



CITY OF WINDSOR
COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES

FOR THE HEARING OF

July 15, 2021

A hearing by the Committee of Adjustment for the City of Windsor was held on July 15, 2021, located , Electronic Participation.
The Hearing was called to order at 3:30 PM.

ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Mike Sleiman, Chair
Tom McMahon, Vice-Chair
Joe Balsamo, Member

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer
Delilah Liburdi, Committee of Adjustment Clerk

Regrets: Dante Gatti, Member

Also in attendance, Administrative staff, representing the interests of the City of Windsor were:

Simona Simion, (Planner II – Research & Policy Support) Planning Department
Melissa Gasic (Planner II - Development Review) Planning Department
Jason Campigotto (Planner III – Site Plan Approval Officer) Planning Department
George Robinson (Planner III – Site Plan Approval Officer) Planning Department
Connor Cowan (Zoning Co-ordinator) Planning Department
Alaa Mokdad, (Zoning Co-ordinator) Planning Department
Rania Toufeili (Transportation Engineer) Transportation Planning
Shannon Mills (Technologist II) Development, Projects & Right-of-Way

* * * * *

**DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST
and the general nature thereof**

Joe Balsamo declares a conflict of interest on Item #6 - **B-038/21** Lot 17 according to Registered Plan 1246 and known as Municipal Number 2968 LANGLOIS AVE and 1070 NORTH SERVICE ROAD and will remove himself from the proceedings.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

Subject Lands: Part Lot 9 according to Registered Plan 864 and known as Municipal Number 1458 ST LUKE RD

Zoning: Residential RD1.3 and S 20(1) 194

RELIEF: Residential unit with reduced minimum parking

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Pam Breault, Agent
Fiona Coughlin, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Tom McMahon

That since applications A-058/21-A-061/21 by **HABITAT FOR HUMANITY**, known as Municipal Number **1458, 1464, 1470 1476 ST LUKE RD** they **BE CONSIDERED CONCURRENTLY** by the Committee for discussion only.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

DISCUSSION

Pam Breault, thanked City Administration and proceeded to give a presentation that outlines this application is part of the Ford City Community Improvement Plan and to revitalize the community. Part of this CIP provides a broader understanding for all those in attendance. The variance is minor, and has nothing to do with street parking and outlines that this has already been reviewed by the Transportation division.

Pam outlines Habitat for Humanity has partnered with the City of Windsor for those in need of housing, and the families that these homes are being built for are in dire need. A family that is waiting for a home has suffered a loss due to COVID. She emphasizes that these celebrations are of success and these ongoing projects with the support of the City is positive.

Mr. Sleiman asks about the side yard setbacks for the development and why a driveway is unable to achieve. Fiona identifies there is only 4 four feet on each side, the driveways are unachievable after a review and due to off-alley parking not allowed. She further indicates the drainage is in the middle of the street and more greenspace has been already provided to achieve this. Mr. Sleiman addressee's City Administration with respect to a cost savings. Ms. Breault outlines that is not a barrier, it is more for drainage concerns and there has been a significant meetings with the City to meet all the goals.

Mr. Sleiman asks Administration if this would be permitted if it was requested by another applicant other than Habitat. Ms. Gasic outlines all applications are based on individual merits, and that due to the areas of concerns for this application, the determined is based on the context, and this particular proposal is in alignment in the neighborhood and the minor variance.

Mr. McMahon asks if each home has 2 vehicles, would parking be a problem. Ms. Gasic, outlines that on-street parking is not an analysis based on the needs of the applicants and in this proposal administration followed the needs based on what the applicant's request. She outlines the complexity, and the City has recommended based on the criteria. One car is required for parking, but this may not be the case in this proposal and is above the requirements of the Zoning By-law. There is not a deficiency for this proposal only 4 are required.

Mr. Balsamo asked if there would be an impact on the development if driveways would be developed. Ms. Gasic outlines, this was not something that could be achieved, and in the City's review, it is not something that would be entertained or required based on previous outline of drainage needs.

Mr. Robertson, identifies to the Committee this submission is airing on the side of caution for the sewers and the rainwater runoff, the sewers are old in this area, and this site is handling its own rainwater onsite, and this is why the development has pushed back the homes for this purpose.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of storm water on the street or is it combined. Ms. Mills, outlines that typical streets have combined, on St. Luke there is only drainage that runs along the rear of the property in the alley, and the driveways are typically shared. She outlines that with this proposal, there could be an issue with flooding, however with a driveway surface there would be a required study. Ms. Mills has outlined all storm water will not be going overland, on the street or in the alley. Mr. Sleiman asks if there has ever been an application where there was no storm water management and have they been approved. Ms. Mills outlines due to the service area and the amount of lots, this is the only resolution for storm management. She agrees that this would be dealt with the same way, if there wouldn't be an impact on city streets with runoff water.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation.

