

**AGENDA**  
**PROPERTY STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

meeting held  
Tuesday June 14, 2022  
at 4:00 p.m.  
via Zoom video conference

---

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Disclosure of Interest**

**3. Adoption of the Minutes**

Adoption of the minutes of the meeting held February 10, 2022 – ***attached***.

**4. Request for Deferral, Referral or Withdrawal**

**5. Appeals**

- 5.1** ***Louis Vaupotic*** against an Order to Repair VY 22-120998 issued April 20, 2022 regarding property at 575 Riverside Drive East, Plan 129, Lot 2 Blk 2. The Notice of Appeal dated May 5, 2022 was received within the 14-day time frame.

Additional Information provided by Helen Tascona, sole Estate Trustee authorizing the Notice of Appeal – ***attached***.

**6. Adjournment**

## **Property Standards Committee**

Meeting held February 10, 2022

A meeting of the Property Standards Committee is held this day commencing at 4:00 o'clock p.m. via Zoom video conference, there being present the following members:

Councillor Rino Bortolin, Chair  
Councillor Ed Sleiman  
Darrel Laurendeau  
Matthew Wachna

### ***Regrets received from:***

Councillor Holt (due to work conflict)

### ***Delegations in attendance:***

Robert Redmond and Jocelyn Quenneville, regarding *Item 5.1*  
Alberto and Maria Folino, regarding *Item 6.1*

### ***Also present are the following resource personnel:***

John Revell, Chief Building Official  
Rob Vani, Manager Inspections, Deputy Chief Building Official  
Mark Nazarewich, Senior Legal Counsel  
Wira Vendrasco, Deputy City Solicitor  
Kevin Alexander, Planner III  
Mike Arthur, Supervisor, Inspections  
Armando Cala, Building By-law Enforcement Officer  
Nicole Brush, Building By-law Enforcement Officer  
Dante Lapico, Building By-law Enforcement Officer  
Karen Kadour, Committee Coordinator

## **1. Call to Order**

The Chair calls the meeting to order at 4:02 o'clock p.m. and the Committee considers the Agenda being Schedule A attached hereto, matters which are dealt with as follows:

**2. Disclosure of Interest**

None disclosed.

**3. Adoption of the Minutes**

Moved by D. Laurendeau, seconded by Councillor Sleiman,  
That the minutes of the Property Standards Committee of its meeting held October  
6, 2021 **BE ADOPTED** as presented.  
Carried.

**4. Request for Deferral, Referral or Withdrawal**

None.

**5. Appeals**

**5.1** Robert *Redmond and Jocelyn* Quenneville appear before the Property Standards Committee via Zoom video conference regarding property at 3139 Loebach Drive.

Officer Dante Lapico provides the following Presentation entitled “3139 Loebach Drive – OTR 21- 333990” **attached** as Appendix “A”:

- On October 28, 2021, he attended the property to investigate a complaint concerning the removal of a noise barrier wall.
- Observed all portions of the required noise barrier wall had been removed.
- Shows a photo illustrating what the wall looked like prior to being removed.
- The owner levelled the ground and added grass and seed as the berm was quite high.
- A legal Title Search of the property was requested to determine if the berm was mandatory and required. During the investigation of the Title Search, there were three notice agreements documented in 1993 on the property title registration.
- In terms of the notice of agreements, this was agreed upon by Remax Construction (developer) and the City of Windsor as part of a subdivision agreement, the developer agrees to install a 3.5-metre high acoustic barrier and earth berm, and registered property owner(s) must maintain the earth berm and barrier per the agreement registered on title and municipal bylaw.
- This berm was a combination of earth berm and barrier.
- The earth berm shall not be altered or removed and shall be maintained by the owner at their entire expense (from the Title Search).
- A permit was issued on March 8, 1994 for the construction of the required noise barrier wall and earth berm.

