

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Planning Act Matters

- Item 7.1 Rezoning – HD Development Group 1850 North Service Road
- a) Adriano Bertolissio, area resident, submitted the **attached** letter received September 29, 2022 as additional information
- Item 7.2 Zoning By-Law Amendment Site Specific Regulations for Multiple Dwelling Farhi Holding Corporation
- b) Barbara D’Alimonte, area resident, submitting the **attached** letter received September 26, 2022 as additional information.
 - c) Daryl McDonald, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
 - d) Lucie Martin, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
 - e) Peter Mycak, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
 - f) Cheng Jing, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
 - g) Omar Ribhi, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received September 28, 2022 as additional information
 - h) Karin Leung, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information
 - i) Kirstyn Fox, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information
 - j) Spiros Govas, Owner of 147 Janette, submitted the **attached** email received September 29, 2022 as additional information
 - k) Ashley Hotte, area resident, submitted the **attached** email received 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) Nicole Baillargeon submitted the **attached** email received September 29, 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 Malandrucolo, 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) Robert Nixon, area resident (in person)
 - d) Florry Foster, area resident (in person)
 - e) Matt Malanka, area resident (via Zoom)
 - f) Sinisa Simic, area resident (in person)

Administrative Items

DELEGATIONS:

- 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)

- 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) (in person)

THIS IS A WRITTEN SUBMISSION
PERTAINING TO PROPOSED ZONING
CHANGE FOR 1850 NORTH SERVICE
ROAD (387 UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT)

NO ZONING CHANGE SHOULD BE
ALLOWED ON THIS PROPERTY
WITHOUT TOTAL REDESIGN.

THE PROPOSAL HAS A 8 TO 9
TIMES DENSITY OF BING RD.

THE PROPOSAL HAS INSUFFICIENT
PARKING FOR NUMBER OF UNITS
PROPOSED.

THE PROPOSAL WOULD TOTALLY
CHANGE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR
ALL RESIDENCE OF BING RD.!

a) BACKYARD LIVING (ENJOYMENT)
FOR HOMES BACKING ONTO PROJECT

i) FROM OPEN SPORTS FIELDS
TO ASPHALT PARKING LOT.

ii) CLIMATE CHANGE IN
SUMMER DUE TO HEAT OF
ASPHALT AND INCREASED
DUST (POLLUTION).

iii) PRIVACY, DO TO HEIGHT
AND SCOPE OF PROPOSED
PROJECT.

iv) TRAFFIC AND PARKING, DO TO
~~THE~~ NUMBER OF UNITS AND LACK
OF PARKING ON STRE. THIS
WILL CREATE A HAZARDOUS
ENVIRONMENT FOR
PEDESTRIANS ON BTHM RD.

(3)

WILL ALSO CREATE A PARKING NIGHT-MARE ON BYNG RD. (NOW UNITS ON BYNG RD. AVERAGE 7 TO 8 SPOTS PER UNIT ^{MORE THAN} ONE OF WHICH IS A CLIMATE CONTROLLED UNIT (GARAGE).)

PARKING FOR PROPOSED PROJECTS WILL ONLY BE ONE PER UNIT, OF WHICH NONE WILL BE TOTAL CLIMATE CONTROLLED (UNDER GROUND AND ACCESSED WITHOUT GOING OUTSIDE)

THIS WILL LEAD TO PROJECT NOT BEING CONSIDERED ^{AS A} ~~TO BE~~ LUXURY CONDOS ^{PROJECT} AS ALLEGED.

TO ALLEVIATE STATED CONCERNS,
THE FOLLOWING IS REQUESTED.

1) A TRANSITION ZONE ON EAST
SIDE OF PROJECT CONSISTING OF
A ROW OF 4 TO 6 UNITS^{RACH}, RAISED
RANCH STYLE CONDOS WITH GARAGES,
THESE^{UNITS} MAY FRONT OR ~~BE~~ BACK ONTO
BANK RD. UNITS.

2) AT LEAST 2 PARKING SPOTS
PER UNIT FOR ANY HIGH RISE
UNITS, WITH ONE BEING A
CLIMATE CONTROLLED UNIT (UNDER
GROUND OR 1ST FLOOR).

3) HIGH RISE UNITS NO MORE
4 LEVELS HIGH TO BETTER
FIT IN WITH EXISTING CHARACTER
OF AREA AND PRIVACY.

