

Meeting Minutes

Subject: Sandwich South Master Plan EA – Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2
Date: June 9, 2021 - 6:00 p.m.
Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting
Our File: 19-9817
Distribution All Present, Encls. ZB: Idm, June 28, 2021

Attendees

Client

Name	Company/ Office
Tiziano Zaghi	Property Owner (representing Haider Habib)
Zak Habib	Property Owner (representing Haider Habib)
Josette Eugenie	Property Owner
James Bryant	Water Resources Engineer, Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA)
Jason Scott	Transit Windsor
Deanna Crawford	Transit Windsor
James Abbs	City of Windsor
Shawna Boakes	City of Windsor
Ellen van Wageningen	Windsor Bicycling Committee

Sandwich South Master Plan Project Team

Name	Company/ Office
Patrick Winters	City of Windsor
Jeff Hagan	City of Windsor
Anna Godo	City of Windsor
France Isabelle Tunks	City of Windsor
Andrea Winter	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)

Name	Company/ Office
Karla Kolli	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)
Zachary Bush	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)
Rob Muir	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)
Shawn Doyle	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)
Laura Herlehy	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)
Alex Butler	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)

Absent

Name	Company/ Office
Keiran McKenzie	Ward 9 City Councilor
Matt Baird	Property Owner (representing Haider Habid)
Steve Tuffin	Director of Operations, Windsor International Airport
Stephen Laforet	Windsor Fire & Rescue Services
Jennifer DeMaeyer	Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex
Fahd Mikhael	City of Windsor
Allen Benson	Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon)

Notes

Item	Discussion	Action by
1.	Introductions	n/a
1.1.	The project team and attending Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members were introduced.	Info
1.2.	The presentation delivered as part of this meeting has been attached to these minutes.	Info
2.	Agenda and Objectives	n/a
2.1.	Project team goes through the agenda of the meeting.	Info

Item	Discussion	Action by
2.2.	Project team covers the objectives of today's meeting.	Info
3.	Project Update	n/a
3.1.	Project team goes through project update. Reminder of the service master plan's scope which includes identifying the needs for road, sanitary and storm sewers, stormwater management facilities, stormwater pump stations and Natural Heritage System.	Info
3.2.	Project team outlines study area, what it includes and the proposed land use map.	Info
3.3.	What we have completed to date: SAC meeting, PIC #1, working with ERCA to develop floodplain, evaluated infrastructure alternatives, meeting with stakeholders.	Info
4.	Evaluation alternatives	n/a
4.1.	Objectives and criteria: There are 9 objectives and criteria used to evaluate alternatives for each project solution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage flood risk • Protect quality of life • Be cost effective and provide value • Protect the natural environment • Support the creation of a complete community • Protect health and safety • Align with existing infrastructure and studies • Build in resiliency • Build in flexibility <p>Project solutions were evaluated and the preliminary preferred solutions are described below for input from the SAC Team. These evaluations will also be posted online for public consultation and input.</p>	Dillon
5.	Transportation Overview of Alternatives	n/a

