





Item 7.6 Official Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendments Z 023-23 [ZNG-7068] & OPA 174 [OPA-7071] 1027458 Ontario Inc. Banwell South of Leathorne (North B) Multiple Dwelling Development - Ward 7

**(S 138/2023)**

- a) Jim Abbs, Senior Planner (PowerPoint)
- b) Karl Tanner and Theresa O'Neill agents Dillon Consulting, available for questions (in person)
- c) Joan Ennis, area resident (in person)
- d) Jeff Benedet, area resident (PowerPoint) (in person)
- e) Kate Benedet, area resident (PowerPoint) (in person)
- f) Nishnat John, area resident (in person)
- g) Kim Friest, area resident (in person)
- h) Maureen Flannery, area resident (in person)

Hello Committee Members,

My name is Peter Middlemore. I am here today representing the current resident and homeowner of 620 Memorial Drive. Her name is Patricia Middlemore and she is my mother. My mother has granted me full autonomy to speak on her behalf tonight. Consider my comments, thoughts, and responses to be her own.

We sternly object to the inconsiderate, naive, ill-thought-out, and short-sighted proposal to close the northern half of the former Lillian Avenue for the intended purpose of selling it for real-estate development. My mother has already faced numerous hardships due to the actions and non-actions of this corporation and has become quite upset by the prospect of the proposal becoming a reality.

So let's review.

The driveways of 605 Vimy and 620 Memorial and the alleyway between them would exit onto Lillian Avenue. In order to make way for the railway underpass on Howard Avenue, streets were altered and Lillian Avenue was removed and the southern half replaced with an extension of the existing alleyway that now ran all the way to Memorial Drive. The alleyway does not receive the same level of service as a city street and as such, the city created a hardship for the homeowners and residents of 605 Vimy and 620 Memorial. In the event of heavy snowfall or high winds and the resulting tree branches that would fall onto the alleyway, these homeowners were now left to fend for themselves.

My mother has already put up with more than most. The property at 605 Vimy was burnt to the ground many years ago by an arsonist and stood that way for years. No property maintenance occurred during this time frame and no city department stepped in to do anything about it. Nothing but neglect by the homeowner and avoidance by the city. Eventually the property was sold and removal of the burnt down house and construction of the new house began. The parking spaces on Vimy and Memorial are most often times filled by a combination of residents and customers of the medical centre. Therefore, the construction crew vehicles and material delivery vehicles often parked directly onto the alleyway and often blocked my mother's ability to exit and enter her driveway. To the untrained and unknowing, the alleyway appears to be a shared driveway and there is no signage indicating that parking is prohibited. Since there is no city enforcement, what is stopping them? Nothing.

My mother is a retired City of Windsor employee and was able to cope with this situation only because she didn't need to exit and enter her driveway each morning and evening as she did when still actively employed. However, she did have to plan her excursions around the

contactors work schedules. Often she would return from an outing and be required to find the owner of the construction vehicle and ask him to move it as it was blocking access to her driveway. No resident should have to put up with this.

Currently, the home at 605 Vimy appears to be rented out to several College and or University students that we believe are also under the false impression the alleyway is a shared driveway and are parking illegally. This proposal would permit the building of yet another dwelling next to 605 Vimy and the issue with the construction crew vehicles and material delivery vehicles will commence once again in an already congested alleyway/parking lot.

It has been continually suggested to us that all we need do is call 311 to register a complaint. The expectation is that my mother is to be the neighbourhood watchdog and to believe that there will be no repercussions or reprisals is naive and foolish. Where will the City of Windsor be when my mother is verbally accosted or even physically assaulted? Where will the City of Windsor be when my mother is the victim of property damage to her home or vehicle? No where to be found of course.

It is clear that the homeowner of 620 Memorial has already been faced with several hardships as a result of this corporation's abandonment and negligence. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the status quo will continue during the construction of another dwelling at the proposed site. We have been told that proactive enforcement can't take place. Funding is not available. Property taxes are collected for the purpose of infrastructure and infrastructure support. If this corporation is unable to properly fund enough bylaw and parking enforcement officers to provide the necessary level of service required, then this proposal should die here tonight.

We suspect that the objector to the withdrawal of this application sees the sale of this property as a cash cow to be milked and frittered away on some yet to be named project.

We suspect that the objector to the withdrawal of this application has no regard for the effect the sale of this property will have on my mother's quality of life and mental well-being.

