REQUEST FOR DEFERRAL

Heritage Act Matter

Item 10.1 Walker Power Building, 325 Devonshire Road - Request for Heritage Designation (Ward 4)
   a) Kathleen Montello submitting the attached request for deferral dated May 5, 2020.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Planning Act Matters

Item 7.1 Zoning By-law Amendment - 930 Marion Ave; Applicant Berkshire 930 Marion Inc.
   a) The following area residents have submitted the attached emails as additional information:
      i. Conrad LaRue, dated May 1, 2020
      ii. Vera Colucci, dated May 6, 2020
      iii. Linda Donais, dated May 7, 2020
      iv. Amy Donais, dated May 7, 2020
      v. Kathleen Garber, dated May 7, 2020
      vi. Jonscot Gibbons, dated May 8, 2020
      vii. Calogero Maniscalco, dated May 8, 2020

Item 7.2 Rezoning - Borys Sozanski - 1035 California - Z-002/20 ZNG/6044 - Ward 2
   a) Ramsey and Nadine Kasey submitting the attached email dated May 5, 2020 as additional information.
   b) Barry Horrobin, Director of Planning & Physical Resources, Windsor Police Service submitting the attached email dated April 27, 2020 as additional information.

Item 7.3 Rezoning - Al Shipley - 955 California - Z-003/20 ZNG/6045 - Ward 2
   a) Kevin Flood submitting the attached letter and drawings dated May 8, 2020 as additional information.
   b) Barry Horrobin, Director of Planning & Physical Resources, Windsor Police Service submitting the attached email dated April 28, 2020 as additional information.
Heritage Act Matters
Item 10.1 Walker Power Building, 325 Devonshire Road - Request for Heritage Designation (Ward 4)
a) Administration submitting the attached additional information memo dated May 7, 2020.

Administrative Items
Item 11.1 Close & convey the east/west alley abutting 777 Vimy Avenue between Marentette Avenue and Louis Avenue, Applicant - K. Meagher, Ward 4
a) Ted & Kathy Potvin submitting the attached letter dated March 29, 2020 additional information.

DELEGATIONS:

Planning Act Matter
Item 7.1 Zoning By-law Amendment -930 Marion Ave; Applicant Berkshire 930 Marion Inc.
a) Tracy Pillon-Abbs, Principal Planner (available for questions)
b) LSTI Group representatives Mike Anobile, Italo Ferrari and Luciano Saraceno (available for questions)

Item 7.3 Rezoning - Al Shipley - 955 California - Z-003/20 ZNG/6045 - Ward 2
a) Al Shipley, applicant (available for questions)
b) Kevin Flood (available for questions)
I do not wish 930 Marion to be rezoned to residential. Hopefully it matters what the current residents want and some of my neighbours also wish to maintain what peace and quiet we have. We already have people going through our yards at night stealing things and leaving behind drug paraphernalia.

Amy Donais
Good afternoon Simona.

I am a concerned resident in very close proximity to the property at 930 Marion. I am contacting you because I would like more information on my appeal rights on the matter of the rezoning of the above mentioned property. The term "lodging house" in the proposed amendment has me quite nervous. I would not like it turned into another "hang out" ie new downtown mission, for the already over abundance of vagrants we have in the area caused by the street help center (hang out) located only blocks away from the property under review. Sorry to seem so harsh but having lived and worked in the area for over 20 years I have noticed a downward spiral in this neighborhood since the inclusion of the center and would not like it to get even worst with the wrong investment on this property. In closing is there any way of knowing who the applicant would be for this property what the intent of the property is or is this information kept tight lipped until construction would begin. Thank you for your time with in this regard.

Sincerely,
Conrad LaRue
Dear Beth / Simona-

Please let this email serve as my objection to the proposed plans for 930 Marion Avenue. I am the property owner at 979 Marion Avenue. I have lived at this address for 18+ years.

Since this property was sold, the owner has failed to maintain said property, only up until recently. The property was a home for drug sales and homeless groups living on the property. The owner did not physically maintain the building, grass, parking lot, etc. The Windsor Police service has been called numerous times and responded to neighbor complaints regarding this building. Its hard to imagine how an owner that cannot take care of a vacant structure is going to provide a suitable building for others to call home.