- In speaking with the owners, advised it is required and that the wall be put back.
- Order to repair issued December 3, 2021 with a deadline of May 2, 2022
- A follow-up investigation was completed on February 9, 2022 and the three defects noted in the Order to Repair are not in compliance as of this date.

In response to a question asked by the Chair regarding what the sound barrier backs onto, D. Lapico responds it backs onto CN Rail.

Robert *Redmond* and Jocelyn Quenneville, appellants provide the following background information and comments:

- Purchased the house in August 2019. Nothing in the mortgage documents referred to the berm.
- The berm had been removed from the neighbours to the left and right 25 plus years ago by the original owner.
- The cement wall was removed initially due to safety issues and was followed by the removal of the berm.
- Hired a person to remove the berm. No difference in sound was observed.
- Received a notice of a complaint and thought perhaps that CN Rail had made the complaint.
- Correction in the Order to Repair indicated the need for a professional sound engineer and have had great difficulty in receiving calls back from someone qualified to do the work.
- Received a quote of \$45,000 for the material for an eight-foot sound wall.
- This is a train yard; the trains park there.

The Chair asks Administration to explain what the purpose of the sound wall is; is it for the residents to mitigate against the rail corridor.

J. Revell responds that the sound wall protects both parties. When the subdivision, was planned out, CN Rail would have been consulted on its proximity. The sound barrier protects the residents who live in that subdivision and protects CN Rail from future complaints or issues arising from noise.

D. Laurendeau asks if the Title on the land has expired and if the requirement to maintain the berm or the wall is still applicable.

R. Vani responds that the only time it would be removed from the Title is if the municipality agrees to remove it. It is our understanding that it is still registered on the Title.

W. Vendrasco responds that in order to develop these lands, the original developer had to put up that noise barrier wall. If that noise barrier was not put up, then these lands could not have been developed. The developer had to attenuate the noise, so without the noise barrier, lands within 300 metres of the railway could not be developed. As a condition of subdivision approval, the developer has to enter into an agreement with the

municipality to address various conditions and this is one of the conditions - that the agreement is registered on title and remains on title. There is a reason why it is placed on title so when people purchase the lands in the future they have notice of that. Whether or not their lawyers pay attention to it is an issue between the purchaser and their lawyer. As a general proposition, subdivision agreements are never removed from title.

In response to a question asked by the Chair regarding if it is on title currently, W. Vendrasco responds it is put on title prior to the developer receiving any building permits.

M. Wachna asks what would be a reasonable timeframe, given the cost and the difficulty in finding a sound engineer to comply with the Order.

D. Lapico responds that a reasonable timeframe in putting up a sound barrier, obtaining an engineer, design and permit process would be from six months to a year if an aggressive approach is taken to comply with our Order and to comply with the Registered Title.

M. Wachna asks if there are any immediate health hazards associated with the sound wall being down.

D. Lapico responds that immediate hazards would be issues regarding noise, vibrations and sleep issues.

D. Laurendeau indicates that the owners referred to a chain link fence at the back of the property, and asks if it is still standing and would it prevent anyone from crossing over the tracks into their property.

Mr. Redmond responds that the chain link fence was removed and they built a six-foot privacy fence with plans to plant trees in front of the wall.

In response to a question asked by Councillor Sleiman regarding what the appellant is looking for, R. Redmond responds that the cost to comply with the Order will range from \$60,000 to \$80,000 and they are not able to afford this at this time.

Councillor Sleiman asks Administration to comment on if there is any immediate danger.

W. Vendrasco responds there are two components to this – one is the earth berm and the second is the noise attenuation wall. The reason for the earth berm is to protect in the event of a train derailment. The noise attenuation wall is designed by an acoustical engineer to attenuate the noise. The other aspect to this is that when the City wants to develop lands, i.e. rezoning that abut a railway, we are required to consult with the railway to find out what their requirements are. If we do not comply with their requirements, they will appeal the rezoning, and the lands cannot be developed.

Councillor Sleiman asks if the berm is restored, will that solve the problem.

W. Vendrasco responds that would address the issue of derailment but the other issue is the noise. The City has had litigation with CN over those issues.