4) MAX. GREEN SPACE (w) GRASS
WATER, TREES, ETC

5) DENSITY OF PROJECT (PEOPLE)
MUST NOT BE GREATER THAN
4 TO 5 TIME THAT OF BUNG RD.

//
IN SUMMATION, THIS PROJECT
AS PROPOSED IS IN NO WAY IN
CHARACTER WITH SURROUNDING
AREA:

1) DENSITY TOO HIGH (4 TO 5 TIMES)
MAX.

2) PARKING (AMOUNT & TYPE) NOT
TO LUXURY STANDARD (AS STATED);
WILL CREATE PARKING LOT ON
BUNG RD AND HAZARDOUS
ENVIRONMENT FOR PEDESTRIANS.
ON BUNG RD.

3) QUALITY OF LIFE FOR BYNG RD.
WILL BE GRAVELY DETROMENTED
IF ALLOWED TO PROCEED AS
NOW DESIGNED.

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS
5 HEADED HYDRA TO BE
BUILT ~~TO~~ AS DESIGNED

YOURS TRULY,

ADRIANO

BERTOISSIO

* VERY CONCERNED RESIDENT
OF BYNG RD.

Sept 26, 2022

My name is Barbara D'Alimonte. I am a owner and resident of Waterpark Condos, 515 Riverside Dr. I'm commenting on the Amendment to zoning By-Law 8600 file no. ZNG/6760 Z-217122 for amendment to zoning of lots between Jamette and Caron, on the west side of Waterpark Condos. I'm opposed to Amending the zoning of the two said lots west of Waterpark Condos. I bought my condo at Waterpark in 2009 for the specific reason of having the view. I also knew there wouldn't be any building high enough to block my view. Also, the value of the Condos on the west side of Waterpark would loose significant value on their Condo.

Barbara D'Alimonte

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

From: Daryl McDonald
Sent: September 28, 2022 1:45 PM
To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>
Subject: Flie number ZNG/6760 Z-017/22

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.

I am a neighbour of the proposed development, I very much object to the closure of Jannette Ave. I frequently use Jannette when leaving the building and Bruce to return. In my opinion the footprint could be adjusted so as not to infringe on any City streets, while we are still in the planning stages.

Daryl McDonald

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

Subject: FW: Farhi development Riverside & Janette
Date: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 3:46:45 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Lucie Martin
Sent: September 28, 2022 1:41 PM
To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>
Subject: Farhi development Riverside & Janette

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.

Hello

I'm a concerned citizen who purchased a condo at Waterpark place specifically to live in the core, on Riverside Drive with a western view of the waterfront and the Ambassador bridge.

I understand that the plan is for a 28 story luxury rental property which I assume is hoping to attract people from outside Windsor-Essex.

I have the following concerns;

- 1) the property plan is not far enough back and will completely block my view - if not in phase I, phase II for sure which result in my moving out of the downtown core.
- 2) we need access to Janette being that Riverside closes occasionally for various walks, runs, open streets and Bruce is a one-way towards Riverside - so we would have no access in or out

I am currently out of the Country and would like to be advised of the decisions made at the October 3rd meeting.

Thank you

Lucie Martin

Sent from my iPhone

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

Subject: FW: Proposed apartment building at Riverside and Janette
Date: Thursday, September 29, 2022 12:25:53 PM

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.

To: Development & Heritage Standing Committee

I would like to voice my concerns in regards to the proposed apartment building at Riverside and Janette. I currently reside across the street at Waterpark Place Condominiums and have for the last 25 years. While I understand that progress is inevitable I would hope that this committee has taken into consideration the disruption of life this will have on the many residents in the area. The loss of view, the loss of privacy, the traffic congestion and increased noise levels are just some of the factors that we will be forced to deal with on a daily basis. Not to mention the drop in property value. And as I understand it this is just phase one with a potential second high rise going up right next to Waterpark Place.

As a long term resident and taxpayer and a strong supporter of a revitalized downtown I believe that the concerns of the residents of this area should be taken into consideration before any movement on this proposal.

Also as our lives will be severely disrupted with construction noise, dirt and traffic I feel we should be seriously compensated for this inconvenience.

