/ks
4:30 p.m., Monday, October 3, 2022
Development & Heritage Standing Committee

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:
Planning Act Matters

Item 7.1 Rezoning – HD Development Group 1850 North Service Road

a) Adam Szymczak, Senior Planner, (PowerPoint)
b) Adriano Bertolissio, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** letter received September 29, 2022 as additional information
c) Maria Anzolin, area resident, submitted the ***attached*** email dated September 30, 2022 as additional information

Item 7.2 Zoning By-Law Amendment Site Specific Regulations for Multiple Dwelling Farhi Holding Corporation

a) Jim Abbs, Planner III, Subdivisions (PowerPoint)
b) Barbara D'Alimonte, area resident, submitting the ***previously distributed*** letter received September 26, 2022 as additional information.
c) Daryl McDonald, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
d) Lucie Martin, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
e) Peter Mycak, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
f) Cheng Jing, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
g) Omar Jarrar, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
h) Karin Leung, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information and the ***attached*** email dated September 28, 2022 as additional information
i) Kirstyn Fox, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information

j) Spiros Govas, Owner of 147 Janette, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information
k) Ashley Hotte, area resident, submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information
l) CP Proximity Ontario submitted the ***attached*** email dated September 29, 2022 as additional information

Item 7.3 Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application for property known as 1247-1271 Riverside Drive E. at the SW corner
a) Justina Nwaesei, Planner III, Subdivisions (PowerPoint)
b) Nicole Baillargeon submitted the ***previously distributed*** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information
c) Residents of Pierre-Hall-Moy neighbourhood submitting the ***attached*** information

Item 11.3 Closure of part of the easterly half of the east/west alley between Campbell Avenue and Mark Avenue, Ward 10
a) Azmi Qaqish, area resident submitted the ***attached*** email dated September 30, 2022 as additional information
b) Rony S. Roy Chawdhury, property owner, submitted the ***attached*** email dated September 30, 2022 as additional information

DELEGATIONS:
Planning Act Matters

Item 7.1 Rezoning – HD Development Group 1850 North Service Road
a) Adam Szymczak, Senior Planner (PowerPoint)
b) Maureen Rudowicz, area resident (in person)
c) Jackie Lassaline, Principal Planner & Owner, Lassaline Planning Consultants (via Zoom) (PowerPoint)
d) Haider Habib, HD Development Group (via Zoom)
e) Steve Habib, HD Development Group (available for questions) (via Zoom)
f) Gino and Anna Sovran, Applicants (in person)
g) Anthony Malandruccolo, representing the Applicants (available for questions) (via Zoom)
h) Adriano Bertolissio, area resident (in person)
i) Kerry Shaw, area resident (in person)
j) Amy Grady, area resident (in person)

Item 7.2 Zoning By-Law Amendment Site Specific Regulations for Multiple Dwelling Farhi Holding Corporation
a) Jim Abbs, Senior Planner (PowerPoint)
b) Daryl McDonald, area resident (via Zoom)
c) Barbara Macedonski, area resident (in person)
d) Alain DaGuerre, area resident (in person)
e) Zoe Sotirakos, Dillon Consulting Limited (in person)
f) Spiros Govas, Owner of 147 Janette (in person)
g) Anastasia Timakis, area resident (in person)

Item 7.3 Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application for property known as 1247-1271 Riverside Drive E. at the SW corner
a) Karl Tanner, Partner, Dillon Consulting Limited (in person)
b) Heather Nash, area resident (in person)
c) Florry Foster, area resident (in person)
d) Matt Malanka, area resident (via Zoom)
e) Sinisa Simic, area resident (in person)

Item 11.3 Closure of part of the easterly half of the east/west alley between Campbell Avenue and Mark Avenue, Ward 10
a) Ibram Sobhy, area resident (via Zoom)

Administrative Items

DELEGATIONS:

Item 10.1 719 Victoria Avenue, Treble-Large House – Heritage Permit & Community Heritage Fund Request (Ward 3) Igor and Marina Karasev, (available for questions) (via Zoom)

Item 11.3 Closure of part of the easterly half of the east/west alley between Campbell Avenue and Mark Avenue, Ward 10
a) Giovanni (John) Miceli, Applicant (available for questions) (in person)
b) Azmi Qaqish, area resident (in person)

Item 11.5 Sandwich CIP/Demolition Control By-law Exemption Report – 3135 Peter Street; Owner 1147011 Ontario LTD (C/O Mamun Chowdury)
a) Terrance Kennedy, Ward 2 resident (in person)

Item 11.6 Brownfield Community Improvement Plan (CIP) application submitted by Haerko Inc. on behalf of the Hiatus House of Windsor for 0 Louis Avenue (Ward 4)
a) Chris Pare, Hydrogeologist, Dragun Corporation / Hiatus House (available for questions) (via Zoom)