M. Wachna indicates that the owner stated that other owners in that cul-de-sac had removed sound barriers and asks if that has been confirmed by Administration.

D. Lapico responds that during his investigation, at some point in time the neighbours' noise barrier walls were removed, which did not extend to the entirety of the property as per the original drawings that were retrieved. He adds that when their Department receives a complaint, an investigation is undertaken.

M. Wachna suggests an extension of time from one to two years.

R. Vani advises that the Property Standards Committee has the authority to confirm, modify, rescind the Order or extend the compliance date.

Moved by M. Wachna, seconded by D. Laurendeau,  
That the Order to Repair VY 21-333990 regarding property at 3139 Loebach Drive, Windsor, Ontario **BE CONFIRMED AND DEADLINE EXTENDED** for one year from the deadline date on the Order.

Carried.

## 6. Business Arising from the Minutes

### 6.1 Alberto and Maria Folino – 280 Aylmer – Violation Number VY 20-240559

Officer Nicole Brush, provides the following Presentation entitled “280 Aylmer Avenue – OTR 20-240559”, *attached* as Appendix “B” that illustrates the current condition of the property:

- At front of the building - falling eaves troughs along with missing handrails on the front porch and deteriorating wood elements on the front porch.
- North side of building – broken glass in the windows along with soffits and fascia along the roofline consistent all around the building.
- South side of building – deteriorating asphalt shingles. Side porch is in disrepair, rotting wood, missing balusters and no eaves trough in this section.
- Rear of the building – continues to have rotting fascia, boarded windows, broken glass, (when inspected, homeless person was sleeping in a metal shed).
- The owner has since removed all sheds (three to four) from the property.
- Boarding on the rear door was not completely removed, unsecured and squatters were getting in.
- The condition as of February 7, 2022 – the building is still boarded up, no repairs to the building have been done. The roof is collapsing, and loose materials could fly off.

- In summary, the building is vacant, deteriorating and attracting wildlife and the homeless. At this time, the building is secured.

Moved by D. Laurendeau, seconded by M. Wachna,

That the Decision of the Property Standards Committee issued to Alberto and Maria Folino, 280 Aylmer Avenue on November 30, 2021 **BE RECONSIDERED** as they did not receive proper notification of the October 6, 2021 meeting.

Carried.

K. Alexander advises in order to obtain a demolition permit, there is a requirement for a redevelopment plan to be approved by City Council before a demolition permit can be issued.

Councillor Sleiman asks the appellants to elaborate on their plans for the property.

Maria and Alberto Folino, appellants provide the following background and comments:

- In 2014, they applied for a demolition permit and the city contacted the utility company who disconnected the utilities.
- In 2015, they followed up with the demolition and city staff advised that they were waiting for confirmation from the utility company regarding the utilities disconnection.
- In 2016, received a letter from the city stating that the demolition permit application had expired; and confirmed that the utilities disconnection had not been received and suggested that they reapply.
- In 2018, the demolition company applied and the city requested that they have the pest control attend to the property to ensure there were no rodents. There was no indication that this property could not be demolished.
- In 2018, received a letter stating that this property falls into a demolition control area and that they could not proceed with the demolition.
- Adds that if the initial application had been denied back in 2014, they would have kept up the property and the utilities would not have been disconnected.
- Asks why it took so long to notify them that they resided in a no demolition area.
- They could have been collecting rent on the property.
- Looking to demolish the building as it is beyond repair.

The Chair clarifies that the city allows the demolition of an existing building only if there is a redevelopment plan to rebuild because of the issues of lingering properties or demolition from neglect, which become “missing teeth” in neighbourhoods.

M. Wachna asks the appellants if they have submitted a development plan to the city.

M. Folino responds that they have the intention to develop at some point, but with the times as they are and the astronomical prices, they do not want to commit to anything-short term. A. Folino adds that he would like to build a twenty unit building.