As I stated before progress is inevitable but not on the backs of hard working, tax paying citizens who are only looking for a decent quality of life.

Respectfully

Peter D. Mycak

Sent from my iPad

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

Subject: FW: Vote for opposing re-zoning - Z 017-22 [ZNG6760] - Ward 3
Date: Thursday, September 29, 2022 12:26:01 PM

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.

Dear City Council of Windsor

I'm writing this email to oppose the re-zoning proposal below:

Clerk's file#: Z/14427
OPPOSED re-zoning: Z017-22 [ZNG6760] - Ward 3

Current owner of: #-515 Riverside Dr. W, Windsor, ON N9A7C3.

Reason:

I purchased my condominium knowing vacant lots were zoned for no higher than 5 stories buildings.

Opposing re-zoning because it will completely obstruct views, and have negative impact on natural light, privacy, and diminish the peaceful enjoyment of my condo.

Regards,
Cheng Jing
Owner of #-515 Riverside Dr. W, Windsor, ON N9A7C3

September 28th, 2022

Subject: FW: File number ZNG/6760 Z-017/22
Date: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 4:07:36 PM

-----Original Message-----

Sent: September 28, 2022 3:50 PM

To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>

Subject: File number ZNG/6760 Z-017/22

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.

Hi,

I am deeply concerned with the proposed closure to Janette Avenue for it to be utilized for vehicular access for the new project. Janette Avenue is used by residents of 515 Riverside to access their Basement and visitors parking, in addition to other residents of the area.

Also the height of the building is concerning as it will tower over all the surrounding buildings.

Thanks,
Omar

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

From: [karin leung](#)

Subject: Re: 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

Date: Thursday, September 29, 2022 9:47:34 AM

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.

Good morning:

Thank you for your email. Kindly acknowledge the following 3 questions to be included in the Agenda of tem 7.2 of the October 3, 2022 Development & Heritage Standing Committee meeting:

1. Can you tell us what will the approximate distance between the balconies and windows of the units at Dieppe Towers and the new proposed building? - Will it be possible for the new neighbors to see into the homes of others and vice versa?
2. How much higher is the proposed 28 storey building compared to Dieppe Towers and Waterpark place condominiums?
3. How many units of the new building will be designated geared to income, supportive housing?

I am interested to receive a copy of Monday's Meeting Agenda & a written answers for above mentioned 3 questions to be followed would be much appreciated.

Thank you very much for your kindly assistance.

Karin Leung

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

Subject: FW: Proposed Amendment to Zoning By-Law 8600 - Farhi Holdings Corporation
Date: Thursday, September 29, 2022 12:25:46 PM

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.

Please be advised, as a condo owner at 515 Riverside Dr. West, I have grave concerns about the proposed amendment to zoning by-law 8600 by Farhi Holdings. I purchased this condo knowing the property on the southwest corner of Riverside Dr. and Janette Ave. was zoned commercial. The proposed tower requesting heights of 28 storeys will entirely *obliterate my current view* of the Detroit River. This will *negatively impact the beautiful site lines* I enjoy on the western horizon, along with the *afternoon sunshine*. It will also *reduce the market value*.

The Phase Two Tower will further plunge the value of my principle residence, destroying any quality of life at this location. It is my understanding, the site on the southeast corner of Riverside Dr. and Janette Ave. is zoned for a maximum height of 5 storeys. Two years ago, when I purchased this property, I was confident I was making a prudent and safe investment.

I further oppose closing a portion of Janette Ave. to facilitate vehicular traffic into the parking garage. The traffic and congestion a development of this magnitude will negatively affect this neighbourhood.

I am opposed to the consideration of amendment to zoning by-law 8600.

Respectfully,

Kirstyn Fox

Subject: FW: FARHI HOLDINGS CORPORATION
Date: Thursday, September 29, 2022 12:26:09 PM

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.

Gentlemen

- I, Spiro Govas and Theodoros Govas owners of the 14 unit apartment building 147 Janette since 1972 are against closing Janette ave..

The access by car and walking to the riverfront is essential to our tenants and the entire neighborhood. The value of our property and the properties of entire neighborhood will be dropped substantially

- We are against waving the required setbacks from the street and neighbouring properties
- we are against taking over and closing the street for private **aggressive** economic benefit.
- The building appears to be very tall next to the existing buildings
- The density appears to be another issue.
- The carron apartment building to be the size it is utilized the portion of the city block from riverside to Pitt street ,this developer wants a substationally taller building with half of the land.