The owners neglect should speak volumes to his application. I understand you as a committee, were not aware of the conditions, continuous police activity, etc. Ironically, once the owner proposed his 3 options to the City, the property overnight was cleaned, grass cut and a fence completely securing the property.

Why was the property not secured since the owner purchased it?

I strongly disagree with the owners proposal to build a residential housing unit or what I am understanding from others, as a low income housing building NOT a senior residence or nursing home.

The sewers on Marion were built in 1910. Many homes in the 900 block of Marion already are experiencing sewer problems as a result of ancient infrastructure. I can only imagine backups will be worse.

In closing, there has been NO public presentation and or information given to residents pertaining to this project. All of our homes will be affected if this project moves forward. If a 3rd floor is built it will change the look of the charming neighborhood. It may block vantage points and or views from our homes.

I strongly urge you to deny the application until presentations and or meetings with the residents can occur.
In addition, the owner should be held accountable for his failure to maintain his property.

I think it's time we look at out of town investors, who fail to maintain their property and then are supported with grants and subsidies from the City and or Government.

Respectfully Submitted:

Jonscot Gibbons
Hello,

I missed the letter my neighbours got but I was told someone wants to rezone 930 Marion from Institutional to Residential.

I am against that. One more house would be one thing but a large building full of tenants would not be good for our neighbourhood.

I already have issues keeping my parking space as we are parking on the road. With lots of extra people, there would forever be people trying to find an extra parking space on the roads nearby, taking our spots every time we move.

There would be tons more people sharing the neighbourhood, lots more traffic. My kids play in the front yard and I don’t want them to be in danger of cars constantly using the roads (we are on Niagara, across from the buildings side).

It has worked well as a institutional building and I’d rather anything but a residential lot with tons of people.

I hope you will take this into consideration

Kathleen Garber

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Hello,

I missed the letter my neighbours got but I was told someone wants to rezone 930 Marion from Institutional to Residential.

I am against that. One more house would be one thing but a large building full of tenants would not be good for our neighbourhood.

I already have issues keeping my parking space as we are parking on the road. With lots of extra people, there would forever be people trying to find an extra parking space on the roads nearby, taking our spots every time we move.

There would be tons more people sharing the neighbourhood, lots more traffic. My kids play in the front yard and I don’t want them to be in danger of cars constantly using the roads (we are on Niagara, across from the buildings side).

It has worked well as a institutional building and I’d rather anything but a residential lot with tons of people.

I hope you will take this into consideration

Kathleen Garber

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Further to the notice received regarding the subject file and the meeting of the Development & Heritage Standing Committee on May 11, 2020, I object to the rezoning of 930 Marion to residential. Many of us have enjoyed for several years the peace and quiet of having no one live across the street from us. I feel it is unfair to expect us to go from that to several people living across the street with the resulting noise, mess, traffic and strain on the sewer system.

Thank you.

Linda Donais
From: Vera Colucci  
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2020 5:55 PM  
To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>  
Subject: Zoning By-Law 8600 File# ZNG/6011 Z-001/20

Dear Sirs/Madams,

I am writing in regards to 930 Marion Ave and the proposed development of 930 Marion.

I live at 983 Marion Ave. I am strongly opposed to the consideration of adding a third story to the existing building. This is a residential neighbourhood and such a large structure is undesirable for the visual look and of the feel of our community on this street. Our road is not very wide and an additional floor would loom large over the street and the houses across the street and even for the houses behind it would cut out light. Also by increasing the population of residents in that structure in a neighbourhood which is constantly dealing with lack of street parking is unacceptable. This additional floor will devalue our homes as well which is also unacceptable.

My hope is that it will be a nursing home as there is such a lack of beds for the elderly in this city. We already have a Retirement Home nearby so another one is not needed. As far as lodging???...not sure what that means, but if made into residential apartments my hope is that it would be mixed rental for the general public mixed with low income housing. I feel this is the best way to integrate all of the needs of the city.