This committee and City Council is obligated to represent the citizens of this city as their top priority. Whether it be many or only one, the obligation is the same. I ask you to properly represent my mother today and vote down this proposal. Thank you.



**Vice-President, Finance & Operations**

Assumption Hall, Room 128  
400 Huron Church Road  
Windsor, Ontario N9C 2J9  
T 519-253-3000 (x 2092)

November 1, 2023

City of Windsor  
Development & Heritage Standing Committee  
350 City Hall Square West  
Windsor, Ontario N9A 6S1

Dear Sir/Madam:

**Re: Zoning By-Law Amendment - 185 Randolph Place, Windsor**

On behalf of the University of Windsor, this letter serves as support for Tilcap Randolph Inc.'s application for the Zoning By-Law Amendment to 185 Randolph Place, Windsor.

Tilcap has shared with the University of Windsor their proposed plans to build a two and a half storey, 12-unit multiple dwelling residential building at 185 Randolph Place, Windsor.

This new development, within a short walking distance of the University, will help alleviate the student housing shortage on the City of Windsor's west side (Ward 2) and provide more affordable housing options. At the recent Ontario's Big City Mayors' caucus, the lack of on-campus student housing was identified as a primary driver of housing shortages. It is well known that frustrated students are failing to find housing or are forced into dangerous overcrowded situations.

Tilcap is focused on creating exceptional student experiences through industry-leading living and learning communities. They have entered into a long-term land lease with the University of Windsor to build a new 452 bed, 150,000 square foot, student residence. Together, we are working collaboratively to provide a safe and comfortable living environment that promotes and supports resident engagement, growth and achievement.

The new residence is currently under construction. Tilcap works collaboratively and effectively with all the diverse teams (internal and external stakeholders) involved with this project. They are always professional and responsive to stakeholder needs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gillian Heisz'.

Gillian Heisz  
Vice-President, Finance & Operations

**From:** Mike Cardinal  
**Sent:** November 6, 2023 1:41 PM  
**To:** clerks <[clerks@citywindsor.ca](mailto:clerks@citywindsor.ca)>  
**Subject:** File number ZNG/7140 Z-028/23

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

## Development and Heritage Standing Committee, Monday November 6, 2023 Meeting

Please accept this late submission for today's meeting. I have been out of town for some time and returned to find this notice in my mailbox.

As a resident, home owner and neighbour, I object to the zoning change request for 185 Randolph Place.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

1. The block sharing the alley between Askin and Randolph, Riverside Drive and University Ave is already overly developed and densely used. Two properties added large buildings in their backyards in the last 2 years. Both have 4 or five electrical meters indicating the new buildings have for or five separate units within, in addition to the original home rented by students. Both have full lot width parking facing the alley. This is in addition to the older two multi-unit buildings occupying the same side of the street. (And the proper apartments facing University Avenue.)
2. Several properties facing the alley are known to be planning Additional Dwelling Units that will also be using the alley and intensifying the same block.

3. The block and surrounding area, with the exception of the 2 older, modest multi-unit structures, is composed of more modest single family dwellings. It has been preserved as a family neighbourhood in the midst of decades of student housing encroachment. The value of a family neighbourhood is immeasurable for quality of life. Additionally, the City's Climate Change priorities need to include University professors and other employees who want to live within a walkable distance from the University.

4. Proper and balanced City Planning designates larger roads like University Avenue and Wyandotte, as the right location for larger, more dense housing structures and smaller neighbourhood streets as the right location for less dense, family homes. Moreover, last year an attempt to protect single family housing adjacent to the University of Windsor was unsuccessful before this Standing Committee because it was argued that more dense housing belongs adjacent to the University. That was viewed as a common and good transition to the neighbourhood. This development is 4 blocks east and 2 blocks north of that location. Both from the University "transition" perspective, and from a "roads" planning perspective, this is the wrong location to change this zoning to high density.

5. The unfortunate history of this property has seen it go from a lovely heritage listed 'arts and craft' home, illegally and improperly renovated to remove the 'arts and craft' features, consequently de-listed from the heritage listing protections, and subsequently torn down. This pattern and today's request sets a horrible precedent. It potentially rewards the investor(s) for such dishonourable and



disrespectful choices. Such a precedent would set a chaotic path in which no significant heritage structure is safe from the wrecker's ball regardless of this Standing Committee's opinions or decisions.

Respectfully submitted

Mike Cardinal