Brian Chillman – Hearn Group

Mr. Chillman sent in a letter and is acting on behalf of the Hearn Group at 2280 Seminole. The business is a 24 hour operation that receives deliveries off St. Luke. His clients are in support of the commitment of Habitat, but has concerns with parking and the traffic. He outlines the truck drivers will have a hard time maneuvering into the location. Mr. Chillman asks if there is a way to do less intense development (3 lots) with parking as opposed to the 4 lots without parking, and his client is opposed to the development.

Mr. Sleiman asks Mr. Chillman of the distance from Seminole/St. Luke entrance to the storage/warehouse. Mr. Chillman was unsure. Mr. Sleiman has provided an overview that north on St. Luke, there are 400-500 feet with already on street parking. Asks if this would make a difference? Mr. Chillman says there will always be cars parked there, and turning into the gate would be even tighter.

Candice Kennedy – Habitat for Humanity (Miller Canfield LLP)

Ms. Kennedy provides a google map with a presentation and the entrance and outlines the opportunity is there for on-street parking, she outlines the assumptions that these objections are based only on an increase of traffic, and not all house owners may not even own vehicles or require parking considering the circumstances of these particular families

Mr. Balsamo addresses Administration with respect to the parking on the street and the change of sides each month, he asks if this was to change (the side parking) would this help. Ms. Toufeili outlines that for turning templates, and EMS vehicles, the no parking restriction would not be changed. Ms. Toufeili outlines that curb cuts would be reinstalled due to no driveways, and this will restore additional parking on St. Luke, and the spaces are sufficient and has been available for years. She outlines that parking would not be able to be moved based on setback requirements. She will look into a further consultation if required. Mr. Sleiman asks the applicant if the other houses were built by Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Coughlin outlines that the homes further down the street on St. Luke were built in 2008 and they have driveways, but this design is not allowed due to the new CIP for a more walkable community and safety. The recommendations that were provided included more front yard porches, and by doing this, the entrance ways have been changed and as an additional piece, the drainage issue needed to remove the driveways to retrieve the approval for the CIP.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of the gate and seems to be a distance from the subject property and asks if it would affect parking. Ms. Gasic, outlines she has measured the frontage of all 4 frontage and they are 36.8 meters which will allow 6.69 cars in those spaces. She feels there is enough space.

Moved by: Tom Mc Mahon

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be, and the same are hereby exempt from **Section 24.20.5.1** of Zoning By-law 8600, as amended, so as to permit, in a **Residential RD1.3 and S 20(1) 194 District**, Residential unit with reduced minimum parking, thereby providing and maintaining:

(a) 0 parking spaces.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

Subject Lands: Part Lot 8 according to Registered Plan 864 and known as Municipal Number 1464 ST LUKE RD

Zoning: Residential RD1.3 and S20 (1) 194

RELIEF: Residential unit with reduced minimum parking

INTERESTED PARTIES

Pam Breault, Agent
Fiona Coughlin, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Tom McMahon

That since applications A-058/21-A-061/21 by **HABITAT FOR HUMANITY**, known as Municipal Number **1458, 1464, 1470 1476 ST LUKE RD** they **BE CONSIDERED CONCURRENTLY** by the Committee for discussion only.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Pam Breault, thanked City Administration and proceeded to give a presentation that outlines this application is part of the Ford City Community Improvement Plan and to revitalize the community. Part of this CIP provides a broader understanding for all those in attendance. The variance is minor, and has nothing to do with street parking and outlines that this has already been reviewed by the Transportation division.

Pam outlines Habitat for Humanity has partnered with the City of Windsor for those in need of housing, and the families that these homes are being built for are in dire need. A family that is waiting for a home has suffered a loss due to COVID. She emphasizes that these celebrations are of success and these ongoing projects with the support of the City is positive.

Mr. Sleiman asks about the side yard setbacks for the development and why a driveway is unable to achieve. Fiona identifies there is only 4 four feet on each side, the driveways are unachievable after a review and due to off-alley parking not allowed. She further indicates the drainage is in the middle of the street and more greenspace has been already provided to achieve this. Mr. Sleiman addressee's City Administration with respect to a cost savings. Ms. Breault outlines that is not a barrier, it is more for drainage concerns and there has been a significant meetings with the City to meet all the goals.