The Chair asks Administration to clarify what happened in 2014 and 2016 that lead up to the 2018 Order to Repair.

R. Vani responds that an application was made in 2014 for the demolition. Normal practices for the Building Department to request from the utility companies, notification when the disconnections are made. The Building Department does not order disconnections. No formal communication was sent out on that application until sometime later and essentially sat there with no action. The appellants made another application in 2018 concerning demolishing the same building. At that point, the appellants were issued a letter indicating that it is in a demolition control area and that a permit could not be issued without an approved redevelopment.

D. Laurendeau asks for the deadline to comply noted in the Order to Repair.

N. Brush responds that at the time she spoke with the owners, she gave them thirty days to clear out the sheds and to board the building and provided an additional six months to make repairs to the building. She adds that the owner thought he had six months to decide what to do with the building, and following that applied for a Notice of Appeal.

M. Wachna asks if this property is developable.

The Chair responds that the property is developable, i.e. a four storey building especially if they have a few lots accumulated. The City does provide incentives for this area so they can tap into the CIP.

D. Laurendeau asks Administration that if the committee's decision was to order a demolition of the house, would this put the city at risk.

R. Vani responds that only Council can waive the Demolition Control Bylaws so this Committee would not be able to do that. He adds that the condition of the building is not in an emergency condition that would warrant a demolition order and waiver of the demolition bylaw.

Moved by Councillor Sleiman, seconded by D. Laurendeau,

**Whereas** the matter relating to Alberto and Maria Folino, appellants for property at 280 Aylmer, Windsor, Ontario, Violation Number VY 20-240559 was discussed at the Property Standards Committee held October 6, 2021; and

**Whereas** a decision was made by the Property Standards Committee to Confirm the Order; and



**Whereas**, the decision was issued to the appellants on November 30, 2021 and;

**Whereas**, the appellants did not receive proper notification of the meeting held October 6, 2021,

**Therefore Be It Resolved** that the Order to Repair VY 20-240559 regarding property at 280 Aylmer Avenue Windsor, Ontario **BE CONFIRMED AND DEADLINE EXTENDED** six months from the date of this decision to repair the building *OR* to execute and register on title a redevelopment plan with the City of Windsor.

Carried.

The Chair states that this problem has been festering for eight years. Currently, there is a great housing shortage and adds that this is an opportunity for the appellants to do something to his property. The Building and Planning Departments are looking to expedite all development applications. If something that cannot be done, then the property should be sold to someone who is looking to develop it. By allowing it to languish, the neighbourhood suffers.

## 7. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting is adjourned at 5:46 o'clock p.m.

---

**CHAIR**

---

**COMMITTEE COORDINATOR**



## ORDER TO REPAIR

### UNDER THE MAINTENANCE AND OCCUPANCY BY-LAW 9-2019 AS AMENDED BY BY-LAW 140-2020

To: ESTATE OF SMARAGDA VAUPOTIC  
 C/O HELEN TASCONA  
 39 BARRIE TERRACE  
 BARRIE ON L4M 1E8

Description: PLAN 129 LOT 2 BLK 2; 2583.25SF  
 25.00FR 103.33D

Property Address: 575 RIVERSIDE DR E

Roll Number: 030-080-08600-0000

Violation Number: 22 120998

Date of Inspection: April 20, 2022

**WHEREAS** Section 15.1(3) of the *Building Code Act, S.O. 1992, c.23*, as amended, authorizes municipalities to enact by-laws prescribing standards for the maintenance and occupancy of all property within the municipality and for prohibiting the occupancy or use of such property that does not conform to the standards; and for requiring any property that does not conform with the standards to be repaired and maintained to conform with the standards as described herein or the site to be cleared of all buildings, structures, debris or refuse and the lands left in a graded and levelled condition;

**AND WHEREAS** the Official Plan for The Corporation of the City of Windsor includes provisions relating to property conditions as required by section 15.1(3) of the *Building Code Act, S.O. 1992, c.23*, as amended;