Thank you for your time.

Vera Colucci
Dear Sir, please do not allow any uses of 930 Marion Ave. except for market rent apartments or condominiums. Thank you.

Sent from my iPad
Good morning;

We received a letter of notice attached below (file # ZNG/6044-Z-002/20).

We oppose this plan for the following:

- It would create a heavy traffic in this part of California ave. This avenue is already narrow enough to prevent fluent passage of vehicles in both directions.

- Another concern is about the parking spots on the street in case all units are occupied with too many families and car owners in a small area not enough distance from our place. This might necessitate parking in front of our property whether on the same side or the opposite side making the area packed with vehicles and congested traffic.

The above factors would impact the value of our property.

For your kind attention,

Thank you,

Ramsey Kasey, Nadine Kasey
1032/owners
Adam:

My comments for this application are as follows. Note that I would have raised the concerns mentioned in my remarks at the pre-submission stage but have no record of receiving the pre-submission information pertaining to this particular application.

The Windsor Police Service does not support the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-Law due to concerns of a public safety nature that may further impact the surrounding neighbourhood, where a tangible quantity of incidents of crime and disorder already exist.

The proposal to demolish the existing single unit dwelling and replace it with something much larger and with considerably more occupants, mirrors a pattern that has been taking place in both the 900 and 1000 blocks of California Avenue for a number of years now. The numerous conversions that have increased onsite densities over the years within this neighbourhood have presumably been directed at providing rental accommodation opportunities for University students. However the cumulative effect of all these conversions seems to have consequences in terms of the quantity and nature of incidents police must regularly respond to and resolve. Since 2015, this single block of California has averaged 43 incidents annually requiring the response and intervention of the Windsor Police Service. This figure is well above average compared to a typical city block of residences. We provided similar reasoning to back up our concerns with previous applications within this same neighbourhood in years past.

While it is acknowledged the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) encourages residential intensification, there is presumably a limit that every neighbourhood reaches when such intensification is no longer beneficial (a so called “social carrying capacity”). The police crime and disorder data suggests that limit has been reached. The PPS also states in Policy 1.1.1[c] that “Healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by: Avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns.” Related to the issue of intensification, is
the total number of bedrooms to be built. The application calls for a double duplex dwelling and if each unit has between 3 and 4 bedrooms each, this would translate into 12 to 16 persons living on the property with only a few parking spaces provided. This seems to represent intensification of the subject property that is significantly beyond what is reasonable.

Collectively, the aforementioned issues are reasons why we are unable to support the application.

Respectfully,

Barry Horrobin, B.A., M.A., CLEP, CMM-III
Director of Planning & Physical Resources
WINDSOR POLICE SERVICE

[Image: logo]

Advanced Certified Law Enforcement Planner

From: Szymczak, Adam <aszymczak@citywindsor.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 8:47 AM
To: Horrobin, Barry <bhorrobin@windsorpolice.ca>
Subject: Fw: LIAISON: Z 002/20 - BORYS SOZANSKI - 1035 CALIFORNIA AVE.

Good Afternoon,

Please provide comments to Adam Szymczak at aszymczak@citywindsor.ca no later than March 31, 2020.

Regards,

Ashley D'Alessandro | Senior Clerk Steno
May 8, 2020

To Councillor Rino Bortolin (Chairperson) & councillors C. Holt, E. Sleiman, J. Morrison

Re: May 11, 2020 Development & Heritage Standing Committee Meeting
- 955 California Council report S67/2020

I am a proponent of controlled gentrification and quality safe homes with proper outdoor amenities for tenants. Respectfully, due to the pandemic there appears to be a lack of oversite by City Departments. No comments from: Chief Building Official, Site Plan Approval Officer etcetera (Council report, page 113/200), and Windsor Police.

Respectfully variance relief should be withheld for the following reasons.

**50% Lot Coverage of a gross 7,539 square feet**
The remaining lot area of 3,769 sq. ft. will be too small to offer appropriate private tenant amenity areas and lack enough area to plant deciduous trees to protect citizens from the urban heat island effects, especially considering the front and rear parking requested.

