering</th>
<th>Brantford</th>
<th>Guelph</th>
<th>Barrie</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Oshawa</th>
<th>Vaughan</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population - # persons</td>
<td>117,207</td>
<td>74,898</td>
<td>87,838</td>
<td>90,192</td>
<td>114,943</td>
<td>128,430</td>
<td>164,415</td>
<td>141,590</td>
<td>238,866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwellings #</td>
<td>53,838</td>
<td>33,042</td>
<td>29,044</td>
<td>33,963</td>
<td>47,969</td>
<td>48,196</td>
<td>65,340</td>
<td>57,469</td>
<td>71,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Dwellings #</td>
<td>48,926</td>
<td>31,210</td>
<td>28,220</td>
<td>35,610</td>
<td>44,710</td>
<td>46,515</td>
<td>63,260</td>
<td>54,920</td>
<td>69,535</td>
<td>4,555,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied Dwellings #</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached % of</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupied dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Detached % *</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Houses % *</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments, duplex % *</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments in building</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 storeys % *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments in buildings</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more storeys% *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dwellings *</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*percentage of occupied dwelling units