**AND WHEREAS** The Corporation of the City of Windsor has passed By-law 9-2019 as amended by By-law 140-2020, being a By-law to establish Standards for the Maintenance and Occupancy of Property in the City of Windsor;

**TAKE NOTICE** that the property, owned by you, situated at: 575 RIVERSIDE DR E  
 Does not conform to the standards set forth in By-law Number 9-2019 as amended by By-law 140-2020

#### DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY:

MULTIPLE UNIT DWELLING

#### DEFECT - Section 1.6

In every building or structure, the foundations, piers, posts or other similar supports shall be maintained in good repair and structurally sound. Where necessary, foundation walls shall be extended to a depth of 1,070 mm below finish grade, provided with subsoil drains at the footings, shored, waterproofed, and treated or repaired to prevent moisture penetration or footing settlement. Every foundation wall, basement, cellar or crawlspace shall be maintained so as to protect the building against deterioration, including that due to weather, water entry, dry rot, and infestation by rodents, vermin or insects. The perimeter of slab on grade type foundations shall be maintained to prevent rodent infestation.

#### DEFECT - Section 1.7

All exterior walls shall be maintained in a watertight condition and in good repair so that they remain straight, level and plumbed (unless otherwise designed), presenting an appearance that is uniform and neat in the opinion of the Officer and free from any damaged, defective, unsecured or deteriorated materials and any conditions that may result in the infestation of rodents, vermin or insects. Appropriate measures shall be taken to remove any stains or other defacement occurring on the exposed finished exterior surfaces and, where necessary, to restore the surface and adjacent areas to, as near as possible, their appearance before the staining or defacement occurred.

#### CORRECTION

1. REPAIR ANY DEFECTIVE / DETERIORATED CONCRETE BLOCKS AT MAIN BUILDING FOUNDATION WALL AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE EXTERIOR WALLS. REPOINT ANY DETERIORATED MORTAR AS REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN FOUNDATION AND EXTERIOR WALLS IN GOOD REPAIR AND WATERTIGHT CONDITION.

2. REPAIR / REPLACE ANY DEFECTIVE / MISSING SIDING AT MAIN BUILDING AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE AS REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN EXTERIOR WALLS IN GOOD REPAIR AND WATERTIGHT CONDITION.

ALL FOUNDATION AND EXTERIOR WALLS OF BOTH MAIN BUILDING AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE TO PRESENT AN APPEARANCE THAT IS UNIFORM AND NEAT IN THE OPINION OF THE OFFICER AND FREE FROM ANY DAMAGED, DEFECTIVE, UNSECURED OR DETERIORATED MATERIALS AS WELL AS ANY CONDITIONS THAT ENCOURAGE PEST INFESTATION.

NO PERMIT REQUIRED - COMPLIANCE REVIEW BY BUILDING BYLAW OFFICER.

**DEFECT - Section 1.8**

Exterior doors, windows and skylights shall be maintained in good repair and weather tight. Rotted and defective doors, door frames, window frames, sashes and casings shall be renewed and defective door and window hardware, weather stripping, caulking and broken glass shall be replaced. Repairs to windows shall be i) reglazing, or refitting with panes of transparent glass; or ii) the use of other materials which are compatible in finish and colour with the remainder of the facade of the building on which the broken window is located, provided such other material are of an appropriate thickness, have sufficient structural support, and are installed so that no broken glass is visible for the exterior of the building. Replace defective, damaged or missing hardware and locking devices: sash controls.

**DEFECT - Section 3.4**

Cracked and broken glass in door panels, missing screens, and missing windows shall be replaced with approved glass or similar materials. All operable windows and all doors shall be capable of being opened from the inside without the use of specialized tools and maintained in good repair. All materials referred to in this section shall be to the satisfaction of the Officer to provide an acceptable level of fire protection.