All calculations are in square feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain lot area</td>
<td>3,770.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Yard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbing (side yards)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front curb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway (width of rear yard parking)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walkway (to rear door from parking)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway (sidewalk to front door)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap parking spot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parking spot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side yards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway from to bring garbage pails to curb on California. (approximate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garbage Storage</strong> (approximate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycle Storage</strong> (approximate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,074.40

Therefore private amenity area and area to plant deciduous trees is only 1,074 square feet.
**1.2 meters (4’) Side Yard Width**
The lack of privacy and fire security.

**Parking In the Front Yard**
Limited area to plant trees.

**2 Meters From Parking To Building Wall**
A completely unacceptable safety risk: If a pickup were to back into the rear yard parking, the box and tailpipe would cantilever over the curb by three feet. Exhaust (carbon monoxide) would be captured by the porches.

Page 9 of 11: “Clause f) reduces the minimum separation between the building wall and the rear parking area. This is partially because the adjacent alley has a width of only 4.5 m (15 feet) and Section 25.5.50.3 requires a minimum parking aisle width of 6.0 m. Section 25.5.50 allows a parking aisle (an aisle that provides access to parking spaces) to be located with an alley. The 1.5 m difference in width shall be made up on the subject parcel. The reduction in parking area separation allows for proper access to the parking spaces.”

I have been able to safely deal with the 15’ alley. See attached image of 909-11-13-15-17 California.

**Not mentioned in the report:**
Curbing for the parking lot.
Paving the alley to eliminate dust and noise. This was a requirement for my 2004 project.
Proper full cut-off rear yard security lighting. Page 99 of 220. The applicant proposes that the university lighting will help make the development secure. Lighting is not supposed to drift from one property to another.
Lastly the height of building is not given.

We as developers and landlords need to consider the future needs of our City.
I am available by phone on Monday if required. 519-796-6040

Sincerely,

____________________________________
Kevin Flood

Cc: Barry Horrobin
Cc: Adam Szymczak
Adam:

My comments for this application are as follows. Note that I would have raised the concerns mentioned in my remarks at the pre-submission stage but have no record of receiving the pre-submission information pertaining to this particular application.

The Windsor Police Service does not support the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-Law due to concerns of a public safety nature that may further impact the surrounding neighbourhood, where a tangible quantity of incidents of crime and disorder already exist.

The proposal to demolish the small, existing single unit dwelling and replace it with something substantially larger on the same site and with considerably more occupants, mirrors a pattern that has been taking place in both the 900 and 1000 blocks of California Avenue for a number of years now. The numerous conversions that have increased onsite densities over the years within this neighbourhood have presumably been directed at providing rental accommodation opportunities for University students. However the cumulative effect of all these conversions seems to have consequences in terms of the quantity and nature of incidents police must regularly respond to and resolve. Since 2015, this single block of California has averaged 27 incidents annually requiring the response and intervention of the Windsor Police Service. This figure is well above average compared to a typical city block of residences. We provided similar reasoning to back up our concerns with previous applications within this same neighbourhood in years past.

While it is acknowledged the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) encourages residential intensification, there is presumably a limit that every neighbourhood reaches when such intensification is no longer beneficial or situationally appropriate (a so called “social carrying capacity”), particularly when the long term social health of the neighbourhood comes into question because of it. The police crime and disorder data suggests that limit has been reached. The PPS also states in Policy 1.1.1[c] that “Healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by: Avoiding
development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns.” Of noted importance and in direct correlation to the issue of intensification, is the total number of bedrooms to be created with the newly built structure. The application calls for a multiple residential dwelling with six (6) dwelling units – a significant increase over what exists on the site now. If each unit has between 3 and 4 bedrooms each, this would translate into 18 to 24 persons living on the property where previously just a single unit home with 3-4 bedrooms existed previously. The fact only eight (8) onsite parking spaces will be provided is anticipated to be problematic, particularly since parking complaints are already an issue in this neighbourhood.