Mr. Sleiman asks Administration if this would be permitted if it was requested by another applicant other than Habitat. Ms. Gasic outlines all applications are based on individual merits, and that due to the areas of concerns for this application, the determined is based on the context, and this particular proposal is in alignment in the neighborhood and the minor variance.

Mr. McMahon asks if each home has 2 vehicles, would parking be a problem. Ms. Gasic, outlines that on-street parking is not an analysis based on the needs of the applicants and in this proposal administration followed the needs based on what the applicant's request. She outlines the complexity, and the City has recommended based on the criteria. One car is required for parking, but this may not be the case in this proposal and is above the requirements of the Zoning By-law. There is not a deficiency for this proposal only 4 are required.

Mr. Balsamo asked if there would be an impact on the development if driveways would be developed. Ms. Gasic outlines, this was not something that could be achieved, and in the City's review, it is not something that would be entertained or required based on previous outline of drainage needs.

Mr. Robertson, identifies to the Committee this submission is airing on the side of caution for the sewers and the rainwater runoff, the sewers are old in this area, and this site is handling its own rainwater onsite, and this is why the development has pushed back the homes for this purpose.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of storm water on the street or is it combined. Ms. Mills, outlines that typical streets have combined, on St. Luke there is only drainage that runs along the rear of the property in the alley, and the driveways are typically shared. She outlines that with this proposal, there could be an issue with flooding, however with a driveway surface there would be a required study. Ms. Mills has outlined all storm water will not be going overland, on the street or in the alley. Mr. Sleiman asks if there has ever been an application where there was no storm water management and have they been approved. Ms. Mills outlines due to the service area and the amount of lots, this is the only resolution for storm management. She agrees that this would be dealt with the same way, if there wouldn't be an impact on city streets with runoff water.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation.

Brian Chillman – Hearn Group

Mr. Chillman sent in a letter and is acting on behalf of the Hearn Group at 2280 Seminole. The business is a 24 hour operation that receives deliveries off St. Luke. His clients are in support of the commitment of Habitat, but has concerns with parking and the traffic. He outlines the truck drivers will have a hard time maneuvering into the location. Mr. Chillman asks if there is a way to do less intense development (3 lots) with parking as opposed to the 4 lots without parking, and his client is opposed to the development.

Mr. Sleiman asks Mr. Chillman of the distance from Seminole/St. Luke entrance to the storage/warehouse. Mr. Chillman was unsure. Mr. Sleiman has provided an overview that north on St. Luke, there are 400-500 feet with already on street parking. Asks if this would make a difference? Mr. Chillman says there will always be cars parked there, and turning into the gate would be even tighter.

Candice Kennedy – Habitat for Humanity (Miller Canfield LLP)

Ms. Kennedy provides a google map with a presentation and the entrance and outlines the opportunity is there for on-street parking, she outlines the assumptions that these objections are based only on an increase of traffic, and not all house owners may not even own vehicles or require parking considering the circumstances of these particular families

Mr. Balsamo addresses Administration with respect to the parking on the street and the change of sides each month, he asks if this was to change (the side parking) would this help. Ms. Toufeili outlines that for turning templates, and EMS vehicles, the no parking restriction would not be changed. Ms. Toufeili outlines that curb cuts would be reinstalled due to no driveways, and this will restore additional parking on St. Luke, and the spaces are sufficient and has been available for years. She outlines that parking would not be able to be moved based on setback requirements. She will look into a further consultation if required. Mr. Sleiman asks the applicant if the other houses were built by Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Coughlin outlines that the homes further down the street on St. Luke were built in 2008 and they have driveways, but this design is not allowed due to the new CIP for a more walkable community and safety. The recommendations that were provided included more front yard porches, and by doing this, the entrance ways have been changed and as an additional piece, the drainage issue needed to remove the driveways to retrieve the approval for the CIP.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of the gate and seems to be a distance from the subject property and asks if it would affect parking. Ms. Gasic, outlines she has measured the frontage of all 4 frontage and they are 36.8 meters which will allow 6.69 cars in those spaces. She feels there is enough space.