Item	Discussion	Action by
5.1.	<p>The team provided a summary of the completed transportation network analysis, estimating total number of vehicles and a draft road network that would be required to accommodate development, including road widening and changes in network. There are 4 high level transportation options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do nothing; 2) Expand Road Network <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. (Plan for High Auto Mode Share); b. (Emphasis on Sustainable Modes; and 3) Consider smaller development plan. <p>It was determined that Option 2B would be the most preferred.</p> <p>There are 5 problem /opportunities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. North-South Capacity in the southeast section of the Sandwich South area which will require widening of 7th Concession Road or 8th Concession Road from two to four lanes; 2. North-South Capacity in the southwest section of the Sandwich South area which will require widening of 9th Concession Road or 10th Concession Road from two to four lanes; 3. Alignment of East-West Collector North of East-West Arterial and South of Baseline Road; 4. Addition of an additional East-West connection from 7th Concession Road to Walker Road; and 5. Traffic management on Baseline Road between 7th Concession Road and 8th Concession Road. 	Dillon
5.2.	<p>Widening of 7th Concession Road or 8th Concession Road</p> <p>8th Concession Road is the preferred alternative because it is more central to the study area. 7th Concession Road is not preferred because it is on the periphery of the study area and will be right-in/right out at the East-West Arterial Road limiting its utility.</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
5.3.	<p>Widening of 9th Concession Road or 10th Concession Road</p> <p>Both corridors are similar, however Concession Road 10 is planned to be right-in/right-out at County Road 42 (CR42) due to its proximity to Lauzon Parkway. Therefore, widening Concession Road 9 is the preferred alternative.</p>	Dillon
5.4.	<p>East-West Collector Alignment / Joy Road Traffic Management</p> <p>In order to create a complete road network facilitating travel within the study area, several collector roads need to be added to the study area. There are few opportunities to add a collector that can traverse the entirety of the study area. There is an opportunity to add an east-west collector between Baseline Road and the East-West Arterial that can use the Joy Road right-of-way, curve north to connect with a collector in East Pelton, or curve south to connect with a collector in East Pelton. Due to the narrow right of way on Joy Road and the disruption to existing residents, using the Joy Road right of way is not preferred. Curving the road south is the preferred alternative as it avoids the Joy Road right of way and facilitates a connection to Walker Road should that collector be extended in the future.</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
5.5.	<p data-bbox="391 264 976 289">Additional East West Connection to Walker road</p> <p data-bbox="391 321 1289 636">The need to provide an additional connection to Walker Road from the Sandwich South area was considered to provide better connectivity to the external road network and through the transportation network assessment, the additional connection to Walker Road would assist with northwest traffic movements, due to much of the Sandwich South traffic would be going north and west of study area and access points to Walker Road are limited to CR42 and the proposed CR42. Not many options for people to access Walker Road.</p> <p data-bbox="391 663 607 688">Potential Benefits</p> <ul data-bbox="440 722 1281 848" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="440 722 1281 793">• Modest improvement to intersection capacity listed above but not significant; and <li data-bbox="440 821 984 848">• Adds flexibility for potential road closures. <p data-bbox="391 879 602 905">Potential Impacts</p> <ul data-bbox="440 938 1187 1085" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="440 938 1130 966">• Expensive, requires acquisition of developed property; <li data-bbox="440 993 1187 1020">• Need for new connection to cross existing rail corridor; and <li data-bbox="440 1050 1162 1077">• Not worth the benefit based on benefit/cost comparison. <p data-bbox="391 1108 1179 1178">It was concluded based on the environmental assessment that this connection would not be a preferred solutions.</p>	Dillon
5.6.	<p data-bbox="391 1215 1149 1287">Additional East-West Connection Walker (Baseline Road Traffic Management)</p> <p data-bbox="391 1318 1289 1625">High peak hour volumes are anticipated on Baseline Road which currently has residential development on both sides of the roadway between 7th Concession Road and 8th Concession Road. Four options were reviewed as part of the solution to mitigate traffic impacts. The “Do Nothing” option does not protect quality of life, therefore options to dead end Baseline Road at 8th Concession Road or institute traffic calming measures were reviewed. Implementing a dead end as noted, results in emergency vehicle access issues. Traffic calming was the preferred option.</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
5.7.	<p data-bbox="391 264 753 291">Draft Transportation Network</p> <p data-bbox="391 321 1292 474">The network is informed by the CR42 Secondary Plan and East Pelton Secondary Plan. We have added additional proposed road, to create a more complete road network. As development happens more roads will be added to figure.</p> <p data-bbox="391 501 1276 655">Looking at location for the East-West Arterial (E-W Arterial) roadway are there any concerns to proximity to where the roadway meets the future Lauzon Parkway? Are we thinking about moving the E-W Arterial further south?</p> <p data-bbox="391 682 1292 995">The E-W Arterial roadway placement was defined as part of the Lauzon Parkway EA. The project team looked at the midblock collector to be placed mid-way between Baseline Road and the E-W Arterial Road, while respecting as much of the road network from the East Pelton and CR42 plan as possible. We did not go back and re-examine the alignment. The stormwater drainage areas were also established based on the location of this corridor and was integrated into the Upper Little River Watershed Stormwater Management Study.</p> <p data-bbox="391 1022 1243 1092">It was requested that the proposed road network that shows the area, north of CR42 be shown.</p> <p data-bbox="391 1119 1292 1146">A full plan will be provided to the group as part of the SAC meeting minutes.</p>	Dillon
5.8.	<p data-bbox="391 1184 581 1211">Cycling facilities</p> <p data-bbox="391 1241 1292 1472">We identified two types of preferred cycling facilities. First being a protected on street cycling lane, with protections built into the roadway. Works along road segments with lower traffic and speeds and with a higher level of intersections. The other facility is a Cycle track, built into the boulevard, same level as the sidewalk. This is ideal where vehicular speeds are higher with less intersections and higher traffic volumes.</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
5.9.	<p>Transportation Discussion:</p> <p>In regards to Walker Road connections. Is there flexibility on where they connect to 7th Concession Road, we have concern with the existing rail line, could be problematic if near the rail crossing on 7th Concession, is there flexibility?</p> <p>The collector road network layout was based on the existing road network outlined in the East Pelton Secondary Plan. There is flexibility in the location of the collector road networks and if proposals to revise the road network are presented those can be reviewed and discussed further.</p> <p>Has there been discussion with owner of railway in terms of longevity, is it going to be there for the next 20 years?</p> <p>In 2006 a strategic rail study was done, looked at lines to be abandoned, this was identified to continue to be active.</p> <p>The recommendation is not to do another east west connector to Walker Road. Was there thought given to pedestrian and active transportation connections, as it is pedestrian unfriendly? Anything about trails or paths? Has that been thought about?</p> <p>We have not considered an additional active transportation connection to Walker Road. We have only recently concluded that there is no value to making a vehicular connection. I would take away the question and consider if further.</p> <p>Have we consulted with the biking communities, and how we can take the roads we have now and create more bike lanes?</p> <p>Previously completed studies (County Wide Active Transportation System (CWATS) and Bicycle Use Master Plan (BUMP)) were used to inform the cycling recommendations for this study. All roadways in the road network will accommodate bicycle facilities (Protected Bike Lanes or Raised Cycle Lanes). We have considered adding additional bike lanes to the current network. Multi-use pathways will also be accommodated within the stormwater corridors.</p>	Info.
6.	Stormwater Management	n/a

