

## Emily Lutz

---

**From:** Dave Snider [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 18 November 2024 11:00 pm  
**To:** Council; Emily Lutz  
**Subject:** Re: 705 Princes Street Motion

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I want to thank those of you who took the time to respond to my email below; especially Mike Hinchberger who responded with additional information and clarification that this initiative would not necessarily see a multi-story apartment building being built on the severed parcel of 705 Princes St N. I do appreciate the time/effort you all put into serving our community - I know it isn't an easy job.

It was clear to me during the Nov 13th council meeting that there is strong desire to take actionable steps now to implement affordable housing solutions that can be realized quickly to meet the growing need. Many in our community (including myself) support this objective. I therefore provide the following feedback for your consideration moving forward.

I believe that efforts to build affordable housing at 705 Princes Street N will be unsuccessful in the short-term for the following reasons:

1. There is strong opposition from the community. This opposition is rooted in a wide range of opinions/reasons (some I do not agree with) - yet the fact remains that this proposal will face significant backlash at each step of the process. This is not a promising start for a project that aims to increase affordable housing as soon as possible. The site selection process used to infer that 705 Princes Street N has a high development priority did not properly account for community support. Although it is encouraging to hear the MoK received >1200 respondents to the housing survey, with a majority providing *general* support to increase affordable housing, this should not be interpreted as strong community support for development at this location.
2. Development of 705 Princes Street N will require detailed and expensive environmental assessments prior to approval. This is not appealing for developers and may prevent medium-large development from ever going forward at this location. Although at the surface this may seem like 'just a parking lot', a small section of the property at the southern boundary is SVCA Regulated Area with significant Natural Heritage Features located very close by. The Kincardine Official Plan and SVCA mapping shows Significant Woodland and Significant Valleyland Features only a few meters from 705 Prince St N. This means that development will require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and an Engineering Report to demonstrate that there will be no hazard/property damage or negative impact to the slopes along the ravine. Given the location is within 120 m of this sensitive area it will require SVCA approval, an EIS and a slope stability hazard assessment (as per our Official Plan). Further risk assessment will be required to determine how the development may impact wildlife. If the slope stability hazard assessment

suggests nearby properties need additional protection and mitigation prior to excavation, then this will add immense cost to the development. Again, I do not think this was factored into the site selection process presented in the Flourish Report. Although it earmarks \$100k for Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessments, this development may well require greater time and investment to get it to the approval stage than is currently realized. If any of these important assessments are not completed prior to approval, the community will be looking for detailed dispositions from MoK and SVCA as to why we are not following our own Official Plan.

I raise this to you because I fear the above concerns will pose significant barriers to timely development of 705 Princes Street N and I want the MoK to invest its efforts in locations that have a high probability of being successfully developed in the short-term.

Sincerely,  
Dave Snider

---

**From:** Dave Snider <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** November 12, 2024 10:43 PM  
**To:** council@kincardine.ca <council@kincardine.ca>  
**Subject:** 705 Princes Street Motion

Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Council Members of the Municipality of Kincardine,

Re: Nov 13, 2024 motion to sever and rezone 705 Princes Street

My family and I reside at [REDACTED] which is located immediately adjacent to 705 Princes Street. I have read the entire Staff Report (dated Oct 23, 2024) and the accompanying Flourish Report presented to Council. The proposed severance and change in land use to Residential Four (R4) has come as a great surprise to me and many of my neighbors. While I agree that there is a need to create affordable housing in our community, and I commend Council for taking efforts to make positive steps forward in alleviating the shortage of affordable housing, I do not support an initiative that will see a multi-story apartment building being built only a few meters from my home.

This proposal is moving too quickly, and I fear the Municipality may miss important opportunities and create additional problems if this motion is passed on November 13, 2024, without sufficient public discussion. Many Kincardine residents, ratepayers, and neighbors of 705 Princes Street will be greatly impacted if a multistory affordable and supportive housing complex is built on this property, and these concerns have not been considered thus far. A development similar to the proof of concept presented in the Flourish Report would significantly decrease the value of our homes. The impact on the larger community has not been considered. How will this affect the use of Victoria Park by our community who rely on this area for parking? Will the Scottish Festival or other community events be impacted by this change? How will this impact the current tenant, Bruce Power, who is a significant contributor to our community?

I am concerned about the proximity of the proposed development which is only a few meters away from a SVCA Regulated Area. Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessments will be required to develop this land (as recognized in the Flourish Report), and further site hazard assessments may be required (not recognized by Flourish). There is a large ravine very close to the proposed site that has very unstable soil. The nearby wooded ravine is sensitive habitat for many plants and animals. Any excavation on 705 Princes Street to build a multi-story development will require hazard assessments to be completed to ensure there is no adverse impact to neighboring properties and homes that are adjacent to the ravine. These costs have not been properly scoped into the *Pro Forma* for 705 Princes Street, and I fear this will either deter medium-large development or significantly increase its cost.

Has Council considered alternatives for 705 Princes Street? For example, if the property was divided into several parcels destined for smaller residential development would it generate more revenue for the Municipality that could ultimately be put towards creation of even more affordable/supportive housing elsewhere? Why is the Elgin Market Site considered low priority? The former landfill site should not require extensive remediation if the building remains above grade. After all, if the vacant land is currently used as a recreational area, then it should be suitable for above-grade development. The environmental constraints at 705 Princes Street could equal or outweigh those at the Elgin Market Site and this is not properly considered in the Flourish Report.

In closing, I ask Council to slow down, discuss the proposal with the community and consider alternatives before rushing ahead on November 13, 2024 with severance and rezoning of 705 Princes Street.

Respectfully,

Dave Snider

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.