Moved by: Tom Mc Mahon

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be, and the same are hereby exempt from **Section 24.20.5.1** of Zoning By-law 8600, as amended, so as to permit, in a **Residential RD1.3 and S 20(1) 194 District**, Residential unit with reduced minimum parking, thereby providing and maintaining:

(a) 0 parking spaces.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

Subject Lands: Lot 7 according to Registered Plan 864 and known as Municipal Number 1470 ST LUKE RD

Zoning: Residential RD1.3 and S20 (1) 194

RELIEF: Residential unit with reduced minimum parking

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Pam Breault, Agent
Fiona Coughlin, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Tom McMahon

That since applications A-058/21-A-061/21 by **HABITAT FOR HUMANITY**, known as Municipal Number **1458, 1464, 1470 1476 ST LUKE RD** they **BE CONSIDERED CONCURRENTLY** by the Committee for discussion only.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Pam Breault, thanked City Administration and proceeded to give a presentation that outlines this application is part of the Ford City Community Improvement Plan and to revitalize the community. Part of this CIP provides a broader understanding for all those in attendance. The variance is minor, and has nothing to do with street parking and outlines that this has already been reviewed by the Transportation division.

Pam outlines Habitat for Humanity has partnered with the City of Windsor for those in need of housing, and the families that these homes are being built for are in dire need. A family that is waiting for a home has suffered a loss due to COVID. She emphasizes that these celebrations are of success and these ongoing projects with the support of the City is positive.

Mr. Sleiman asks about the side yard setbacks for the development and why a driveway is unable to achieve. Fiona identifies there is only 4 four feet on each side, the driveways are unachievable after a review and due to off-alley parking not allowed. She further indicates the drainage is in the middle of the street and more greenspace has been already provided to achieve this. Mr. Sleiman addressee's City Administration with respect to a cost savings. Ms. Breault outlines that is not a barrier, it is more for drainage concerns and there has been a significant meetings with the City to meet all the goals.

Mr. Sleiman asks Administration if this would be permitted if it was requested by another applicant other than Habitat. Ms. Gasic outlines all applications are based on individual merits, and that due to the areas of concerns for this application, the determined is based on the context, and this particular proposal is in alignment in the neighborhood and the minor variance.

Mr. McMahon asks if each home has 2 vehicles, would parking be a problem. Ms. Gasic, outlines that on-street parking is not an analysis based on the needs of the applicants and in this proposal administration followed the needs based on what the applicant's request. She outlines the complexity, and the City has recommended based on the criteria. One car is required for parking, but this may not be the case in this proposal and is above the requirements of the Zoning By-law. There is not a deficiency for this proposal only 4 are required.

Mr. Balsamo asked if there would be an impact on the development if driveways would be developed. Ms. Gasic outlines, this was not something that could be achieved, and in the City's

review, it is not something that would be entertained or required based on previous outline of drainage needs.

Mr. Robertson, identifies to the Committee this submission is airing on the side of caution for the sewers and the rainwater runoff, the sewers are old in this area, and this site is handling its own rainwater onsite, and this is why the development has pushed back the homes for this purpose.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of storm water on the street or is it combined. Ms. Mills, outlines that typical streets have combined, on St. Luke there is only drainage that runs along the rear of the property in the alley, and the driveways are typically shared. She outlines that with this proposal, there could be an issue with flooding, however with a driveway surface there would be a required study. Ms. Mills has outlined all storm water will not be going overland, on the street or in the alley. Mr. Sleiman asks if there has ever been an application where there was no storm water management and have they been approved. Ms. Mills outlines due to the service area and the amount of lots, this is the only resolution for storm management. She agrees that this would be dealt with the same way, if there wouldn't be an impact on city streets with runoff water.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation.

Brian Chillman – Hearn Group

Mr. Chillman sent in a letter and is acting on behalf of the Hearn Group at 2280 Seminole. The business is a 24 hour operation that receives deliveries off St. Luke. His clients are in support of the commitment of Habitat, but has concerns with parking and the traffic. He outlines the truck drivers will have a hard time maneuvering into the location. Mr. Chillman asks if there is a way to do less intense development (3 lots) with parking as opposed to the 4 lots without parking, and his client is opposed to the development.

Mr. Sleiman asks Mr. Chillman of the distance from Seminole/St. Luke entrance to the storage/warehouse. Mr. Chillman was unsure. Mr. Sleiman has provided an overview that north on St. Luke, there are 400-500 feet with already on street parking. Asks if this would make a difference? Mr. Chillman says there will always be cars parked there, and turning into the gate would be even tighter.