Item	Discussion	Action by
6.1.	<p>Four (4) options were presented at the PIC. Options 1a and 1b, use a wet stormwater management pond, where Option 1b includes low impact development measures within the upstream storm sewer system to provide additional water treatment and runoff attenuation. Draft conceptual layout and cross sections of the stormwater ponds were presented to provide context on the size and various pond design components.</p> <p>Options 2a and 2b, used dry ponds, to compensate the lower water quality, low impact development controls would need to be incorporated upstream.</p>	Dillon
6.2.	<p>Evaluations:</p> <p>They were all consistent in meeting goals of managing flood risk and safety. All the options aligned with existing infrastructure studies and creating a complete community. They all protect quality of life. Cost effectiveness, centralized wet ponds are cost efficient, in contrast the other options which have higher capital and higher operation and maintenance cost. Also there are higher lifecycle servicing costs to implement LID controls. Options 1b and 2b have the most resilient. Looking all together, Option 1a gives us the most flexibility and is the most cost efficient and therefore is the preliminary preferred option.</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
6.3.	<p>Stormwater Management Discussion:</p> <p>Was a similar analysis done for the whole study area?</p> <p>We have done analysis in terms of peak flow benefits of the complete area. The concept we have been advancing has been focused on East Pelton and the CR42 Secondary Plan area as that is the current scope of the study.</p> <p>The functional design for the stormwater management ponds will be completed for the two established secondary plan areas as there are established plans for those two areas. Design of exterior areas will be developed as part of future studies.</p> <p>Is the Tecumseh Hamlet stormwater management pond part of this study?</p> <p>Analysis has been done for that area as part of a separate study and integrated into the overall hydrology model as that area is within the overall drainage area. Where there are existing studies and information is available, that information has been integrated into this study to ensure that this study is coordinated with other completed and ongoing studies.</p> <p>In regards to the facilities. They are going to be on private properties, but will service lands owned by other people, is there going to be a cost sharing plan discussed?</p> <p>Cost sharing would be established during the draft plan approval process, we would likely cover the costs and then figure out how to split it with developers in the future.</p>	Info.
7.	Storm Sewer	n/a
7.1.	<p>Team explained options:</p> <p>Option 1. Do nothing</p> <p>Option 2. Storm sewer network</p> <p>Option 3. Combine open drain and storm sewer network</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
7.2.	<p>Evaluation of alternatives:</p> <p>The current drains wouldn't support the new developments. Traditional storm sewer is preferred to create a complete community, this will allow us to implement all the other things we talked about. The new network will improve the level of service. We want to reduce the service levels so we can provide access for health and safety reasons. Option 2 and 3 align with other studies and secondary plans. We want to make sure the solutions have resiliency, specifically with respect to climate change. Overall Option 2 is preliminary preferred.</p>	Dillon
7.3.	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>We are developing the sewer network, it is based on the stormwater pond layout. It will be more detailed for the two secondary plan areas.</p>	Info.
8.	<p>Floodplain Mapping:</p> <p>The existing floodplain mapping is being finalized, it is based on a two zone concept. The zones would include:</p> <p>Floodway: Flood hazard area is where development is not permitted without study to confirm no adverse impacts, and</p> <p>Flood Fringe: Development is permitted that meets flood-proofing standards based on, at a minimum, the designated flood elevations.</p>	Dillon
8.1.	<p>The fringe areas is a lot wider, it is where flood proofing would be required. Some of the flood fringe depth is only 10cm deep. The flood fringe is determined based on peak timings. We are putting these on scales of mapping that can be seen at a local level. We are creating the regulatory mapping to show the floodway and flood fringe. The flood fringe would show the safe flood proofing would be. We sent the templates to ERCA.</p> <p>Flood plain management: Drain realignment. We are reducing flood risk with E-W arterial drain diversion.</p>	Dillon
9.	<p>Natural Environment</p>	n/a
9.1.	<p>Develop a Natural Heritage System (NHS)</p> <p>Delineate natural features, function and linkages of landscape to protect and preserve, where appropriate, enhance environment. Based on the ultimate floodplain boundaries and functional stormwater management requirements.</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
9.2.	<p>Staging of Development</p> <p>A number of factors that must be considered in the development of a staging plan were reviewed with the team. Details regarding the infrastructure required to allow for development to occur which will be highlighted in the SSMSP report. Reviewing staging is the next steps of this project.</p>	Dillon
10.	<p>PIC #2:</p> <p>The project team requested feedback on the content and presentation of materials for the upcoming PIC # 2</p>	Dillon