October 3, 2022
Development & Heritage Standing Committee
Item 7.1 – Written Submission

From: Maria Anzolin
Sent: September 30, 2022 3:37 PM
To: voteforjim22@outlook.com
Cc: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>; Szymczak, Adam <aszymczak@citywindsor.ca>
Subject: RE: Development & Heritage Standing Committee (Monday, October 3, 2022) - Rezoning – HD Development Group – 1850 North Service Road – Z-021/22 ZNG/6784 - Ward 10

(Re-sending to correct a few typos and to respond to your question)

Q: What was the reply by other candidates?
A: Not certain that I should be replying to this question, because each responded in a different manner (phone, in-person and/or in writing). Regardless, the other candidates did indicate that the existing residents deserve a proper consultation/engagement process now that the detailed material has been made available.

Dear Mr. Morrison,

Thank you for your reply to my message. I did not reply earlier because I wanted to review the report being submitted by the City of Windsor to the Committee on this proposal and I only accessed the documents yesterday evening further complicated by toadying being a holiday to commemorate the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation.

In reading the report by the City of Windsor's Administration, I am disappointed that the re-zoning of Z-021/22 ZNG/6784 is being endorsed by the City's Administration for review by Council. I respectfully suggest that this development requires further consideration. And, as indicated in my earlier message, I do not understand why the City of Windsor is allowed to conduct new business during an active election. Most governments adhere to "care-taking" practices during an election to respect the democratic process.

Given that the meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 3, 2022 at 4:30PM, I am emailing you my comments for you to consider as my representative for Ward 4. Due to my limited mobility, I cannot attend but wanted to make sure that I did not miss the opportunity to have my comments on record. I have copied the City in hopes that this message will be treated as an official request to be notified of the decision

In reviewing many of the documents, including the City's Official Plan and the Multi-Residential Interim Control By-law Study adopted by the Council, here are some key issues for consideration by you and other Committee members:

1) City of Windsor's Official Plan: The City's Plan cites that new developments should strengthen existing and future neighbourhood. The analysis pertaining to Z-021/22 ZNG/6784 focuses the impact on the future neighbourhood but fails to outline the impact on the existing neighbourhood. In fact, I was surprised to see that none of the material provided t the committee refers to the views by those currently residing in the neighbourhood. As you attended the public session, you know that the reaction was strongly against the proposal as it exists..

Recommendation: Prior to making any decision on the proposal, it is recommended that the developers, along with representatives of the City of Windsor hold a proper public engagement session and not just an open house.

The City's site plan control is used to ensure that:

- developments are built and maintained in the way that council approved
- new developments meet certain standards of quality and appearance there is safe and easy access for pedestrians and vehicles
- the appearance and design features of buildings, and their sustainable design, are satisfactory there is adequate landscaping and drainage
- nearby properties are protected from incompatible development.

2) "Incompatible development": The City's Plan makes numerous reference to "compatibility" with that any new developments must take into account the existing neighbourhood. Here is where I think the analysis provided to Committee members is weak (if not negligent). While many can argue "compatibility" is subjective, I will argue that there several areas that provide clear evidence of incompatibility and thus the Administration should recommend that the Developer undertake additional due diligence.

The City's Official Plan cites through Policies 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.3 the importance of walkable neighbourhood centres and importance of retaining distinctive character within existing neighbourhoods. I think the impact on these two elements was not properly considered within the proposal nor through the assessment by the City Administration. As an example, a single copy of the "transportation study" was available at the open house but residents were not provided any detailed information for further review despite having made requests. In quickly reviewing the transportation study (that evening at the open house) in a cursory manner, the study did **NOT** conduct an assessment of the impact of traffic on Byng Road - the road that is likely to be impacted most. Similarly, the study does not take into account the impact of increased traffic on Walker Road with the increase in production at the Windsor Assembly Plant

within a short period of time. Nor did the analysis refer to the distinctive nature of the existing neighbourhood – a quiet, green neighbourhood.
Recommendation: Prior to making any decision on the proposal, it is recommended that the developers, along with representatives of the City of Windsor conduct an impact analysis of transportation on Byng Road and provide a copy of the revised assessment to residents on Byng Road.

3) Multi-Residential Interim Control By-law: Adopted by Council in June 2022, the Infill Design Guidelines provide further direction for the design of infill development that respect the unique character of Windsor's existing neighbourhoods. In reviewing, I found reference to townhouses but not large apartment/condo buildings. Suggesting that the focus should be townhouses and not apartment buildings. Of further note, the by-law indicates that buildings should be no more than three storeys of building height (height will depend on the height of housing in the immediate vicinity of the development). These references suggest that one 6-storey building is incompatible, imagine five, 6-storey buildings!
Recommendation: Prior to making any decision on the proposal, it is recommended that the developers, along with representatives of the City of Windsor should engage with existing residents to discuss possible mitigation measures to promote compatible development!