Candice Kennedy – Habitat for Humanity (Miller Canfield LLP)

Ms. Kennedy provides a google map with a presentation and the entrance and outlines the opportunity is there for on-street parking, she outlines the assumptions that these objections are based only on an increase of traffic, and not all house owners may not even own vehicles or require parking considering the circumstances of these particular families

Mr. Balsamo addresses Administration with respect to the parking on the street and the change of sides each month, he asks if this was to change (the side parking) would this help. Ms. Toufeili outlines that for turning templates, and EMS vehicles, the no parking restriction would not be changed. Ms. Toufeili outlines that curb cuts would be reinstalled due to no driveways, and this will restore additional parking on St. Luke, and the spaces are sufficient and has been available for years. She outlines that parking would not be able to be moved based on setback requirements. She will look into a further consultation if required. Mr. Sleiman asks the applicant if the other houses were built by Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Coughlin outlines that the homes further down the street on St. Luke were built in 2008 and they have driveways, but this design is not allowed due to the new CIP for a more walkable community and safety. The recommendations that were provided included more front yard porches, and by doing this, the entrance ways have been changed and as an additional piece, the drainage issue needed to remove the driveways to retrieve the approval for the CIP.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of the gate and seems to be a distance from the subject property and asks if it would affect parking. Ms. Gasic, outlines she has measured the frontage of all 4 frontage and they are 36.8 meters which will allow 6.69 cars in those spaces. She feels there is enough space.

Moved by: Tom Mc Mahon

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be, and the same are hereby exempt from **Section 24.20.5.1** of Zoning By-law 8600, as amended, so as to permit, in a **Residential RD1.3 and S 20(1) 194 District**, Residential unit with reduced minimum parking, thereby providing and maintaining:

(a) 0 parking spaces.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

Subject Lands: Lot 6 according to Registered Plan 864 and known as Municipal Number 1476 ST LUKE RD

Zoning: Residential RD1.3 and S20 (1) 194

RELIEF: Residential unit with reduced minimum parking

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Pam Breault, Agent
Fiona Coughlin, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Tom McMahon

That since applications A-058/21-A-061/21 by **HABITAT FOR HUMANITY**, known as Municipal Number **1458, 1464, 1470 1476 ST LUKE RD** they **BE CONSIDERED CONCURRENTLY** by the Committee for discussion only.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Pam Breault, thanked City Administration and proceeded to give a presentation that outlines this application is part of the Ford City Community Improvement Plan and to revitalize the community. Part of this CIP provides a broader understanding for all those in attendance. The variance is minor, and has nothing to do with street parking and outlines that this has already been reviewed by the Transportation division.

Pam outlines Habitat for Humanity has partnered with the City of Windsor for those in need of housing, and the families that these homes are being built for are in dire need. A family that is waiting for a home has suffered a loss due to COVID. She emphasizes that these celebrations are of success and these ongoing projects with the support of the City is positive.

Mr. Sleiman asks about the side yard setbacks for the development and why a driveway is unable to achieve. Fiona identifies there is only 4 four feet on each side, the driveways are unachievable after a review and due to off-alley parking not allowed. She further indicates the drainage is in the middle of the street and more greenspace has been already provided to achieve this. Mr. Sleiman addressee's City Administration with respect to a cost savings. Ms. Breault outlines that is not a barrier, it is more for drainage concerns and there has been a significant meetings with the City to meet all the goals.

Mr. Sleiman asks Administration if this would be permitted if it was requested by another applicant other than Habitat. Ms. Gasic outlines all applications are based on individual merits, and that due to the areas of concerns for this application, the determined is based on the context, and this particular proposal is in alignment in the neighborhood and the minor variance.

Mr. McMahon asks if each home has 2 vehicles, would parking be a problem. Ms. Gasic, outlines that on-street parking is not an analysis based on the needs of the applicants and in this proposal administration followed the needs based on what the applicant's request. She outlines the complexity, and the City has recommended based on the criteria. One car is required for parking, but this may not be the case in this proposal and is above the requirements of the Zoning By-law. There is not a deficiency for this proposal only 4 are required.

Mr. Balsamo asked if there would be an impact on the development if driveways would be developed. Ms. Gasic outlines, this was not something that could be achieved, and in the City's review, it is not something that would be entertained or required based on previous outline of drainage needs.

Mr. Robertson, identifies to the Committee this submission is airing on the side of caution for the sewers and the rainwater runoff, the sewers are old in this area, and this site is handling its own rainwater onsite, and this is why the development has pushed back the homes for this purpose.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of storm water on the street or is it combined. Ms. Mills, outlines that typical streets have combined, on St. Luke there is only drainage that runs along the rear of the property in the alley, and the driveways are typically shared. She outlines that with this proposal, there could be an issue with flooding, however with a driveway surface there would be a required study. Ms. Mills has outlined all storm water will not be going overland, on the street or in the alley. Mr. Sleiman asks if there has ever been an application where there was no storm water management and have they been approved. Ms. Mills outlines due to the service area and the amount of lots, this is the only resolution for storm management. She agrees that this would be dealt with the same way, if there wouldn't be an impact on city streets with runoff water.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation.