Item	Discussion	Action by
10.1.	<p>Comments and discussion: Provide additional context on the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>Define acronyms and better describe terminology.</p> <p>Did everyone understand the difference between floodway and flood fringe?</p> <p>Most agreed they understood the difference</p> <p>One comment was: “I thought the difference was easily mapped and the graphics showed it well. The public might get stuck on the evaluation of alternatives, so better summaries would be warranted.”</p> <p>Is there some thought to look at the design of buildings in new developments?</p> <p>We can speak to those things, as far as the recently completed SWM master plan, recommendations that should be implemented to prevent basement and surface flooding should be adhered to. This will include a study and corresponding development manual. We will be meeting criteria when servicing the buildings.</p> <p>We have details of dialing into the two secondary plan areas. We might want to speak to that in more detail, through presentation and what is going on the website.</p> <p>Explaining floodway and flood fringe.</p> <p>Could help show where you are allowed to build etc. in the cross section. Updating the cross section to be more similar to the stormwater management facilities diagrams to better understand where you can build and the relative scale of expected flooding would be useful.</p> <p>On the floodplain cross section, it shows floodway in the center, the key words will have to be development prohibited. It needs to be completely clear.</p> <p>This graphic is from the MNR and is very high level.</p> <p>ERCA will provide materials to Dillon to help illustrate the flood plain mapping for the upcoming consultation.</p> <p>Are we going to get more arterial roads and collector roads in a pdf?</p> <p>A road network plan of the entire study area will be accompany a copy of the powerpoint.</p>	Info.

Item	Discussion	Action by
10.1 (cont'd)	<p>Transit Windsor comment:</p> <p>Transit's preference would be for the cycle track of bike lane to go behind the bus stop. As some of our bus stops go through bike lanes.</p> <p>The transportation team to coordinate with the Windsor transit team as recommendations are finalized.</p> <p>Good job everyone. We are being asked to fill in the gaps as what we see is missing. I want to make sure that positive feedback is given. We talked about the natural environment and heritage system. Is it too early to talk about archaeological work?</p> <p>We have archaeological work done in the area and will need to determine the best way to present it in the PIC.</p>	Info
11.	Next Steps:	n/a
11.1.	<p>We need to review this with all the city staff and prepare for PIC 2. In advance of PIC 2, we are hoping to have meetings with key property owners, to give them the opportunity to speak property specific.</p> <p>After the PIC, we take the report into finalization and present to council.</p> <p>If you do have questions and something comes up, please email the project team.</p> <p>As far as future SAC meetings, we want to know how useful this was, want to get a sense from the group moving forward, and if a similar session is needed?</p> <p>This type of meeting is helpful because it gives a broader view, whether we need another one, I'm not sure, because we are having individual meetings. Unless some big changes are happening in the analysis.</p>	Dillon

Errors and/or Omissions

These minutes were prepared by Zachary Bush who should be notified of any errors and/or omissions.