This enormous building proposal is NOT compatible with the existing quiet neighbourhood. I respectfully request that more analysis is needed to understand how the area can safely accommodate a new devolopment that is five-fold the size of the existing neighbourhood in a relatively closed ecosystem.I submit it cannot but we deserve the respect of having a proper discussion and not just an open house.

I hope, as you wrote, that you will represent views of the existing neighbourhood. This is an important issue to me and my neighbours. The demise of an existing neighbourhood needs to be carefully assessed and MUST involve the voices of existing residents and NOT just the wallets of the developers!

Yours respectfully,

Maria

PS: Thank you for the update on Udine Park. The addition of lights is a great step in making the area more secure. As per my messages, I think proper cleaning (removal of dead or decaying trees and de-thinning of the trees along the creek is also required.

From: MARIA ANZOLIN
Sent: September 30, 2022 12:35 PM
To: voteforjim22@outlook.com
Cc: clerks; aszymczak

Subject: Development & Heritage Standing Committee (Monday, October 3, 2022) - Rezoning – HD Development Group – 1850 North Service Road – Z-021/22 ZNG/6784 - Ward 10
Importance: High

Dear Mr. Morrison,

Thank you for your reply to my message. I did not reply earlier because I wanted to review the report being submitted by the City of Windsor to the Committee on this proposal. Unfortunately, I am disappointed that a recommendation to go ahead is being submitted to Council. I respectfully suggest that this development requires further consideration. And, as indicated in my earlier message, I do not understand why the City of Windsor is allowed to conduct new business during an active election. Most governments adhere to "care-taking" practices during an election to respect the democratic process.

Given that the meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 3, 2022 at 4:30, I am emailing you my comments for you to consider as my representative for Ward 4. Due to my limited mobility, I cannot attend but wanted to make sure that I did not miss the opportunity to have my comments on record. I will also submit a request to be notified of the decision. However, the (expedited) deadline for doing so was yesterday because of the commemoration of the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation.

In reviewing many of the documents, including the City's Official Plan and the Multi-Residential Interim Control By-law Study adopted by the Council, here are some key issues for consideration by you and other Committee members:

1) City of Windsor's Official Plan: The City's Plan cites that new developments should strengthen existing and future neighbourhood. The analysis focus the impact on the future neighbourhood but fails to outline the impact on the existing neighbourhood. In fact, I was surprised to see that none of the material provided t the committee refers to the views by those currently residing in the neighbourhood. As you attended the public session - unfortunately I did not see you there - you know that the reaction was strongly against the proposal as it exists.

- **Recommendation: Prior to making any decision on the proposal, it is recommended that the developers, along with representatives of the City of Windsor hold a proper public engagement session and not just an open house.**

The City's site plan control is used to ensure that:

  - developments are built and maintained in the way that council approved
  - new developments meet certain standards of quality and appearance there is safe and easy access for pedestrians and vehicles

- the appearance and design features of buildings, and their sustainable design, are satisfactory there is adequate landscaping and drainage
- nearby properties are protected from incompatible development.

2) "Incompatible development": The City's Plan makes numerous reference to "compatibility" with the existing neighbourhood. Here is where I think lies the issue for greatest disagreemet. And, while many can argue "compatibility" is subjective, I will argue that there several areas that need to be studied with greater rigour. The City's Official Plan cites through Policies 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.3 the importance of walkable neighbourhood centres and importance of retaining distinctive character within existing neighbourhoods. I think the impact on these two elements was duly considered within the proposal nor te assessment by the City Administration. As an example, a copy of the "transportation study" was available at the open house but residents were not provided any detailed information despite having made requests. In reviewing the transportation study in a cursory manner at the open house, the study DID not conduct an assessment of the impact of traffic on Byng Road - the road that is likely to be impacted most. Similarly, the study does not take into account the impact of traffic on walker Road with the increase in production at the Windsor Assembly Plant.
Recommendation: Prior to making any decision on the proposal, it is recommended that the developers, along with representatives of the City of Windsor conduct an impact analysis of transportation on Byng Road and provide a copy of the revised assessment to residents on Byng Road.

3) Multi-Residential Interim Control By-law: Adopted by Council in June 2022, the Infill Design Guidelines provide further direction for the design of infill development that respect the unique character of Windsor's existing neighbourhoods. In reviewing, I found reference to townhouses but not large apartment/condo buildings. Suggesting that the focus should be townhouses and not apartment buildings. Of further note, the by-law indicates that buildings should be no more than three storeys of building height (height will depend on the height of housing in the immediate vicinity of the development).
Recommendation: Prior to making any decision on the proposal, it is recommended that the developers, along with representatives of the City of Windsor should engage with existing residents to discuss possible mitigation measures to promote compatible development!