Brian Chillman – Hearn Group

Mr. Chillman sent in a letter and is acting on behalf of the Hearn Group at 2280 Seminole. The business is a 24 hour operation that receives deliveries off St. Luke. His clients are in support of the commitment of Habitat, but has concerns with parking and the traffic. He outlines the truck drivers will have a hard time maneuvering into the location. Mr. Chillman asks if there is a way to do less intense development (3 lots) with parking as opposed to the 4 lots without parking, and his client is opposed to the development.

Mr. Sleiman asks Mr. Chillman of the distance from Seminole/St. Luke entrance to the storage/warehouse. Mr. Chillman was unsure. Mr. Sleiman has provided an overview that north on St. Luke, there are 400-500 feet with already on street parking. Asks if this would make a difference? Mr. Chillman says there will always be cars parked there, and turning into the gate would be even tighter.

Candice Kennedy – Habitat for Humanity (Miller Canfield LLP)

Ms. Kennedy provides a google map with a presentation and the entrance and outlines the opportunity is there for on-street parking, she outlines the assumptions that these objections are based only on an increase of traffic, and not all house owners may not even own vehicles or require parking considering the circumstances of these particular families

Mr. Balsamo addresses Administration with respect to the parking on the street and the change of sides each month, he asks if this was to change (the side parking) would this help. Ms. Toufeili outlines that for turning templates, and EMS vehicles, the no parking restriction would not be changed. Ms. Toufeili outlines that curb cuts would be reinstalled due to no driveways, and this will restore additional parking on St. Luke, and the spaces are sufficient and has been available for years. She outlines that parking would not be able to be moved based on setback requirements. She will look into a further consultation if required. Mr. Sleiman asks the applicant if the other houses were built by Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Coughlin outlines that the homes further down the street on St. Luke were built in 2008 and they have driveways, but this design is not allowed due to the new CIP for a more walkable community and safety. The recommendations that were provided included more front yard porches, and by doing this, the entrance ways have been changed and as an additional piece, the drainage issue needed to remove the driveways to retrieve the approval for the CIP.

Mr. Sleiman asks for confirmation of the gate and seems to be a distance from the subject property and asks if it would affect parking. Ms. Gasic, outlines she has measured the frontage of all 4 frontage and they are 36.8 meters which will allow 6.69 cars in those spaces. She feels there is enough space.

Moved by: Tom Mc Mahon

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be, and the same are hereby exempt from **Section 24.20.5.1** of Zoning By-law 8600, as amended, so as to permit, in a **Residential RD1.3 and S 20(1) 194 District**, Residential unit with reduced minimum parking, thereby providing and maintaining:

(a) 0 parking spaces.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): Kwamee Alfarani

Subject Lands: Lot 25 according to Registered Plan 50 and known as Municipal Number 1037 CALIFORNIA AVE

Zoning: Residential RD1.3

RELIEF: Construct an addition to existing single unit dwelling with reduced minimum lot area and minimum lot width

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Kawamee Alfarani, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Mr. Alfarani outlines he has purchased a 4 bedroom home with undesirable sizes. He would like to change the sizes of the bedrooms and requires a variance.

Mr. Balsamo, asks if it will still be a single family development or will it be a multi-rental. Mr. Alfarani outlines it will be for his family and there are 2 parking spaces off the alley to satisfy this.

Mr. Sleiman asks the applicant, that the building envelope has been chalked out, and if it is going to be wider? Mr. Alfarani indicates he is unsure of the question. Mr. Sleiman indicates on the righthand side there is a foot of the existing home, and is this going to be removed. Mr. Alfarani indicates he is following that drawing.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Tom McMahon

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be, and the same are hereby exempt from **Section 5.20.1.5, Section 10.3.5.1, and Section 10.3.5.2** of Zoning By-law 8600, as amended, so as to permit, in a **Residential RD1.3 District**, to construct an addition to existing single unit dwelling with reduced minimum lot area and minimum lot width, thereby providing and maintaining:

- (a) An addition to a single unit dwelling with an area of 250.8 square metres.
- (b) A lot width of 7.0 metres.
- (c) A lot area of 250.8 square metres