**CORRECTION**

1. REPAIR / REPLACE ANY WINDOWS AND EXTERIOR DOORS OF MAIN BUILDING AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CONTAINING DAMAGED / DEFECTIVE MATERIALS OR HARDWARE. WINDOWS AND EXTERIOR DOORS MUST BE MAINTAINED IN GOOD REPAIR AND WEATHERTIGHT CONDITION.

2. REPAIR/ REPLACE THE DEFECTIVE OVERHEAD DOOR AT ACCESSORY STRUCTURE.

NO PERMIT REQUIRED - COMPLIANCE REVIEW BY BUILDING BYLAW OFFICER.

---

**DEFECT - Section 1.9**

All stairs, porches, landings, loading docks, balconies, canopies, awnings, fire escapes together with any guard, balustrade, railing, screen or other appurtenance attached thereto shall be maintained in good repair and in a safe and structurally sound condition.

**DEFECT - Section 1.10**

A handrail or-guard shall be provided and maintained in good repair as follows: (a) At least one side of stairs less than 1 100 mm in width, (b) Two sides of stairs 1 100 mm in width or greater, and (c) Two sides of a curved stair used as an exit. (d) Handrails are not required for stairs (i) within dwelling units having not more than 2 risers, or (ii) for exterior stairs having not more than 3 risers and serving not more than one dwelling unit.(e) Only one handrail is required on exterior stairs having more than 3 risers provided such stairs serve not more than one dwelling unit.(f) Except as required in (b) & (c), one handrail may be provided centrally for stairs up to 2.4 m wide.(g) Handrails shall have a maximum Uniform height of 920 mm when measured vertically from a line drawn through the outside of the stair nosing and minimum uniform height of 800 mm.

**DEFECT - Section 1.11**

A guard shall be installed and maintained in good repair as follows: (a) Except for the edges of the floor pits in repair garages and loading docks, every surface to which access is provided for other than maintenance purposes, including but not limited to exterior lands, porches, decks, balconies, mezzanines, galleries, raised walkways and roofs, shall be protected by a guard having a minimum height of 900mm on each side which is not protected by a wall and where there is a difference in elevation to adjacent surfaces of more than 600 mm. Except that a guard of 710 mm minimum height is acceptable for exterior porches, decks and balconies where the vertical drop from the open side exceeds 600 mm but does not exceed 1 800 mm. (b) Every exterior stair with more than 6 risers and every ramp shall be protected with guards on all open sides where the difference in elevation between the adjacent ground level and the stair or ramp exceeds 600mm. (c) When an interior stair has more than 2 risers, the side of the stair and the landing or floor level around the stairwell shall be enclosed by walls, or be protected by guards, except that a stair to an unfinished basement in a dwelling unit is permitted to have 1 unprotected side.

**DEFECT - Section 1.12**

Guard - Openings Guards for residential occupancies shall have no openings which would permit the passage of a spherical object having a diameter of 100 mm unless it can be shown that the location and size of such openings which exceed this limit does not represent a hazard. Guards - Not to Facilitate Climbing Guards around exterior balconies, porches and decks of buildings of residential occupancy shall be constructed and maintained not to facilitate climbing.

**CORRECTION**

1. INSTALL MISSING HANDRAILS AS OUTLINED IN SECTION 1.10 AT FRONT AND REAR DOORS. ALL WORK TO BE DONE TO INDUSTRY STANDARD AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL REQUIRED BYLAWS AND CODES.

2. **OBTAIN BUILDING PERMIT** TO REPLACE THE MISSING REAR STAIRS AND REPAIR / REPLACE THE DETERIORATED AND PREVIOUSLY POORLY REPAIRED 2ND FLOOR DECK /BALCONY / CANOPY AT REAR OF BUILDING. GUARD RAILS TO BE MAINTAINED IN COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIRED BYLAWS AND CODES. DUE TO PRESENCE OF DETERIORATED MATERIALS, ENGINEER OVERSIGHT REQUIRED AT OWNER'S EXPENSE.

**BUILDING PERMIT REQUIRED** - PLANS REQUIRED WITH APPLICATION. PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER DESIGN / SCOPE OF WORK REPORT REQUIRED.