As mentioned in my earlier correspondence, I do not understand how an enormous building proposal is compatible with the existing quiet neighbourhood. Moreover, more analysis is needed to understand how the area can sfely accommodate a new devolment that is five-fold the size of the existing neighbourhood in a relatively closed ecosystem.

I hope, as you wrote, that you will represent review of the existing neighbourhood. This is an important issue to me and my neighbours. The

demise of an existing neighbourhood needs to be carefully assessed and MUST involve the voice of existing residents and just the wallets of the developers!

Yours respectfully,

Maria

PS: Thank you for the update on Udine Park. The addition of lights is a great step in making the area more secure. As per my messages, I think proper cleaning (removal of dead or decaying trees and de-thinning of the trees along the creek is also required.

October 3, 2022
Development & Heritage Standing Committee
Item 7.2 – Written Submission

Dear Ms. Stuart:

Thank you very much for your email regarding Item 7.2 of Notice of Standing Committee Meeting - Zoning Bylaw Amendment - Farhi Holding Corporation - for a property located at the Southwest corner of Riverside Dr W & Janette Ave - Z 017-22 [ZNG6760] - Ward 3.

According to the Council Report: S 114/2022, it detailed the Planning Analysis of (PPS) 2020 and comments from Professionals of Specific Organizations.

I am inspired by the hard work of City Windsor Members. I am confident that City will provide a safe and sound community for everyone to enjoy their living in Windsor.

I am satisfied with the above report and kindly REMOVE myself as a delegate to speak in person during the meeting.

Kindly acknowledge my message and thank you very much for your assistance.

Karin Leung
P.S. My written request for a notification of ByLaw Amendments update will forward to Council Services.

October 3, 2022
Development & Heritage Standing Committee
Item 7.2 – Written Submission

From: CP Proximity-Ontario <CP_Proximity-Ontario@cpr.ca>
Sent: September 29, 2022 4:36 PM
To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>
Subject: Comments on ZNG/6760 & Z-017/22 (Riverside Drive W (at Janette Ave)

Good Afternoon,
RE: Comments on ZNG/6760 & Z-017/22 (Riverside Drive W (at Janette Ave), within 1000m of CP Rail Yard

Thank you for the recent notice respecting the captioned development proposal in the vicinity of Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The safety and welfare of residents can be adversely affected by rail operations and CP is not in favour of residential uses that are not compatible with rail operations. CP rail yards and freight trains operate 24/7 with schedules and volumes subject to change. CP's approach to development in the vicinity of rail operations is encapsulated by the recommended guidelines developed through collaboration between the Railway Association of Canada and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The 2013 Proximity Guidelines can be found at the following website address: http://www.proximityissues.ca/.

CP recommends that the below condition be inserted in all property and tenancy agreements and offers of purchase and sale for all dwelling units in the proposed building(s):

"Canadian Pacific Railway and/or its assigns or successors in interest has or have a railway right-of-way and/or yard located adjacent to the subject land hereof with operations conducted 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, including the shunting of trains and the idling of locomotives. There may be alterations to, or expansions of, the railway facilities and/or operations in the future, which alterations or expansions may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity. Notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and/or vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwellings, Canadian Pacific Railway will not be responsible for complaints or claims arising from the use of its facilities and/or its operations on, over, or under the aforesaid right-of-way and/or yard."

Should the captioned development proposal receive approval, CP respectfully requests that the recommended guidelines be followed.

Thank you,
CP Proximity Ontario

CP Proximity Ontario
CP_Proximity-Ontario@cpr.ca
7550 Ogden Dale Road SE, Building 1
Calgary AB T2C 4X9

City of Windsor **File No:** Z-044/21 ZNG/6633

Pierre-Hall-Moy Neighbourhood Residents
Response to Application for Zoning Amendment for 1247 Riverside East, Windsor, ON

In response to the Zoning Amendment Application before the City of Windsor's Development & Heritage Standing Committee (File No: Z-044/21 ZNG/6633) proposed zoning amendment and re-development of the properties at 1247 and 1271 Riverside Drive East (the "Site") and the related documents made available to the public via City of Windsor website, the residents representing Pierre-Hall-Moy Avenues and Riverside Drive whom are directly impacted by the proposed development have engaged in vigorous discussion and this letter is a product of that discussion. Some of the main concerns brought forward were height of the building and its monolithic massing, the disassociation with the character and history of the neighbourhood, parking, pedestrian and cyclist access to the riverfront and safety concerns regarding increased density and additional traffic.