Additionally besides seeking a Zoning By-Law amendment, the applicant also requires a number of variances relating to reduced parking area separation, reduced side yard width, maximum lot coverage, etc. These are indicators the magnitude of the application is too great for the site. In general, the application seems to represent intensification of the subject property that is significantly beyond what is reasonable and appropriate for the neighbourhood.

Collectively, the aforementioned issues are reasons why we are unable to support the application.

Respectfully,

Barry Horrobin, B.A., M.A., CLEP, CMM-III
Director of Planning & Physical Resources
WINDSOR POLICE SERVICE

Advanced Certified Law Enforcement Planner

From: Szymczak, Adam <aszymczak@citywindsor.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 9:16 AM
To: Horrobin, Barry <bhorrobin@windsorpolice.ca>
Subject: Fw: Agenda Items - May Development & Heritage Standing Committee meeting

Per your email.

Adam
From: D’Alessandro, Ashley  
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 3:07 PM  
To: planningdept  
Cc: Szymczak, Adam  
Subject: RE: Agenda Items - May Development & Heritage Standing Committee meeting

Hi Val,

I have attached the documents Barry has asked for. Sorry I missed your call.

Thanks,

Ashley

From: planningdept <planningdept@citywindsor.ca>  
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 2:57 PM  
To: Szymczak, Adam <aszymczak@citywindsor.ca>; Simion, Simona <ssimion@citywindsor.ca>  
Cc: D’Alessandro, Ashley <adalessandro@citywindsor.ca>  
Subject: FW: Agenda Items - May Development & Heritage Standing Committee meeting

Hi Guys:

This email came in the Planning Department Inbox. I am forwarding this to Adam S. I am hoping he receives this but I Barry did not forward the liaison sheets or any sketches pertaining to the applications below. Simona or Ashley do you have these and could one of you forward them to Adam S. Thanks from Val. :)

Valerie Jarison  
Secretary, Administrative Support Staff  

Planning & Building Department  
Planning Division  
350 City Hall Square  
Second Floor, Suite 210  
Windsor, ON  N9A 6S1  
Phone: 519-255-6543, ext. 6863  
Fax: 519-255-6544  
vjarison@citywindsor.ca  
www.citywindsor.ca
I have received a response from Simona on this request but not Adam and I am not sure he is getting his emails. Can someone please forward the liaison sheets and any sketches for the following applications:

1. 1035 California (Z-002/20) – Adam
2. 955 California (-003/20) – Adam

Thank you,

Barry Horrobin, B.A., M.A., CLEP, CMM-III
Director of Planning & Physical Resources
WINDSOR POLICE SERVICE

Advanced Certified Law Enforcement Planner

Adam and Simona:

I noticed from the recent posting in the Windsor Star for the agenda items for the May meeting of the DHSC that the applications listed include the following:

1. 930 Marion Avenue (Z-001/20) – Simona
2. 1035 California (Z-002/20) – Adam
3. 955 California (-003/20) – Adam

I cannot locate anything in my files indicating that I commented on these 3 applications. Did either of you receive anything from me as I do not recall them being circularized per the usual process? Can you advise and if you did not get anything from me, can you have the particulars forwarded by email so that I can submit my remarks?

Thanks,
Barry Horrobin, B.A., M.A., CLEP, CMM-III
Director of Planning & Physical Resources
WINDSOR POLICE SERVICE

Advanced Certified Law Enforcement Planner
Good Afternoon Beth,

I am not available May 11th. Can you please request a deferral and give me the next two dates the committee will meet so that I can ensure that my calendar is clear? In the meantime, I will communicate with my clients and the representatives of the City regarding the remaining outstanding issues to see if we can come to agreement.