I wish to suggest to the decision makers that we ,the residents of the city, want to encourage development but properly done.

The people shall enjoy the area and not be blocked out of the riverfront by foot and vehicles.

The main connections of Tecumseh west and Riverside are Janette southbound and Bruce northbound .

The west side of downtown, the city centre will be blocked, imagine the traffic during festivals on the riverfront.

My brother and I have been in the area for 50 years. We have seen similar proposals to close Jannette in the past. I'm sure the planning is having files on them. The city officials have always protected the character of the neighbourhood. I'm asking you this time to do the same .

I'm not against multi level housing, I'm against this request.

I m available to be there on October 3 at 4:30 pm
please call me for any additional informations you may need,

please register me as a delegation

Yours truly

Spiros Govas

--

Spiro Govas

Subject: FW: Clerk's file# Z/14427
Date: Thursday, September 29, 2022 2:02:34 PM

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.

Clerk's file# Z/14427

OPPOSED re-zoning: Z017-22 [ZNG6760] - Ward 3

Current tenant of: ##-515 Riverside Dr. W, Windsor, ON N9A7C3. (to be a future owner of this condo; this residence is to be my forever home)

Dear Mayor & Members of City Council,

The subject site is currently zoned for commercial use and should remain, current longtime residents of surrounding buildings have waited, hoped, anticipated for the vacant lots to be developed into something commercially resourceful – grocery, bakery, retail, restaurant, hardware, general supply, boutique, a variety of shops to benefit current residents & visitors enjoy their time downtown. Current residents have to travel far to obtain necessities for living day to day. We don't have a shortage of people in this neighbourhood, and then we have the influx of people from the Aquatic Centre, Art Gallery, College, River Front trail, people walk or electric scooter down Riverside Dr, & summer cruise ships that dock nearby. People & vehicular traffic is already congested & parking is limited.

The vacant lots have never even had an attempted commercial area developed, and this Provincial Policy Statement can give an excuse to not use the zoning properly so it can be changed not to benefit this already overpopulated area, but to cram in more people without proper amenities for Multiple Dwellings. Without consideration to all of the long-time residents located all around this 28-story building. This proposal removes 6 matured trees and doesn't add any greener spaces, takes away a main connector road, takes away the views of current residents, the natural light to all of the surrounding buildings and the proposal says it's mitigating climate change! It adds 160-187 parking spaces, and 166 units. This proposed amendment benefits the Developer's interests only, it doesn't help Windsorites become greener, or provide anything beneficial besides more people.

28 storeys is much too high - closing Janette will not help the neighbourhood - not having amenities for their to be residents will cause lots more problems in the neighbourhood.

Please add me to the list of written requests to be notified re: the re-zoning. Thank you.

Kindest regards,

Ashley Hotte

October 3, 2022
Development & Heritage Standing Committee
Item 7.3
Written Submission

Subject: FW: Residents Reply to File No: Z-044/21 ZNG/6633
Date: Thursday, September 29, 2022 2:02:44 PM
Attachments: [1247 Riverside Rezoning Residents Response.pdf](#)

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.

Hello-

I am submitting a letter outlining a response compiled collectively and collaboratively with dozens of residents of the Pierre, Hall, Moy, and Riverside neighbourhoods adjacent to the proposed development at 1247 Riverside Drive.

While we emphatically support development of this site *in principle*, at this time, and based on the plans presented in the Development & Heritage Standing Committee Agenda, **we collectively and firmly oppose the zoning exemptions** requested by the Development group, on the basis of concerns outlined in the letter. Several residents have expressed a desire to speak as delegates at the Committee meeting, and they will send in this request separately.

We do hope to work with the development group and the city to make improvements to the plan, for the benefit of both the neighbourhood and its future residents, and as such would like to request further community consultation and engagement on the plans for the development prior to granting any zoning amendments.

Thank you for forwarding this letter to all concerned parties, and we look forward to a robust conversation Monday afternoon.

Cheers,

Nicole

Nicole Baillargeon

Director, Mean Studio
www.meanstudio.ca

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 these 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,

Sinisa Simic for Pierre-Moy-Hall and Riverside Neighbourhood Group.