Introduction

Primarily, the residents would like to commend the development group, for their recognition of the potential of the land to be developed and for bringing this opportunity to our neighbourhood. We fully understand and value the capital investment that it will take to make this vision a reality and furthermore would like to partner in good faith with the development group and the City in extracting the most value from this opportunity for current and future residents, the developer, and the City, and to ensure the most successful, sustainable, long-view of development for our neighbourhood.

We would like to point out to the development group, Development & Heritage Standing Committee and City Council that our neighbourhood is very inclusive and diverse; we, as a group, very much value our neighbours and what every individual brings to the table. This neighbourhood includes residents from all walks of life, from construction workers, small business owners, retirees, artists, professors, landscape architects, urban planners, architects, engineers and community organisers. We have organised ourselves through the years around various issues via letter drops, in-person meetings, social media groups, and chats. With this being said, the development group should know that the concerns below have been assessed and articulated by a well-informed

group of concerned neighbours, many with professional qualifications and accreditations to support their assertions. Perhaps the most valuable aspect of the conversation is that we also have lived experience from all the residents of the neighbourhood regarding day-to-day conditions in the area.

Neighbourhood Concerns

1. PROPOSED HEIGHT OF THE NEW DEVELOPMENT - the development team is asking for an increase in height from 14 metres (m) max to 24m with 'scenery loft' which would bring the total height to under 30m. This height, as illustrated in the supplementary documents (Urban Design Brief) appears to be problematic for a few reasons:

    a) The overall height as proposed in the current building form appears to have not considered the neighbourhood architectural fabric – there are no references to any of the existing street front datums. The current massing, in contrast with its adjacent, seemingly excessive expanse of concrete driveway/parking space, appears as an alien monolith placed, not integrated into the neighbourhood.

    b) Frontage along Hall Ave. does not appear to address the issues that arise from doubling the height of the building envelope. This is particularly problematic if "facilitating the pedestrian realm" (Urban Design Brief – 8.3, 8.7) is an objective of the development. Such jarring change in mass, height, and lack of facade interaction with the street would seem to achieve the opposite of "facilitate the pedestrian realm." Similar conditions could be observed at the Walker Power, and the Children's Aid Society buildings (both listed as precedents in this project brief). These two buildings are a product of past development patterns and we believe should be considered very different from a newly-built residential building in a tightly-knit residential neighbourhood. The Walker Power Building is a fully commercial building, set in a former industrial landscape and so its context is very different. It has been successfully adapted for re-use, and its inclusion of commercial space on the main floor comprises a half-hearted and somewhat successful appeal to pedestrian traffic in relation to its context, which is very different than the neighbourhood surrounding the site in question. The CAS building, on the other hand, is an *institutional* building from a period of time when pedestrian infrastructure and contextual design were disregarded and

de-emphasized. This building in particular is insensitive to its context and actually disregards, de-tracts and diminishes the pedestrian realm along Riverside Drive and perpendicular streets. Neither of these structures named as precedents were originally designed with any consideration for the way that the architecture interacts with surrounding urban fabric, human scale, or pedestrian infrastructure, and their uses and contexts are quite different from the site in question. Unfortunately, we do not believe these are appropriate or desirable precedents for the proposed development of 1247 Riverside.

c) Unmitigated height and the monolithic approach to the way that the building height is reached is more problematic, potentially, than the total proposed height for the development. A multi-unit development being inserted into a neighbourhood comprised exclusively of single family and duplex residential would benefit from an architectural effort to break down a single mass, in order to present itself as a contextually sensitive and responsive development while still potentially achieving the developer's desires for a taller building accommodating more units. We would suggest as well, that a less monolithic building, more appropriately scaled and integrated with the neighbourhood might be a more comfortable and desirable living situation for many potential residents.

2. SITE PLAN ARRANGEMENT – we have reviewed your proposed site plan and we have significant concerns with the following elements:

a) The visual and spatial dominance of parking infrastructure results in de-emphasizing and diminishing the neighbourhood's inherent walkability and we worry it could lead to unnecessarily increasing traffic on Hall Avenue - which is home to many young families with active children, neighbours and people from surrounding neighbourhoods walking and biking through to riverfront parks etc.

b) The added traffic load would negatively affect the already dangerous crossing of Riverside Drive for pedestrians and cyclists

c) The proposed plan shows two new curb cuts on Hall Avenue for access to surface and below-grade parking spaces. This approach is inconsistent with the City's lack of desire to allow curb cuts for residents in order to maintain the character of our historic neighbourhoods. It is particularly

troublesome that this arrangement is proposed, when one considers that the Hall-Moy neighbourhood is an active/functioning alley neighbourhood. We have services and garbage pickup in the alleyways and they provide access to the majority of our garages/parking spaces. It is disappointing that the proposed development is not willing to consider and follow neighbourhood form on this topic, as there is no foreseeable reason why all the vehicular access to the development could not be done from one of the three active alleys abutting the south end of the site.

d) Proposing a curb cut leading to a ramp directly on a residential street (Hall Ave) is problematic from a CPTED standpoint as these type of ramps are difficult to surveil and provide a very convenient space for a perpetrator to hide.