Thank you,
Kathleen
Kathleen M. Montello
Montello Law Professional Corporation
2510 Ouellette Avenue
Suite 102
Windsor, Ontario
N8X 1L4

Telephone: (519) 966-9668
Facsimile: (519) 966-0651

This communication including any information transmitted with it is intended only for the use of the addressees and is confidential. If you are not an intended recipient or responsible for delivering the message to an intended recipient, any review, disclosure, conversion to hard copy, dissemination, reproduction or other use of any part of this communication is strictly prohibited, as is the taking or omitting of any action in reliance upon this communication. If you receive this communication in error or without authorization please notify us immediately by return e-mail or otherwise and permanently delete the entire communication from any computer, disk drive, or other storage medium.
TO: Development and Heritage Standing Committee, and Members of Council  
FROM: Kristina Tang, Heritage Planner  
DATE: May 7, 2020  
SUBJECT: Additional Memorandum concerning Communication with Proponent with regards to Heritage Designation Request of Walker Power Building, 325 Devonshire Road Item 10.1

The request for heritage designation was first communicated with the Owners in the summer of 2019 during the development review process for the Walker Power Building. Several meetings and email correspondence took place in 2019 in attempts to alleviate the Owner’s concerns/reservations to the recommendation for heritage designation. Further, in September 2019, the draft heritage designation bylaw’s physical heritage attributes (ie. Elements that would become protected and regulated upon designation) were shared with the Owner in order to facilitate conversations or discussions about designation specifics. Neither the Owner nor representatives responded with interest to further discussion.

Subsequently, Report S 178/2019 Walker Power Building, 325 Devonshire Road - Request for Heritage Designation, was first scheduled for the Development and Heritage Standing Committee (DHSC) Jan 13, 2020 Meeting Agenda. Ms. Kathleen Montello, Solicitor representing The Walker Power Building Inc., had submitted a letter (dated Jan 4, 2020) to Heritage Committee outlining objections to the Designation. Ms Montello was present at the Jan 13, 2020 meeting and after some back-and-forth deliberations, ultimately requested for a deferral of the agenda item. At her request, Committee passed the motion:

“THAT the report of the Heritage Planner dated December 16, 2019 entitled Walker Power Building, 325 Devonshire Road-Request for Heritage Designation (Ward 4) BE DEFERRED to a future meeting of the Development and Heritage Standing Committee to allow for administration to meet with the applicant to discuss the effects of the Heritage Designation on development plans. Carried.”

A meeting took place with Administration on Jan 15, 2020 to discuss a number of outstanding issues with the property/development. At the meeting, Administration asked Ms. Montello again if she wanted to meet further about the heritage designation to discuss tweaks to the proposed heritage designation by-law, or if there were specific items that her clients disagreed about in the by-law. Because Ms Montello expressed no further desire to engage on the topic of heritage designation, no further meetings were schedule for or requested concerning this topic.

Item S178/2019 was subsequently placed on the agenda for DHSC March 9, 2020 meeting. However, Ms Montello requested for deferral again through email on March 4, 2020, citing her potential unavailability and that the easement and insurance issues were still in progress. Heritage Committee agreed to the deferral request.

The latest request for deferral has been received by Clerks on May 6th, also via email from Ms. Montello, citing her unavailability for the May 11, 2020 DHSC meeting.
March 29, 2020

Re: S36/2020

Objection to closure of alley 700 block of Vimy, Windsor, ON

I was contacted by Christopher Aspila for the City planning department on Friday March 27 about the closure of the alley at our home at 723 Vimy. I want to strongly object to this closure.

We have lived at 723 Vimy for 35 years and use the alley daily. The permitted garage was built in 1990 and my vehicle is parked in the garage and used every day. This is a well maintained heated and air conditioned garage with an alarm system and a surveillance system. This garage was permitted as a usable garage with alley access for a vehicle when it was built.

I have maintained the alley since the garage was built. I trim overhanging branches and maintain any weeds or grass not cut by the other residences. I have purchased a large walked behind snow blower that I use to clear the alley after any snowfall. I have on several occasions brought in loads of gravel to maintain a level driving surface for my vehicle.

As stated this alley is used daily, sometimes several times daily and it is vital that it remain open.

Please feel free to contact me at 519-xxx-xxxx if you need more information or want to come and inspect the property.

Thank you,

Ted Potvin
Owner 723 Vimy Ave, Windsor