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): THE ESTATE OF MARY DANKO

Subject Lands: Lot 17 according to Registered Plan 1246 and known as Municipal Number 2968 LANGLOIS AVE and 1070 NORTH SERVICE ROAD

Zoning: Residential RD1.1

REQUEST: A consent for a Lot addition.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

George Zirokais, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Mr. Zirokais is in agreement with the report.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Tom McMahon

Seconded by: Mike Sleiman

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be and the same are hereby exempt from the provisions of Section 53 of the Planning Act, 1990, as amended, so as to permit in a **Residential RD1.1 District, the conveyance of said lands being particularly designated as Part ___ on Reference Plan 12R-___ for the purpose of a lot addition.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): 255 CABANA INC

Subject Lands: Part Lot 6 and Concession 4 and known as Municipal Number 255 CABANA RD E

Zoning: Residential RD1.4

REQUEST: To sever the southerly portion of the Lot for the purpose of creating a new Lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Applicants not in attendance.

Mr. Sleiman asks for the matter to be heard in the absence of the applicants.

Moved by: Tom McMahon
Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Sleiman asks Administration for an overview of the proposal.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Ms. Simon, outlines the applicant is seeking to create a new lot, and this is a large property. The north part went thru the zoning and has already been approved, and they would like to sever the southerly portion of the Lot. The applicant is aware of the reserved and will be required to remove this on title from the Land Registry office. This is for the construction of a single unit dwelling, thereby requesting the severance. The newly created lot comprises of excess land for the subject property. The owner will retain Part 2. The applications states that the proposed uses for both properties, retained and severed, will remain residential.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Tom McMahon

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be and the same are hereby exempt from the provisions of Section 53 of the Planning Act, 1990, as amended, so as to permit in a **Residential RD1.4 District, the conveyance of said lands being particularly designated as Part ___ on Reference Plan 12R-___ for the purpose of creating a new Lot.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): MOHAMMAD NASERIAN, SARA ETEMAD-RAD

Subject Lands: Part Lot 23 according to Registered Pan 1478 and known as Municipal Number 3911 ROSELAND DR W

Zoning: Residential RD1.4

REQUEST: The consent to sever the easterly portion of the Lot for a future dwelling.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mohammad Naserian, Owner
Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Ms. Pillon-Abbs agrees with the report.

Mr. Balsamo asks about the porch removal and where would it be relocated? Ms. Pillon-Abbs identifies it will be lowered or a landing to run parallel to the house, and due to the irregular side of the house, it will be removed and in compliance. If steps/ramp can't be reconfigured, they would come back to the committee.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation.

Kimberly Wolfe - represents a neighbor at 3229 Roseland drive, which is in opposition of the application due to safety of traffic view around the corner. She feels this is an obstruction and poses safety concerns at this intersection. Ms. Wolfe outlines the golf course down the street, and the traffic is substantial, and that offers an additional risk.

Carlo Cerroni - is speaking on behalf of 830 Kennedy Dr. W, directly across the street and would be filing an objection to the application. His concern is this lot is a feature to the neighborhood, they feel they haven't seen the building envelope, and the concern of unsightly views is possible with a new development. His concerns address wildlife in the area, and structures that would be unsightly. Mr. Cerroni, identifies the greenery that is current and the positive it has attributed to the neighborhood.

Jim Georgopoulos- owner of 820 Kennedy Dr. His concerns outlined the impact of a similar lot subdivision which happened recently at 365 Neal Blvd that in his opinion negatively impacted that neighborhood. He would like to propose that the property owners surrounding that address (365 Neal Blvd) be surveyed for insight as to how the new construction there has impacted them so that we may understand what the consequences of an almost identical situation are for the proposed subject lands. His other concern echoes Mr. Cerroni's concern.

Don Sinasac – owner of 3296 Roseland Dr. Outlines his objections in a letter previously sent. He feels the development is not compatible, and the orientation is not applicable. He disagrees with the Planner's report.

Mr. Balsamo outlines that the City Forester has commented, and would like to know his concerns. Ms. Gasic outlines Mr. Fediuk's comments with respect to the 15 trees surrounding the site, and pre-consultation will be required to preserve the trees when development is to commence, otherwise it will be null and void as part of the condition.

Ms. Wolfe, asks about any transportation studies based on the severance and the traffic issue.

Ms. Toufeili, Transportation Planning, outlines the stop-control intersection should not cause site-line specifics, however this application is only for severance currently, and when development comes forward, it would be discussed at such time. She encourages residence at the time of development to ask for a traffic study based on the development at such time.