3. LACK OF CONNECTION TO STREET - The current proposal does not attempt to create any connection to the street frontage of Hall Avenue. If one considers the proposal as-is, one could conclude that it is behaving more like a modernist tower-in-the-park development, rather than anything modelled after contemporary good urban planning principles (Notably influenced by the writings of Jane Jacobs etc.). It is important to note that the modernist tower-in-park typology of buildings are a demonstrably failed typology and have been torn down around the country, having generally become (always were?) understood as unpleasant places to live. This is generally due to the fact that places which don't establish connection with the surrounding context and furthermore, don't inspire a sense of ownership of the ground plane (stoops, porches, front doors, eyes on the street etc.) create a no-mans-land that inevitably falls into disrepair. Thereby, there is a significant concern in the way that the site plan and the architecture of the proposed development is turning its back onto our neighbourhood.

4. PARKING - The development plan includes approximately 1.65 parking spots per dwelling unit. This is an additional 16 spots (approximately 3500 sqft devoted to parking) above the city's prescribed minimum of 1.25 spots per unit. This approach is not in line with the province's urban planning principles of encouraging multimodal transport and reducing the over-reliance on the car. In general, the over-abundance of parking space created by parking minimums is known to reduce the viability of public and active transportation of all modes and contributes to cities' over-reliance on cars, pollution, and general blight.

At the same time, given that our city is not currently widely walkable or easily accessible via public transit, most homes do have at least one, and often multiple vehicles. Many homes in our older neighbourhood do not have a driveway, or only have room for one car in the alley. Our neighbourhood also includes multi-unit houses and buildings. As a result, many existing households rely on street parking and there is some concern that increased density would put additional stress on the demand for street parking.

The residents of the Pierre-Hall-Moy neighbourhood adjacent to the proposed development expressed both of these concerns and we collectively acknowledge that parking is a complicated problem when we face both the desires for safe walkable neighbourhoods and also the realities of daily life. These conflicting objectives intersect with many other issues and concerns both directly related to this development and more broadly, including alleyway safety/lighting, stormwater management, increased traffic/road safety, and promotion of active and public transportation. We would like to have more discussion on this issue with the development group and the city and to find a resolution that feels more comfortable for all. One solution might be to keep the proposed amount of parking but to reduce its prominence above grade via more inconspicuous location, reduction of auxiliary paved space, additional landscaping, and inclusion of permeable paving where possible.

5. RIVERSIDE DRIVE AND ACCESS TO RIVERFRONT - One of the main draws for potential new residents will surely be immediate and walkable proximity to the Riverfront. We understand that there have been several previous studies and conversations regarding the 4-lanes of traffic along Riverside Drive East between Devonshire and Caron Avenue. We all have many negative experiences with traffic in the area as it pertains to accessing the Riverfront. We see many pedestrians, cyclists, e-scooters, families, independent children, and seniors - both residents of the Pierre-Hall-Moy corridor and those from other neighbourhoods - passing through on their way to access Windsor's splendid Riverfront. With this new investment in the community, we feel that there is an opportunity and imminent need to improve safety and walkability in the area by introducing traffic calming measures on Riverside and within the Pierre-Hall-Moy corridors as well as installing pedestrian and cycling crossing points to the Riverside.

Specifically, we see an opportunity for a traffic signal or pedestrian crossover (PXO) connecting Hall and the riverfront multi-use path. Given the high number of vulnerable road users, active transportation users and others crossing Riverside at Hall on a regular basis and the high ADT and 85th percentile speed of Riverside Dr E, we believe this addition would contribute towards the City's Vision Zero targets (Vision Zero Policy 2020). In addition, this would meet Actions 1C.1, 1E.4, 2D.1, 2D.4, 5B.2, 5B.3 and 5B.5 of the City's Active Transportation Master Plan. Finally, adding a crossing at Hall Avenue would also contribute to meeting section 1.5.1(a) of the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) on facilitating active transportation through community connectivity.

Given these considerations, will the Development group and the City help to provide safer transportation in the area and improve access to the Riverfront?

6. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT - There is a posted stormwater management plan prepared by Aleo Associates Inc., dated November 23, 2021, to support the current rezoning application for the Site. We understand the outcomes of the stormwater assessment separates the Site into the southern portion (0.33 acres) which is allowed to discharge to the storm drain on Hall Avenue and the northern portion (0.64 acres) which needs to be managed at the Site. Based on the submitted site plan there appears to be a considerable proportion of the Site that is proposed to be paved or covered by the structure. These impermeable surfaces restrict the infiltration of precipitation.

    a) Potential for flooding - There was considerable concern raised amongst the neighbourhood about how, in the event of significant storm events, would stormwater be managed, if the capacity of the proposed stormwater system for the Site were to be exceeded. Where would excess stormwater be directed?
    b) Due to a significant proportion of the Site being proposed as covered by impermeable surfaces, there is concern that this could contribute to additional flooding in the neighbourhood. Perhaps there could be consideration by the development group to add some permeable surfaces where a paved or impermeable surface has been proposed to reduce the reliance on the existing stormwater infrastructure in the neighbourhood.
    c) The design drawings for the stormwater management plan are limited in detail and do not provide a depth or profile of the proposed "depressed grass areas." Depending on the depth, would barriers be required for fall

prevention? Concern was expressed regarding the stormwater management area on the northern portion of the property in terms of both the design and the aesthetics. There was concern raised that the retention area would provide a "visual" and physical barrier between the building and the neighbourhood. This is, once again, not in-line with the commitment to "facilitate the urban realm".

d) Where will water from the sub-surface parking structure sump be directed into the storm system? How will groundwater be managed if sub-surface parking structure intersects the groundwater table?
e) There was also a question raised regarding the Intensity Duration Frequency (IDF) curves used to prepare the calculation. What period do the IDF curves from the Windsor airport cover and if they include such significant rainfall events experienced by Windsor on August 29, 2017?

7. NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER, HISTORIC AND SOCIAL CONTEXT - Some residents are concerned that the historic background of the property is disregarded in the proposed new development. It was noted that this property did have a heritage designation but that it was removed by the City prior to demolition in 2013. This Site has an extensive history overlapping the early development of the City. It was home of one of Windsor's Mayors John Davis ("The John Davis House"). It was also one of the five "hotels" along the Detroit Riverfront during the prohibition era in the United States and was part of the notable "rum-running" history of Windsor's waterfront. Could some recognition and celebration of the history and social context of the land be incorporated into the building, site design, or landscaping (e.g. public art, material references, visible information boards, plaques, etc.) ?

8. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

a) Environmental Site Assessment - There was no information provided on the File No: Z-044/21 ZNG/6633 regarding previous Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) completed for the property. The property was previously utilised as a commercial property, under Ontario Regulation 153/04 (Records of Site Condition - Part XV.1 of the Act under Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.19), which regulates brownfield redevelopment in the province, converting a less-sensitive land use, in this case commercial, to a more-sensitive land use, residential, requires filing for a Record of Site Condition with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks prior to redevelopment of a brownfield Site. Does the proponent intend to file for a record of Site

Condition? We acknowledge the most recent use of the property as a tavern and entertainment business represents a low-risk use of the property for potential environmental impacts; however, historical use and construction practices at the Site may represent potential contaminating activities (PCAs) to soil and groundwater quality on the Site (e.g. underground fuel storage tanks for heating, asbestos / lead / mercury in construction materials, fill of unknown quality imported to the Site, etc.) and these should be adequately addressed.

b) Excess Soils - If the intent is to construct underground parking, there will be a large volume of excess soils generated during construction. Will the development group follow requirements under Ontario Regulation 406/19: On-site and Excess Soil Management under Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c., during construction? How will excess soils be managed at the Site?

c) Construction Noise, Dust and Heavy Truck Traffic - Without information from an ESA there is a concern regarding soil quality and consequently dust arising from construction at the Site. There was a question raised by the neighbourhood regarding noise and dust during construction, especially of a large structure within a residential neighbourhood. How long is the anticipated duration of construction? How will concerns of dust, noise and heavy truck traffic through the residential area be addressed during construction?

d) To our dismay, the proposed site plan appears to remove all existing mature trees. We insist that as long as these mature trees are healthy, the development group makes all possible accommodations to keep them in place. We also insist as well that the developer plants more trees on the property according to a landscaping plan that prioritises shade and greenery around the site and contributes to the canopy that keeps our neighbourhood shady, comfortable, and beautiful. The abundance of mature trees in our neighbourhood is one of its many draws - but as these are removed, or fallen due to ill health, storms, and damage, the neighbourhood loses the many environmental benefits they provide. New trees should be planted to replace old, and to increase the canopy, but healthy mature trees are invaluable and irreplaceable.

9. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION FOR RE-ZONING/ZONING EXEMPTION APPLICATIONS - The “Notice of Public Meeting” mailed to residents on Pierre-Hall-Moy, dated September 6, 2022, contained insufficient information to inform the community of the application to amend the zoning for the Site. A reference to the “Current Zoning

Applications" page should also be provided, to allow residents more than 10 days prior to the public meeting from when the Council Report is available to review, digest and discuss any publicly available documents supporting a proposed zoning amendment application. Allowing access and additional time for residents to read and understand this material is important to encourage discussion about changes in our community and to foster community engagement in this decision making process. The Reports provided to Council are particularly dense and many members of our community will require additional time to review and decide whether they choose to respond and engage in the Municipal process. There also seems to be some confusion as to whether the documents uploaded to the agenda package for this file are the most recent and up-to date proposal for the site. We are only able to respond to the proposal we are given access to.

CLOSING

In light of the above-mentioned concerns presented by our neighbours, it would be beneficial for both sides to come to workable solutions directed at the mutual benefits present with this development opportunity. In order to find theses mutually beneficial solutions, we would recommend that the development team consider the following:

- A robust neighbourhood engagement process to be initiated by the developer as would be expected of any project of this scale
- Development to take a more neighbourly approach:
    - Contextual design
    - Breaking down of scale and height ("human-scale" design)
    - Revising access strategy to be more in line with the neighbourhood (utilise existing alleyways and improve them to be vital access points)
    - Consider a more eco-friendly approach (less emphasis on cars, less impermeable surfaces, revised location and design of retention pond and water-management strategy, thoughtful landscaping)
    - Consider a more neighbourhood scaled approach along Hall Avenue (street address)
    - Consider researching the rich history of the neighbourhood, the site, and use it to enhance design and beautification of the site plan.

We, the residents of Moy-Hall neighbourhood, submit these concerns for your consideration and at this time, given the proposed plans made publicly available for review, we do not support the re-zoning or zoning exemptions proposed for 1247 Riverside Drive. We would like to see a more considered, and nuanced approach from the development team and a revised design for the site and building. We believe that for a piece of urban architecture to truly be successful, it is imperative to take into

consideration the concerns of residents, the sustainability of the program, and to take a more thoughtful and sensitive design approach. We hope that we can come to an agreement on a design which will truly enrich our neighbourhood, our city and our new neighbours at 1247 Riverside Drive for generations to come.

Warmest regards,
Pierre-Moy-Hall Neighbourhood Residents

Brenda Francis Pelkey + Mayer Schulman
248 Hall Ave.

Nadja Pelkey
250 Hall Ave.

Peter Guba + Gabriela Guerra
381 Moy Ave.

Robert Beer
207 Moy Ave.

Naomi Pelkey
250 Hall Ave.

Margot Schulman
250 Hall Ave.

Lucy Howe + Zeke Moores
308 Hall Ave.

Sinisa Simic + Nicole Baillargeon
396 Hall Ave.

Russel Dupuis
166 Pierre Ave.

The Malanka Family
288 Hall Ave.

Donna Bergamin
331 Moy Ave.

Courtney Thomas + Justin Bondy
522 Hall Ave.

Jordan + Jesse Marchand
277 Hall Ave.

Susan Johnson Washington
260 Hall Ave.

Cameron McNaughton + Amee Stieler
382 Moy Ave.

Diana Radulescu
371 Moy Ave.

Elise Keller + Johnny Oran
305 Hall Ave.

Ramona Marte
1240 Assumption St.

Stephanie Hill + Andrea Pollock
212 Hall Ave.

Arun Rattan
365 Moy Ave.
Janine Pfaff
341 Moy Ave.

October 3, 2022
Development & Heritage Standing Committee
Item 11.3 – Written Submission

From: Azmi Qaqish
Sent: September 30, 2022 9:56 AM
To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>
Subject: Parking

Hi, this is Azmi from 1677-1691 Tecumseh road west. I am writing to express concerns about the closure of the alley way as I will not have back access to my parking. I just received the letter today and this is too short of a notice. Please let me know what you can do about this.

Thank you,

Azmi

October 3, 2022
Development & Heritage Standing Committee
Item 11.3 – Written Submission

From: Rony S. Roy
Sent: September 30, 2022 10:06 AM
To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>
Cc: Rony S. ROY Chawdhury
Subject: RE: Closure of part of the easterly half of the east/west alley between Campbell Ave., and Mark Ave. Ward 10

Greetings!

My neighbour has received a notice stated in the subject line in this email. I am the owner of 1695 Tecumseh Road West, Windsor Property. Should the proposed application be implemented and passed my parking would be affected. My commercial and residential clients will not be able to comfortably park for their business. I therefore do NOT agree/support this plan. I am paying a high tax to the city for the property, should the alley be closed or given to someone else by affecting my business does not prove justice.

Please do not take such a decision that would affect my livelihood and future sale value of my property.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Shabbosachi Roy Chawdhury

Rony S. Roy Chawdhury, EdD