---

**DEFECT - Section 1.14**

All roofs, including chimneys, stacks, masts, lightning arresters, antennas, fascia, soffits, flashings, solar panel and supports, and other roof structures shall be maintained in good repair, watertight and structurally sound condition. Such maintenance may include, but is not limited to: a) removal of loose, unsecured objects or materials b) keeping roofs and chimneys weather tight and free from leaks and/or defects.

**CORRECTION**

1. REPAIR / REPLACE DETERIORATED ASPHALT SHINGLES, FASCIA AND SOFFITS OF MAIN BUILDING AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE TO ENSURE ROOFS ARE MAINTAINED IN GOOD REPAIR AND WATERTIGHT CONDITION.

NO PERMIT REQUIRED - COMPLIANCE REVIEW BY BUILDING BYLAW OFFICER.

---

**DEFECT - Section 1.15**

Water runoff from roof surfaces shall discharge into an eaves trough or gutter and thence to a downpipe, discharging directly to grade with an appropriate extension away from the building to prevent flooding, erosion and other nuisance to neighbouring properties. Discharge into the municipal storm system may be permitted if approved or authorized by the City Engineer or Chief Building Official or his/her designate.

**DEFECT - Section 1.32**

The storm water run-off from all downspouts, sump pump discharges or impervious surfaces shall be designed and maintained so as to discharge water run-off away from the building and to prevent flooding, erosion and other nuisance to neighbouring properties.

**CORRECTION**

1. REPAIR / REPLACE ANY DEFECTIVE / MISSING EAVES TROUGHS AND DOWN SPOUTS OF MAIN BUILDING AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE. PERIMETER ROOF DRAINAGE SYSTEM TO BE MAINTAINED IN GOOD REPAIR AND DISCHARGE RUNOFF TO A POINT OF DISPOSAL ON OWN PROPERTY ACCEPTABLE TO THE OFFICER.

NO PERMIT REQUIRED - COMPLIANCE REVIEW BY BUILDING BYLAW OFFICER.

---

***YOU ARE HEREBY REQUIRED***, by this Order, to do the work required to repair the defects set forth in this Order and make the said property conform to the standards set forth in the said By-law

**ON OR BEFORE: May 20, 2022**

**Dated at Windsor, Ontario, on April 20, 2022**

John Revell, MCIP, RPP  
Chief Building Official

Per:



---

Jay McGuire  
Inspector/Property Standards Officer  
Building Department  
Telephone: (519)-818-0184  
e-mail: jmcguire@citywindsor.ca

**NOTICE:**

1. If the owner or person against whom an Order has been made or their agent wishes to appeal such Order, they must **within FOURTEEN (14) DAYS from the service of the Order upon him**, file a Notice of Appeal, duly completed, with the Secretary of the Property Standards Committee.
2. Attached hereto is a Notice of Appeal form.
3. In the event that you do not appeal this Order, the said Order shall be deemed confirmed.
4. A photocopy of this document may be offered in evidence to the Court, should a trial result from a charge, which may be filed in an enforcement procedure. Copies of these documents may be obtained or examined at Building Department, City Hall, on workdays between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.
5. If such repair or clearance is not done within the time specified in this Order, the Corporation may carry out the repair or clearance at the expense of the owner.
6. This Order is pursuant to Section 15.2(2) of the BUILDING CODE ACT, S.O. 1992, c.23, as amended.
7. **OBTAIN THE PROPER BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL REPAIRS / DEMOLITION.**
- 7.1 Every property owner who has a property subject to corrective measures under this by-law shall obtain a building permit unless exempted in writing by the Chief Building Official or designate.
- 7.2 The minimum permit fee is as per the "City of Windsor User Fee Schedule", as passed by and amended by Council from time to time. Additional inspections where the minimum permit fee has been used, shall be billed in accordance with the "City of Windsor User Fee Schedule" as passed by and amended by Council from time to time.