Mr. Cerroni, responds to Mr. Balsamo's comments and the tree's and outlines they could be 100 years + and the roots underground, and would like to know how the root system wouldn't be interfered with at time of development if preserved. Ms. Gasic outlines the requirements will have to be satisfied by the City's Landscape Architect, and at such time the severance would be issued. At this time the conforming isn't applicable.

Mr. Sinasac asked if this meeting could be rescheduled based on the trees at a time the City Landscaper would be required and these are city trees, and the city would do it's due diligence. The Chair outlines the conditions is based on this matter, and the meeting can't be rescheduled, and the 3 conditions are applicable prior to granting the severance. Ms. Mills outlines that city trees are not allowed to be trimmed, and they should contact the City Parks Forestry department for maintenance, and the root system would identified at such time based on the foundation or building envelope at time of development.

Ms. Pillon-Abbs, confirms that the applicant is aware of the conditions, and is ready to work with the City Forester, and if alternations at time of building permit, would not have objections to preserving the trees.

Moved by: Tom Mc. Mahon

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED ON CONDITION** that the applicant(s) provide at their entire expense:

- I. That the existing porch either be removed or Minor Variance obtained for it;
- II. That the owner consults with the City Forester;
- III. That the owner removes the two existing driveways (a portion fronting the severed lot) and restore the Right-of-Way to City Standards.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be and the same are hereby exempt from the provisions of Section 53 of the Planning Act, 1990, as amended, so as to permit in a **Residential RD1.4 District, the conveyance of said land being particularly designated as Part __ on Reference Plan 12R-__ for the purpose of a Lot for future dwelling.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): ATWAN DEVELOPMENT INC.
Subject Lands: Part Closed Alley and Lots 13 and 14 according to Registered Plan 1160 and known as Municipal Number 2603 PILLETTE RD.
Zoning: Residential RD1.2
REQUEST: To sever the southerly portion of the lot for a future dwelling.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Vanessa Santos, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Ms. Santos is in agreement with the recommendations.

Mr. Sleiman, asks that she is aware of the conditions presented, and Ms. Santos confirms yes.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Tom McMahon

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED ON CONDITION** that the applicant(s) provide at their entire expense:

- I. That the existing sheds/ accessory structures be removed.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be and the same are hereby exempt from the provisions of Section 53 of the Planning Act, 1990, as amended, so as to permit in a **Residential RD1.2 District, for the conveyance of said lands being particularly designated as Part__ on Reference Plan 12R-__ for the purpose of creating a Lot for a future dwelling.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): 2757395 ONTARIO INC.

Subject Lands: Part Lot 8 and Lot 7 according to Registered Plan 333 and known as Municipal Number 364-374 OUELLETTE AVE

Zoning: Commercial CD3.1

RELIEF: Conversion of existing mixed commercial building into a combined use building with reduced minimum amenity space.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Motion to hear the application in the absence of the applicant.

Moved by: Joe Balsamo
Seconded by: Tom McMahon

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None to note

DISCUSSION

Ms. Simon provides an outlines the applicant is seeking the conversion of existing mixed commercial building into a combined use building with reduced amenity space. The property at 364-374 Ouellette Ave is known as Canada Building. The building was constructed in 1930 and at 12 stories high was the tallest building in Windsor at that time. In 2008, City Council approved the heritage designation. The owner plans to rehabilitate and convert the upper floors to residential units while the lower floor(s) remain as commercial units. Proposed alteration to the heritage building was reviewed by City Council. As per submission, the following amenity area is proposed on the lower level: a meeting room/events space (123 sqm) and a restaurant. The building is built to the property lines with no additional space for amenities. As per applicant, balconies and pool were considered. However, weight loading and age of the building were evaluated and the proposed balconies and pool to the top levels and due to the age of the building were not deemed feasible.

The Chair asks if there is public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo
Seconded by: Tom McMahon

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

AND IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the lands and premises above described be, and the same are hereby exempt from **Section 16.1.5.9** of Zoning By-law 8600, as amended, so as to permit, in a **Commercial CD3.1 District**, conversion of existing mixed commercial building into a combined use building with reduced amenity space, thereby providing and maintaining:

- (a) A minimum space area of 123.6 m²

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

After reviewing the draft minutes presented by the Secretary-Treasurer, it was

Moved by Joe Balsamo
Seconded by Tom McMahon,

That the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment Hearing held June 13, 2021 **BE ADOPTED.**

CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting accordingly adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Mike Sleiman, Chairperson

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer