ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Item 7.2 Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, 9725 Riverside Drive, south west intersection of Riverside Drive and Martinique Avenue, east of Mountbatten Crescent (Ward 7)
-City Engineer submitting the attached memo dated February 13, 2017 as additional information.
-written submissions (attached) received from the following:
  - Residents of Mountbatten (dated December 3, 2013)
  - Mario & Cathy Favero
  - William & Marilyn MacMillan
  - Dianne Ball
  - Anthony & Jennifer Beck
  - Marsha Campbell
  - June Carroll
  - Edward Hebert
  - Tom & Geri Cross
  - John & Lorraine McGregor
  - Pat & Anne Hull
  - Joan Bagaria
  - John Gauthier
  - Edie Curtin, Essex Condominium Corporation No. 37
  - Linda Reaume
  - Sue & Alice Docherty
  - Helen Wade
  - Alex Bruce
  - Virginia & Barry Smith
  - Katherine & John Moroun

Item 7.4 Draft Plan of Subdivision Application, 1903269 Ontario Ltd., located south of the east/west section of Maquire Street, east of Howard Avenue (Ward 9)
-George Bragianis, resident of Ward 9 submitting the attached diagram & map of the area in question
-Tim Byrne, Director of Watershed Management Services, ERCA submitting the attached e-mail dated February 13, 2017 as additional information.

Item 11.4 Amendment to Sign By-law 250-2004 for 29 Entertainment Group Inc.
-Mike Sassine submitting the attached e-mail dated February 9, 2017 as additional information.
DELEGATIONS:

Planning Act Matters

Item 7.4 Draft Plan of Subdivision Application, 1903269 Ontario Ltd., located south of the east/west section of Maguire Street, east of Howard Avenue (Ward 9)
- Karl Tanner, Dillon Consulting Ltd. and Gord Wonsch, owner
- Ilias Kiritsis, Solicitor and George Bragianis, resident of Ward 9

Item 7.2 Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, 9725 Riverside Drive, south west intersection of Riverside Drive and Martinique Avenue, east of Mountbatten Crescent (Ward 7)
- Ed and Sue Grimmett, resident of Ward 7
- Glenn Stannard, resident of Ward 7
- P. John Moroun, resident of Ward 7
- Helen Wade, resident of Ward 7
- Edie Curtin, representing Essex Condominium Corporation No. 37

Administrative Items (5 minute maximum)

Item 11.3 Application by the owner of 3340 Bloomfield Road for an exemption from Demolition Control By-law and an application for Financial Incentives under the Sandwich CIP (Ward 2)
- Matt Buschman, President, Buschante Development Group Corp. (available for questions)

Item 11.4 Amendment to Sign By-law 250-2004 for 29 Entertainment Group Inc. (Ward 3)
- Mike Sassine, representing 29 Entertainment Group Inc.
The proposed subdivision is being designed in order to ensure that the existing community will not be adversely affected by its construction. Notably, stormwater runoff for the new development will be completely isolated from the existing infrastructure in the area, as it will outlet directly to the Detroit River. Connection to municipal infrastructure to support the new development will consist of a new sanitary sewer outletting to Martinique Avenue. Sanitary and stormwater flows will be completely separated within the new subdivision, and measures will be employed during design and construction to ensure sanitary infrastructure is isolated in order to prevent stormwater infiltration.

Mark Winterton
City Engineer and Corporate Leader
Environmental Protection and Transportation
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

CITY OF WINDSOR
Office of the City Solicitor – Real Estate Division
400 City Hall Square East, Suite 201
Windsor, Ontario N9A 7K6

Attention: Mr. Michael Stamp
Mr. Frank Scarfone

RE: Development Design for Phase 2 of the Mountbatten Crescent-Martinique Development

Dear Messrs. Stamp and Scarfone:

Recently, the area residents of Martinique, Menard and Mountbatten had the opportunity to attend an information Open House on Thursday, November 17, 2013 hosted by representatives of the City of Windsor. During the session, two proposed subdivision designs were outlined and discussed with the participants. In short, Proposal “A” had the roadway exiting onto Martinique within the middle of the development. Proposal “B” was an exit design to Martinique at the south end of the new development.

The presenters were looking for comments and suggestions regarding Proposal “A” and Proposal “B”. At that time, it was the opinion of the majority of the Mountbatten Crescent residents that Proposal “A” might be the favoured design for a variety of reasons over Proposal “B”.

This letter mainly deals with the issue of subdivision roadway design. Many neighbours have already individually expressed opinions relative to maintaining the construction standards (the same as the first phase agreements). In addition, there have been some varying opinions regarding the type of housing on Martinique.

Since the Information Open House, the Mountbatten Crescent neighbours have explored several possibilities to ensure the most effective design is achieved for all concerned, both present and future residents in the subdivision. It is the opinion of the Mountbatten residents that a third subdivision proposal should be considered and ultimately examined and approved.

The new proposal, hereafter referred to as Proposal “C”, a copy of which is attached hereto, would have the existing Mountbatten Crescent roadway becoming a continuous “U” with a new roadway exiting in a northerly direction through the parking lot to Riverside Drive. This would simply relocate the existing entrance to the former water treatment facility a short distance east, thereby allowing the new Mountbatten residents access to and from Riverside Drive. This design has many benefits for all residents in the immediate area.
There are many other streets on the east side of Windsor exiting to Riverside Drive. In this new subdivision not only would there be a direct entrance and exit to the subdivision, it is believed the traffic flow for the most part would be restricted to persons residing or visiting the old and new Mountbatten area. In addition, the exiting of traffic to Riverside Drive will address the concerns of the residents on Martinique regarding increased traffic exiting and entering their street due to the subdivision.

Both proposal "A" and "B" could see an increase in traffic from Wyandotte to Martinique and into the new subdivision. During the Open House this was a concern of the neighbours on Martinique. The new proposal would greatly diminish the traffic flow with the two entrances and exits to and from the interior of the subdivision from Riverside Drive.

Another benefit to the City of Windsor is that with the design of the interior of the new area entering and exiting from Riverside Drive there would be no restrictions to the immediate sale and future construction of the units facing Martinique. The only question then becomes will those units be single family dwelling units or town homes to match the current homes on Martinique.

The opinion of the current Mountbatten Crescent neighbours is that Proposal "C" will reduce unnecessary traffic within the area. It will reduce any opportunity for traffic to cut through from Mountbatten Crescent to Martinique, thereby maintaining the current safety aspects on the Mountbatten roadway.

In addition the below signed neighbours are also requesting a temporary closing of the existing Mountbatten Crescent at the extreme south end during the housing construction phase. The purpose for the closure will be to ensure all construction vehicles utilize the new roadway into the phase 2 area. The purpose for this request is the desire of the residents to maintain normal traffic on the street during the construction. In addition another reason are the obvious safety concerns for the residents and in particular the children and grandchildren in the neighbourhood.

The signatures below represent 95% of the current Mountbatten Crescent land owners who support Proposal "C" as outlined above.

We, the Mountbatten residents, await your valued feedback.

Very truly yours,

RESIDENTS OF MOUNTBATTEN CRESCENT

Glenn Linoa Stannard  431 Mountbatten Cres
Linda Stannard

Liz Mammarella  Liz Mammarella  461 Mountbatten Cres

Address

Address
Continued signing page for proposal 02 Mountbatten Crescent

473 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

446 Mountbatten
Address

437 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

434 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

455 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

428 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

443 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

422 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

467 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

407 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

440 Mountbatten Cres.
Address

425 Mountbatten
Address
Continued signing page for proposal C... Mountbatten Crescent

Helen Kersey

419 Mountbatten Crescent
Address

James Pender

413 Mountbatten Crescent
Address

Sandra

409 Mountbatten Crescent
Address

Margaret Hall

407 Mountbatten Crescent
Address

Angela Chatilacari

410 Mountbatten Crescent
Address

Shirley Alexander

452 Mountbatten Crescent
Address

Amel Fait

479 Mountbatten Crescent
Address

Address

Address

Address

Address

Address

Address
NOTES

1) With the closing of the previous entrance to the plant, parking spots could be made (making parking even with new entry & loss of parking space).

2) No road required to exit to Martinique & possibility of more lots in development.

3) With straight-through road improved emergency access.
---Original Message-----
From: cathy favero
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 3:02 PM
To: Abbs, James
Cc: Kusmierczyk, Irek
Subject: Planning, Heritage & Economic standing Committee Mtg

Mr. Abbs,
We recently received a notice of a public meeting being held on Monday, Feb. 13 @ 4:30 pm to approve a plan of subdivision regarding file zng /3525 & sdn/5038. Since we cannot attend the meeting we wish to include these concerns as our written submission to the application by the Planning, Heritage and Economic Standing Committee.

a). What has the city of Windsor done to address the serious sewage backup issues we have on Mountbatten Cres and east Riverside area when we experience heavy rains? Before proceeding with further burdening an already overtaxed sewage infrastructure with more development this needs to be dealt with satisfactorily. We prefer that this land be kept as green space to help alleviate the serious flooding issue in this area and feel that ERCA should have made this recommendation knowing full well the history of flooding in this area. We strongly feel it should not go ahead without the city first solving the sewer backup problem.

B). If this plan is approved, we strongly propose that the Mountbatten extension have its own entry from Riverside Dr. at the Ganatchio Trail. This would reduce added traffic on our street and benefit the new residents by giving them their own entry and exit and more importantly allowing emergency vehicles better accessibility. At the public meeting a few months ago, one of the city planners stated that by not opening up access at Riverside Dr. additional parking spots would be available for patrons of Lilly Kazilly or users of the Ganatchio Trail. Why would we, who live here and pay exorbitant taxes to the city precisely for the privilege of living at this location, have fewer rights than the occasional visitor who may or may not make use of the parking spots. We believe our voices need to be heard. There is already a ton of parking.

Thank you,
Mario & Cathy Favero
425 Mountbatten Cres.

Sent from my iPad
To: Irek

Regarding:

The proposals for the building of 19 homes on Mountbatten and the construction of 5 blocks of condominiums on the west side of Martinique.

To be reviewed at city council Monday February 13th at council chambers, 350 City hall Square at 4:30 PM

We, the residents of Vanderbilt Crescent strongly object to any additional building of any housing units in this area.

Currently, the poor design of the sanitary and storm sewer system (the systems deadhead on Vanderbilt, Sand Point, and Mountbatten) when combined with a moderate to heavy rainfall causes the storm systems to overflow, co-mingle with the sanitary systems, and end up entering people’s basements causing millions of dollars of property damage.

Any additional building would just add to this problem and further tax a sanitary and storm system that is already inadequate.

Having said this, we strongly object to any additional development unless actions are taken beforehand to less any risks.

One such action is to join / couple the Vanderbilt sewers to Martinique at a secondary point (west side of Vanderbilt where the emergency roadway exists) so that the system is not deadheaded on this street. This is just one action and we are sure that there are others that could be employed or undertaken.

We are 44 families on Vanderbilt and another 28 families on Sand Point, as well as many more on Mountbatten.

From: Dianne Ball
Sent: February 1, 2017 7:57 PM
To: Kusmierczyk, Irek
Subject: Sewer system....Vanderbilt

To: Irek

Regarding:

The proposals for the building of 19 homes on Mountbatten and the construction of 5 blocks of condominiums on the west side of Martinique.

To be reviewed at city council Monday February 13th at council chambers, 350 City hall Square at 4:30 PM

We, the residents of Vanderbilt Crescent strongly object to any additional building of any housing units in this area.

Currently, the poor design of the sanitary and storm sewer system (the systems deadhead on Vanderbilt, Sand Point, and Mountbatten) when combined with a moderate to heavy rainfall causes the storm systems to overflow, co-mingle with the sanitary systems, and end up entering people’s basements causing millions of dollars of property damage.

Any additional building would just add to this problem and further tax a sanitary and storm system that is already inadequate.

Having said this, we strongly object to any additional development unless actions are taken beforehand to less any risks.

One such action is to join / couple the Vanderbilt sewers to Martinique at a secondary point (west side of Vanderbilt where the emergency roadway exists) so that the system is not deadheaded on this street. This is just one action and we are sure that there are others that could be employed or undertaken.

We are 44 families on Vanderbilt and another 28 families on Sand Point, as well as many more on Mountbatten.

Signed:

Vanderbilt Crescent residents
From: jenbeck
Sent: February 2, 2017 2:26 PM
To: Kusmierczyk, Irek
Subject: Proposal of new building

Regarding the proposal for the building of 19 homes on Mountbatten and the construction of 5 blocks of condominiums on the west side of Martinique to be reviewed at city council on Monday February 13 at 4.30 in council chambers. We, the residents of Vanderbilt Crescent strongly object to any additional building of housing units in this area. Currently, the poor design of the sanitary and storm sewer system, when combined with moderate to heavy rainfall causes the storm systems to overflow, co-mingle with the sanitary systems and end up entering people's basements causing millions of dollars of property damage, not to mention that we have problems with insuring these homes, which makes the situation even more stressful. Any additional building would just add to this problem and further tax a sanitary and storm system that is already inadequate. Having said this, we strongly object to additional development unless actions are taken beforehand to lessen the risk. One such action is to join/couple the Vanderbilt sewers to Martinique at a secondary point (west side of Vanderbilt where the emergency roadway exists) so that the system is not deadheaded on this street. This is just one action and we are sure that there are others that could be employed or undertaken. We are 44 families on Vanderbilt and another 28 families on Sand Point as well as many more on Mountbatten. For the City to ignore these concerns could be putting them at risk for a class action suit at some point. Unfortunately, we will not be able to attend the meeting as my husband has just been released from hospital and has a follow up appointment that afternoon which cannot be missed.

Regards
Anthony & Jennifer Beck
483 Vanderbilt Crescent

Sent from my iPad
From: Marsha Campbell  
Sent: February 2, 2017 3:03 PM  
To: Kusmierczyk, Irek  
Subject: Proposal for building of homes on Mountbatten and five blocks of condos on west side Martinique

City Council meeting Monday February 13th at 4:30pm

Dear Sir,

I, along with other residents of Vanderbilt Crescent strongly object to any additional building of any housing units in this area

Currently, the poor design of the sanitary and storm sewer system (the systems deadhead on Vanderbilt, Sand Point and Mountbatten) when combined with a moderate to heavy rainfall causes the storm systems to overflow, co-mingle with the sanitary systems, and end up entering people's basements causing millions of dollars of property damage.

Any additional building would just add to this problem and further tax a sanitary and storm system that is already inadequate.

Having said this, we strongly object to any additional development unless actions are taken beforehand to less any risks.

One such action is to join/couple the Vanderbilt sewers to Martinique at a secondary point (west side of Vanderbilt where the emergency roadway exists) so that the system is not deadheaded on this street. This is just one action and we are sure that there are others that could be employed or undertaken.

We are 44 families on Vanderbilt and another 28 families on Sand Point, as well as many more on Mountbatten.

Sincerely,

Marsha Campbell  
Vanderbilt Crescent resident
From: June Carroll  
Sent: February 8, 2017 9:56 AM  
To: Kusmierczyk, Irek  
Subject: FLOODS

I was a victim of the flood in 2010 and again in September. In 2010 the sewers couldn't handle the water and again in September the water was too much for our existing system to handle. Now with additional developments on the drawing board, what is the city doing to handle the water of existing taxpayers?

Windsor taxes are higher than any other municipality in Essex county. What is the city doing to accommodate current taxpayers before adding more households to an existing situation?

June Carroll,
Dear Sir: I am in complete agreement with the suggestion contained in the attachment to this e-mail. The flooding on this street has cost me considerable sums and given the cost of owning and paying taxes on this property seems totally unwarranted.

Your truly: Edward Herbert

On Wednesday, February 1, 2017 10:26 AM, Paradigm Property Management <paradigm@bell.net> wrote:

Dear Vanderbilt resident:

Residents on the west side of Vanderbilt have been advised via notice of a meeting on Monday February 13th, at 4.30 PM in council chambers, at city hall.

The purpose is to discuss a proposed development of housing units along the west side of Martinique and the extension of Mountbatten Crescent.

The proposal will add approximately 50 units to our area. There is a detailed blueprint that was issued to west side residents.

We already have issues with sanitary and storm sewer overflow and the addition of any significant number of units just makes this problem worse

We have attached a note that should go to our councilman Irek Kusmierczyk so that he is advised of our objections.

The board urges 2 things:

1) Please attend the meeting so that you can voice your objections in person
2) Please forward the attachment included here to Irek Kusmierczyk (irek@citywindsor.ca) so that he further understands our issues with this development

Please – by sending notes to Irek, we have made our concerns known and can quote these concerns if further problems arise. By doing nothing, we send a message that all is OK and there are no problems.

So – we urge all residents to send notes to the councilman so that he can also advocate on our behalf.

Thanks,

Vanderbilt Board
February 1st, 2017
To: Irek

Regarding:

The proposals for the building of 19 homes on Mountbatten and the construction of 5 blocks of condominiums on the west side of Martinique.

To be reviewed at city council Monday February 13th at council chambers, 350 City hall Square at 4:30 PM

We, the residents of Vanderbilt Crescent strongly object to any additional building of any housing units in this area.

Currently, the poor design of the sanitary and storm sewer system (the systems deadhead on Vanderbilt, Sand Point, and Mountbatten) when combined with a moderate to heavy rainfall causes the storm systems to overflow, co-mingle with the sanitary systems, and end up entering people’s basements causing millions of dollars of property damage.

Any additional building would just add to this problem and further tax a sanitary and storm system that is already inadequate.

Having said this, we strongly object to any additional development unless actions are taken beforehand to less any risks.

One such action is to join / couple the Vanderbilt sewers to Martinique at a secondary point (west side of Vanderbilt where the emergency roadway exists) so that the system is not deadheaded on this street. This is just one action and we are sure that there are others that could be employed or undertaken.

We are 44 families on Vanderbilt and another 28 families on Sand Point, as well as many more on Mountbatten.

Signed:

Tom & Geri Cross

Vanderbilt Crescent residents
From: L McGregor  
Sent: February 3, 2017 11:53 AM  
To: Kusmierczyk, Irek  
Subject: New development proposals for Martinique and Mountbatten

My husband and I purchased our home at 485 Vanderbilt Crescent in July, 2014. Prior to that, we were unaware of the flood and ensuing damage that occurred here in 2010. Being very concerned about future flood damage, we contacted the City and arranged for a backup sewer valve (through the City’s financial subsidy program). In addition, we also installed a second sump pump as a backup to our main one. We felt fairly secure, that is, until the flood in September, 2016 which, according to some owners, caused more damage than the one in 2010.

Now, every time we get a moderate to heavy rainfall, I go downstairs to check the sump pump pit to ensure it doesn’t overflow. I honestly don’t know what I could do if it did. I’m a senior in my 70’s and, due to a fall last summer, had to undergo hip replacement. In addition, my husband is terminally ill with cancer and is in no shape to help me do much of anything now. The point is that we shouldn’t have to live in fear every time we get a moderate to heavy rain, just because our sanitary/storm system is unable to deal with increased capacity, a capacity which is not only related to climate change, but also to increased population in the area. To add even more housing in this area without addressing this deficiency is, in my opinion, reckless. You are not only exposing existing area residents to repeated flooding and associated damage, but the new proposed subdivision as well. That is not only unfair to these new homeowners but to those of us who have already settled here. You can expect property values to most assuredly be impacted (negatively) by this deficiency as well.

There is only one logical solution. Fix the design and capability of the existing sanitary/storm system before entertaining any new development in the area.

Respectfully submitted

John and Lorraine McGregor
Irek

My husband and I are owners at 488 Vanderbilt Cr. and share a townhouse with Virginia and Barry Smith. They are kindly keeping us informed ... and after reading their letter to you, we wanted to add our voice, and concern about the proposed project. We also experienced significant damage in the 2010 flood, and as we were in the United States at the time, were not there to immediately contact a restoration company, which compounded the problem.

This September we were at home, and even though we have two sump pumps which functioned perfectly, there was still water that came in to our lower level. With the assistance of friends we were able to prevent damage, where others could not.

In our opinion there should not be any further development on Martinique, or Mountbatten Streets without addressing the inadequacy of the sewer system.

Thank you Irek,

Pat and Anne Hull
From: Joan E Bagaria  
Sent: February 8, 2017 7:07 PM  
To: Kusmierekzyk, Irek  
Subject: Proposed development on Martinque.

My home runs alongside Martinque, their backyard and my side yard are adjacent to one another, separated by a "ditch" supposedly to drain excess water down to Riverside Drive.

I would estimate that Martinque condos are approximately 5 feet higher than my property which drains into the "ditch" causing water to overflow on my property.

I have flooded three separate times and no longer have the use of my basement as a living area.

I strongly oppose any new homes being added to our existing sewer system.

I would also like to know why the "fire road" Vanderbilt Cr and Martinique is not an actual road with additional sewage drainage.

I have installed two new sumps pumps, overflow valves, etc., in an attempt to protect my property, but I still live in dread every time it rains.

One flood to go through is difficult. I have been through 3 which I swear is a nightmare!

Joan E. Bagaria
To: City Council; City of Windsor

My name is John Gauthier, the registered owner of 446 Martinique. I strongly oppose the proposed development by the City regarding the Mount Batten extension and egress to Martinique. Firstly, the traffic is bad enough as it is, with people cutting from Riverside Dr. to Wyandotte St. East on Martinique. This new development will increase traffic tremendously and what will happen to on street parking on Martinique for owners and guests? The cul de sac on Mount Batten, I thought was contrary to the fire departments thinking on dead end streets; all other condominium projects have their own access to Riverside Dr. Finally, I was one of the flooded units on Martinique and am afraid that further highly dense residential construction will only add to the possibilities of further catastrophic flooding. I hope that you take this, and I am sure others who have raised objectives, into consideration when making your decision.

Sincerely,
John Gauthier
Essex Condominium Corporation No. 37

Ms. Anna Ciaccielli  
Supervisor of Council Services  
350 City Hall Square West, Room 203  
Windsor, ON  
N9A 6S1  
clerks@citywindsor.ca

Mr. Jim Abbs  
Planner III Subdivisions  
jabbs@citywindsor.ca

February 9, 2017

FILE: ZP/12739 ZB/11534  
RE: Proposed Rezoning and Draft Plan of Subdivision, 9725 Riverside Drive, south west intersection of Riverside Drive and Martinique Ave., east of Mountbatten Cres. (Ward 7).

Dear Ms. Ciaccielli and Mr. Abbs:

I am the representative for Essex Condo Corp No. 37 and Treasurer of the Board. Our Corporation is comprised of 44 town homes, 34 of which are on Martinique, opposite the proposed development and the other 10 are on Menard, south of the development. We would like to present at the meeting on Monday and I will speak on behalf of the Condo Corp. The following are our concerns:

1. Due to the recent flooding of a number of Condo Units on Martinique we are concerned and would like to be made aware of infrastructure reports concerning storm & sanitary sewer connection points and their capacity. We are interested to know if the City plans on making connections at all 3 locations, Mountbatten Cres., Martinique Ave. and Riverside Dr. or do they plan to make sewer connections at only one or two of the above mentioned locations? We are concerned about connection patterns that may have a detrimental effect on the Martinique sewer and storm water capacity. This in fact will lead to more flooding in areas on Martinique Ave. We do understand that the flooding was a "once in a 100 year occurrence"; however, the flooding has occurred twice in the last seven years. This does not give our residents confidence in the 100 year study. The best practice for new subdivisions usually incorporates provisions for containment and control of increased storm water runoff on site and within the subdivision, e.g. A retention pond. This subdivision plan makes no such allowance. We have been informed about the possibility that this subdivision may have its own storm water outlet using the lake outlet connection left over from the former town of Tecumseh Water Treatment Plant; however, no detailed storm water management infrastructure report exists at this time to confirm this. If the City plans to start installing the necessary infrastructure for this subdivision in the Spring of 2017 would it not seem logical that these studies would have been completed and available now?
2. Living on Martinique Ave. I see the very constant, busy traffic pattern. Not only is it for cars, but it is a school bus route and one of the few North/South direct through streets from Wyandotte to Riverside Drive. It also has no stop signs as on Riverdale. I have heard the argument that 19 new homes and 20 condos will not make a difference; however, most residents agree that construction, buses and the increase in population will greatly affect the quality of life for the residents in a mainly retirement area. The majority of residents on Martinique and the Condo Units favour a Riverside Drive entrance as proposed by the Mountbatten group and do not want an entrance on Martinique. The residents are very well aware of the Ganatcho Trail and are appreciative to have such a wonderful path. The safety of walkers, runners and users of the path would not be impacted by an additional entrance on Riverside Drive in our opinion.

3. By parceling out the property there will not be an overall plan to afford continuity to the look of the project. In essence different developers could put up 3 or 4 different types of town homes on the same block. That is the concern on Martinique.

In summary Essex Condo Corporation No. 37 is concerned about

1. Flooding
2. New entrance on Martinique which will result in major traffic and construction concerns.
3. Consistency and continuity in design.

It is therefore recommended by ECC # 37 that this application be deferred until such time when detailed infrastructure reports and storm water management designs are complete.

Sincerely

Edie (Edith) Curtin
Treasuer ECC # 37
From: linda
Sent: February 8, 2017 12:25 PM
To: Kusmierczyk, Irek
Subject: Proposed development of approximately 50 units along the west side of Martinique and the extension of Mountbatten Crescent

Good Afternoon Irek:

My e-mail is in regard to the proposed development of approximately 50 units along the west side of Martinique and the extension of Mountbatten Crescent. I have been flooded in 2010 and then again in September of 2016, not only water but raw sewage also in September. Many units on our street were flooded and some having raw sewage also. Many of our residents installed the back water valve after the 2010 flood, but the water for many of the residents had water and raw sewage coming out of the drain in the most recent flood in September. My flooding was not due to a sump pump not working, as the pump was working overtime while submersed in water and did not stop working. The addition of 50 units in our area would compound our problem as we already have issues with sanitary and storm sewer overflow. Adding more housing units in close proximity to the Vanderbilt Crescent would just make this problem worse.

Please make our concerns known and if problems arise our concerns can be heard.

Thank you.

Linda C. Reaume
From: Sue Docherty
Sent: February 8, 2017 3:09 PM
To: Kusmierczyk, Irek
Subject: Petition Against Build of New homes/condos on Mountbatten and Martinique

Irek,
Attached please find a petition against the actions defined above and for discussion on Feb 13/17.
I have included the name of my mother who is my next door neighbour with her permission. We find it reprehensible that any consideration is given to expanding the sewer usage without addressing the capacity issues. Both my mother and myself flooded in Sept 2016 and I also flooded in 2010.
Thanks for your attention to this matter.

Sue Docherty
Alice Docherty
To those it may concern,

After very careful consideration, I have concluded that the people on Mountbatten are right in requesting that the road from the new subdivision exit onto Riverside Drive rather than onto Martinique at all. The old road is already there, with an existing exit. Could this be redesigned or moved somewhat further east to accommodate the new traffic? This would contain traffic without adding to Martinique’s. As per Proposal C, it looks like a easier design to implement as well. I am an avid user of the Ganatchio Trail but would not be inconvenienced excessively by construction as there is plenty of room in the large parking lot as a temporary detour.

Martinique Avenue is already a unique street, one we sought out for retirement in a wonderfully quiet area. It gets traffic from Wyandotte and Riverside Drive and gives us access readily. There are already streets exiting onto it and I fear that the extra traffic from the subdivision will overextend its functional capacity. I am particularly worried if Proposal A is implemented as extensive traffic will empty directly toward our front yards, into the area where Martinique Avenue flooded. We are worried about additional flooding if the road is built here since the six condos most affected were also the ones that flooded on September 29, 2016. I believe they are at a lower elevation which could affect the new road. If the road is built higher, we could get additional flooding. When I ride my bike from the trail, I can take my feet off the pedals and coast to the last condo which flooded. (446) We also view this exit as a safety issue from both the perspective of traffic on Martinique Avenue and fire truck access to the new residents. To us, the city’s first proposal with the exit at the green space would make much more sense, being safer and more convenient for everyone if the city will not consider the Mountbatten proposal (Proposal B).

I would rather have a reservoir or retention pond as an alternate solution as I believe we don’t have enough sewer capacity to support over thirty new residences. I realize that our flooding issue was due to the deluge of rain and may never happen again but I remember the "big" flood of the seventies in this area and know that with global warming more weather events will occur.

Thank-you for your attention.
Helen Wade
From: Helen Wade
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 12:37 PM
To: Toldo, Beth; clerks; Winters, Patrick; Winterton, Mark
Subject: Peche Island Shores, Phase 11 and road to Martinique Avenu
P.S. Further to the letter below, recently sent, I have attached the Proposals to which I refer in case the names (A, B, C) have changed since last fall. I have included photos of each area.
1. The Martinique green space between condos 458 and 464 (Proposal B).
2. The existing road to the subdivision. (Proposal C).
3. Flooding at 444 Martinique. (Extended to Condos 436, 438, 440, 442, 444, 446)
4. The proposed road entrance at condos 440, 442. (Proposal A).

Thanks,
Helen Wade
Good Morning,

I am sending the full submission prepared for the meeting this afternoon which contains the points I and my neighbours wish to cover, especially concerning Proposal A. They have asked me to represent them as they are the most affected by this plan. This covers condos 436, 438, 440, 442, 444 and 446. I will attempt to shorten this significantly for the meeting. You may also make this part of the public record.

Sincerely,
Helen Wade

Peche Island Shores, Phase 11

and road to Martinique Avenue.

Where should the road go?

Road to Riverside- YES!  Road To Condo- NO!

Good afternoon to all of you at City Hall who have taken the time to listen to us today. To the people of Mountbatten and Martinique and others, thanks for your support.

I am representing my husband and myself from Condo 444 on Martinique Avenue, as well as the neighbours, six of us in a row who all flooded on Sept. 29, 2016, the very spot that you have indicated that the road from the subdivision should exit. The families in Condos 436, 438, 440, 442 and 446 have all requested that I speak on their behalf. Two of these families are new to Martinique Avenue and others were unable to attend the last meeting in June. My husband and I were attending our granddaughter’s wedding in Lincoln, Nebraska and therefore unable to be there. We are all united in asking the city to join the Mountbatten folk and Martinique Condo Association in endorsing Proposal C.  (Photo of condos)

For clarification, the proposals I will refer to are as follows:

Proposal C as the road to Riverside Drive, containing the new subdivision.

Proposal B as the road to the Martinique green space between condos 458 and 464.

Proposal A as the road to the flooded condos, the proposed road entrance at condos 440 and 442, affecting all six units who flooded- these condos and two on either side. (436, 438, 440, 442, 444, 446).  (Photos of Proposal C)
First of all, I want to say that after very careful consideration, I have concluded that the proposal favoured by the residents of Mountbatten, as well as the condo association, is the right one, in requesting that the road from the new subdivision exit onto Riverside Drive rather than onto Martinique at all. I understand why it is a concern to the city both because of another exit to Riverside Drive as well as the Ganatchio Trail and the loss of parking spaces BUT a precedent has been set. The old road is already there, with an existing exit to Riverside Drive. Could this be redesigned or moved somewhat further east to accommodate the new traffic? This would contain Mountbatten traffic within the development without adding to Martinique's. It would be consistent with the existing streets. As per Proposal C, it looks like a easier design to implement as well. I am an avid user of the Ganatchio Trail but would not be inconvenienced excessively by construction as there is plenty of room in the large parking lot as a temporary detour. Even in the busy summer, I have never seen the parking lot entirely full. I think we could sacrifice a few spaces to keep the estimated 40 or 50 vehicles per day from exiting onto Martinique. I strongly endorse Proposal C. (Photo of Proposal C road to Riverside Drive, cul de sac + bike & dog)

Now let's look at:

Proposal A- SAFETY and Traffic.

Safety is a huge Issue for seniors. It will become a hazard for those who will have to back out from their garages into 3-way traffic, some directly into the proposed roadway entrance. Some are memory-impaired or physically handicapped which would make it potentially more dangerous. It appears that the road will come directly to the garages of Units 440 and 442 and be wide enough to spill over onto Units 438 and 444, while presenting difficulties for Units 436 and 446. Remember, those are the exact condos that flooded. This is a new development since the June meeting and so may not have been considered. To contain this 4-way traffic, are you prepared to put in stop signs or a light? This would greatly impede the flow of all traffic on a fairly short block. (Photo of garages).

Martinique Avenue is already a unique street, one we sought out for retirement in a wonderfully beautiful area of East Riverside. It gets drive-through traffic from Wyandotte and Riverside Drive but also gives us access readily. There are already streets exiting onto it and I fear that the extra traffic from the subdivision will overextend its functional capacity. I am particularly worried if Proposal A is implemented as extensive traffic from the subdivision will empty directly toward our front yards. We are worried about additional flooding if the road is built here since the six condos most affected were the ones that flooded. I believe they are at a lower elevation which could affect the new road. When I ride my bike from the trail, I can take my feet off the pedals and coast to the last condo which flooded- Unit 446). If the road is built higher, will we be more prone to flooding? (Photo of Proposal A +bike).

Emergency Services- It will be more difficult for fire trucks and other emergency vehicles to wind through the subdivision than to follow the direction of all the other near exits to Riverside Drive. Therefore, we view this exit as a safety issue from both the perspective of traffic on Martinique Avenue and fire, police and ambulance access to the new residents.

Flooding Issue- The six condos which flooded on September 29, 2016 were all in a row- Units 436, 438, 440, 442, 444, 446. I realize that this major storm was unprecedented but global warming could and I believe will
cause flooding more often. Remember Riverside Drive and our entire area beyond Jarvis Street being flooded in the seventies-1978 I think. The city took action- we now have berms and the Ganatchio Trail for which we are very thankful.

(Photos of our flooded condos).

Sewers, Infrastructure

are not able to support existing homes, not only on Martinique and surrounding streets but especially Blue Heron Pointe and most of Tecumseh. Otherwise, why would 6,000 people be looking for drywallers at the same time? At the ward 7 meeting on October 7, I listened to our mayor, Drew Dilkens, and well as our city councillor, Irek Kusmierczyk discuss these flooding issues. I realize the deluge of September 29 was unprecedented and why the Little River Plant was overburdened. I heard about the costs of new infrastructure but was very saddened to hear that raw sewage, although chlorinated, had to be flushed into our Little River. I’m asking the engineers and city planners to correct this situation before any new homes are built and before the inevitable flooding happens again.

I know we have two lakes in the city already but I witnessed firsthand the extensive flooding and devastation in Blue Heron Point and area. Perhaps we need to consider another reservoir rather than flushing raw sewage into Lake St. Clair, the source of our drinking water. Might a reservoir or retention pond serve as an alternate solution to our flooding problems? Are 37 residences more important than our health? Toronto is converting park lands into retention ponds. Why couldn’t we? Please either fix the sewer problem before putting in the subdivision or consider the proposed site as a retention pond or reservoir to be ready for the next thrust of global warming. Look at all the flooding, not only in North America but all over the world. I am sincerely thankful that our homes and cars are not floating into the lake. Let’s get prepared! (photos- Blue Heron + flooding in area.)

Then of course we need to look at practical issues for those of us involved with the potential road to our condos. The many cars who would use this route morning and evening will likely shine their lights directly into my bedroom window. I ask you, would you want your tranquil bedroom all of a sudden and forever to be invaded by car lights and noise? Our property values may be reduced or at least make our condos more undesirable and therefore harder to sell. Coincidentally, two of the six families potentially involved with the road, sold their condos just before the flood, leaving new owners with the both the flooding and road headaches. This also meant that they did not have a chance to speak to this issue when it was discussed in June.

Lastly, it makes no sense. This will be a total inconvenience and cause us unnecessary stress, becoming a quality of life issue.

(Photos of condo, Bob and big bin.)

Walk with me from the proposed road (A), south past 5 condos. Behold! An open green space- no condos, a straight run through from Mountbatten. This was your priority but became Proposal B. Your own assessment of traffic considerations states minor cut-through traffic potential. Proposal C should be your obvious choice. If, after serious introspection and all the facts before you, you decide that Proposal C cannot be considered, then please go back to your first proposal and look at Proposal B, the green space on Martinique Avenue between
units 458 and 464. There would be no people backing out of garages into other 3-way traffic, therefore much less of a safety issue. Emergency services would have a straight run. And possible higher ground might even alleviate flooding problems. (Photos of green space)

In closing, I ask you kindly to please make the road to Riverside Drive your first choice. It’s easy, switch C to A and you have the best order to consider. Thank-you.

C  B  A

Proposal C becomes the correct plan. Be clever. Concentrate on it.

Proposal B is your back-up plan. The green space remains so be sure that drivers don’t fear crashing into a condo or garage as they slide on ice in the winter.

Proposal A - assign it to the recycle bin. Assume it is the least acceptable of all. It definitely does not rate an “A” grade. C= Correct  B= Back-up  A= Annihilate it!
To: Irek

Regarding:

The proposals for the building of 19 homes on Mountbatten and the construction of 5 blocks of condominiums on the west side of Martinique.

To be reviewed at city council Monday February 13th at council chambers, 350 City hall Square at 4:30 PM

We, the residents of Vanderbilt Crescent strongly object to any additional building of any housing units in this area.

Currently, the poor design of the sanitary and storm sewer system (the systems deadhead on Vanderbilt, Sand Point, and Mountbatten) when combined with a moderate to heavy rainfall causes the storm systems to overflow, co-mingle with the sanitary systems, and end up entering people’s basements causing millions of dollars of property damage.

Any additional building would just add to this problem and further tax a sanitary and storm system that is already inadequate.

Having said this, we strongly object to any additional development unless actions are taken beforehand to less any risks.

One such action is to join / couple the Vanderbilt sewers to Martinique at a secondary point (west side of Vanderbilt where the emergency roadway exists) so that the system is not deadheaded on this street. This is just one action and we are sure that there are others that could be employed or undertaken.

We are 44 families on Vanderbilt and another 28 families on Sand Point, as well as many more on Mountbatten.

Signed:

Vanderbilt Crescent residents
Irek

We experienced a disastrous flood in 2010, after which we repaired and replaced everything in the basement. It was a very costly insurance claim. We then invested in all the recommended upgrades to prevent this from happening again. It was all inspected by the city building department. In September 2016 the next flood came and we again experienced water back up.

We were fortunately home and we bailed water for 5 hours to prevent it from spreading throughout the basement. We are in our mid 70’s and it was very strenuous work for us. We enjoy our home, but we fear the next flood. We may not be home for the next one or we may not be physically able to deal with it. Our equipment including our sump pump worked but we had a small fountain from our floor drain.

The sewers do not seem to be able to handle the large rainfalls that we are experiencing with are changing climate. Some residents no longer qualify for insurance or have very reduced coverage because they have had more than one flood. The value of our homes will decrease if we continue to experience flooding.

We ask that a sewer improvement be implemented before further building takes place on Martinique and Mountbatten streets. We feel a new subdivision will put further load on an already failing system. The pumping stations do not seem to be able to handle the load during a heavy rainfall.

Thank you

Virginia and Barry Smith
490 Vanderbilt Crescent
We are forwarding the attached note to confirm that we agree with the sentiments set out in it.

To: Irek

Regarding:

The proposals for the building of 19 homes on Mountbatten and the construction of 5 blocks of condominiums on the west side of Martinique.

To be reviewed at city council Monday February 13th at council chambers, 350 City hall Square at 4:30 PM

We, the residents of Vanderbilt Crescent strongly object to any additional building of any housing units in this area.

Currently, the poor design of the sanitary and storm sewer system (the systems deadhead on Vanderbilt, Sand Point, and Mountbatten) when combined with a moderate to heavy rainfall causes the storm systems to overflow, co-mingle with the sanitary systems, and end up entering people’s basements causing millions of dollars of property damage.

Any additional building would just add to this problem and further tax a sanitary and storm system that is already inadequate.

Having said this, we strongly object to any additional development unless actions are taken beforehand to less any risks.

One such action is to join / couple the Vanderbilt sewers to Martinique at a secondary point (west side of Vanderbilt where the emergency roadway exists) so that the system is not deadheaded on this street. This is just one action and we are sure that there are others that could be employed or undertaken.

We are 44 families on Vanderbilt and another 28 families on Sand Point, as well as many more on Mountbatten.

Signed:

Vanderbilt Crescent residents
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Gentlemen- We were circulated this development proposal in December of 2014.

We responded in January of 2015. We advised to defer until an EIA was completed as there is Natural Heritage coverage on this property and on neighboring lands.

In conjunction with our recommendation and advice to the City MMA and MNRF in early 2015 both advised of concerns with Endangered Species and that prior to proceeding with a plan of subdivision an Environmental Impact Assessment needs to be completed. MNRF has provided a Letter of Advice on Endangered Species however local Natural Heritage issues are still outstanding.

We also expressed a concern for water resource issues relative to both stormwater Quality and Quantity. These issues are in full agreement with Public Works for this site.

We are very concerned that there is no reference to our comments as these are matters fully within our portfolio and the comments were provided more than a year in advance of the meeting this afternoon.

Mike and I have provided an additional letter on this matter which is appended for your information and action.

Tim BYRNE, c.e.t
Director, Watershed Management Services
Essex Region Conservation Authority
360 Fairview Avenue West, Suite 311 • Essex, Ontario • N8M 1Y6
P. 519-776-5209 x 350 • F. 519-776-8688
tbyrne@erca.org
www.essexregionconservation.ca

Please consider the environment before printing this email. This e-mail transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the express use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us by telephone at the number above and arrange to return this transmission to us or destroy it.

Follow us on Twitter: @essexregionca
February 10, 2017

Mr. Jim Abbs, Senior Planner
City of Windsor
Suite 404, 400 City Hall Square East
Windsor, ON N9A 7K6

Dear Mr. Abbs:

RE: Notice of Public Meeting to Consider Draft Plan of Subdivision SDN-004-14 [SDN-4277]
Draft Plan of Subdivision - 1903269 Ontario Ltd.: ARN 373907009003851, PIN: 015615055
Applicant: 1903269 Ontario Limited

The following is provided for your information and consideration as a result of our review of Notice of Public Meeting to Consider Draft Plan of Subdivision SDN-004-14 [SDN-4277]. We note that we previously provided comments on the draft plan of subdivision on January 20, 2015 (attached). We would like to reiterate our comments and provide some additional context.

1. Water Resources Management. As the watershed based resource management agency, we offered comments that we were concerned with the potential impact of the quality and quantity of runoff in the downstream watercourse due to future development of this site. We provided these comments to the City with knowledge that there are drainage concerns in this vicinity. Our concerns and recommendation were not incorporated into the conditions of approval outlined in Report # S 21/2017. We request that the Planning, Heritage & Economic Standing Committee revise the recommendation 1 (f) in the report to reflect the need for a detailed servicing study report on the impact of the increased flow to the existing municipal sewer systems to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Essex Region Conservation Authority. In addition, the detailed servicing study report should address the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff.

Further, that recommendation 1 (f) ii be revised to: The study shall be finalized to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Essex Region Conservation Authority. ERCA staff would be pleased to work with the City Engineer to coordinate our requirements and review of this subdivision.

2. Natural Heritage. We are concerned that our recommendations for the completion of an Environmental Impact Assessment for the subject development were not incorporated or mentioned in the planning report S 21/2017. Our comments recommended that an EIA study be completed as part of the application for draft plan of subdivision. These comments were provided as part of our role as advisor to the City of Windsor on natural heritage planning matters. It is our recommendation that an EIA study is required to be completed in advance of this application being approved to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014.
Mr. Abbs
February 10, 2017

Specifically, the presence of the natural heritage feature on the southern portion of the subject property has not been evaluated through an environmental study, consistent with direction provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (Natural Heritage Reference Manual, 2010 - available [www.ontario.ca/document/natural-heritage-reference-manual](http://www.ontario.ca/document/natural-heritage-reference-manual)). We note also that provincial direction on this file correlates with our direction. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing provided a letter in response to the application, dated January 21, 2015, which advised the City that "...the proponent should engage a qualified biologist to undertake a field assessment on and adjacent to the site". Further, the letter reflected direction from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry that detailed the advice that "MNRF recommends that potential SAR on the subject lands and other natural heritage features on and adjacent to (within 120 m) of the proposed development are considered, as per the PPS policies and the NHRM, prior to planning approval".

We recommend that the Application be deferred until such time as an Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed. We would encourage the applicant to contact our office to discuss the Terms Of Reference for the Environmental Impact Assessment. Further, until such time as this Environmental Impact Study is completed, it is our recommendation that this application cannot be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 policies on natural heritage; namely 2.1.5 (d) and 2.1.8.

**FINAL RECOMMENDATION**

We cannot support this application for draft plan of subdivision until such time as the Environmental Impact Assessment is completed to be consistent with PPS, 2014 policies for natural heritage.

We request to receive a copy of the Notice of Decision on this application. If you should have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the ERCA Watershed Planner, Michael Nelson by phone at (519) 776-5209 ext. 347 or by e-mail at mnelson@erca.org.

Sincerely,

Michael Nelson, Watershed Planner

ENCL 1. ERCA comments on draft plan of subdivision, dated January 20, 2015.
ENCL 2. Aerial photographs of subject lands in 2010 and 2015, including 120-m adjacent lands area.
January 20, 2015

Mr. Jim Abbs, Senior Planner
City of Windsor
Suite 404, 400 City Hall Square East
Windsor, ON N9A 7K6

Dear Mr. Abbs:

RE: Request for Comments for Draft Plan of Subdivision SDN-004-14 [SDN-4277]; Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision; ARN 37390700900385; PIN: 015615055; Applicant: 1906239 Ontario Limited

The following is provided for your information and consideration as a result of our review of the application requesting approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision SDN-004-14 [SDN-4277]. We have reviewed this application based on the mandate of the Essex Region Conservation Authority and provide the following comments.

The application indicates that the draft plan of subdivision would create 18 single detached residential lots fronting on Maguire Street, and 2 blocks for future residential development fronting on a road to be constructed at a later date to facilitate development of additional lands owned by others to the south.

NATURAL HERITAGE

The subject property contains a natural heritage feature that was identified in the Essex Region Natural Heritage System Study (ERNHSS, 2013). The subject parcel is also located within 120 metres of another natural heritage feature identified in the ERNHSS study located immediately to the north. Based on the information circulated to our office as part of this circulation it cannot be determined whether these features satisfy the criteria for natural heritage in the PPS, 2014 - specifically, 2.1.5 (b) significant woodlands, 2.1.5 (d) significant wildlife habitat, or 2.1.7 habitat of endangered species and threatened species. Without further details provided in an Environmental Evaluation Report or Environmental Impact Assessment that would address these criteria it is premature to recommend conditions for approval of the draft plan of subdivision. It is also recommended that the applicant engage the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry to determine their requirements for addressing PPS 2.1.7.

SECTION 28 CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

The subject lands are not subject to our Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourse Regulations under the Conservation Authorities Act, (Ontario Regulation No. 158/06).
Mr. Abbs  
January 20, 2015

WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

We are concerned with the potential impact of the quality and quantity of runoff in the downstream watercourse due to future development on this site. We therefore request inclusion of the following Draft Plan of Subdivision conditions:

1. That the developer undertakes an engineering analysis to identify stormwater quality and quantity measures as necessary to control any increases in flows in downstream watercourses, up to and including the 1:100 year design storm, to the satisfaction of the Municipality and the Essex Region Conservation Authority.
2. That the developer installs stormwater management measures identified above, as part of the development of the site, to the satisfaction of the Municipality and the Essex Region Conservation Authority.
3. That the developer obtains the necessary clearance from the Essex Region Conservation Authority prior to undertaking site alterations and/or construction activities.

RECOMMENDATION

It is our recommendation that this application be deferred until such time as the Environmental Evaluation Report/Environmental Impact Assessment can be competed to satisfy applicable natural heritage policies of the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement.

We request to receive a copy of the Notice of Decision on this application for our files.

If you should have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the ERCA Watershed Planner, Mike Nelson by phone at (519) 776-5209 ext. 347, by fax at (519) 776-8688 or by e-mail at mnelson@erca.org.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mike Nelson  
Watershed Planner  
/mn
Hi Councillor Payne

Thanks for taking the time to speak with me yesterday regarding my application for 3rd party advertising on our video sign located at 401 Ouellette ave. We have owned and operated a business in downtown Windsor for almost 15 years and have recently began purchasing real estate in the downtown core. We believe in reinventing and re-investing in downtown Windsor. The new LED video sign located our building at 401 Ouellette is uniquely positioned to capture tourists as well as locals and offers all downtown businesses an affordable alternative to advertise and bring awareness to there businesses and products.

We have submitted an application to the city for 3rd party advertising on our video screen located at 401 Ouellette. Currently we are permitted to advertise for any supplier, tenant or individual involved with or selling products to any tenant of 401 Ouellette Ave.

We have asked the the city to grant us a 3rd party advertising permit which would allow us to offer all local businesses the opportunity to advertise, many of which have expressed interest and see it as a great opportunity as the sign is uniquely positioned at the gateway to our city. The city raises an issue of safety however as the screen is already operating we feel that this objection is completely unfounded. The screen is currently running video and advertising, all we are asking for is to expand the content to others. We are seeking this opportunity to help subsidize the cost of the screen, vacancies in our building, the hydro costs for operating the screen and most importantly as an opportunity to re-invest into downtown.

Currently downtown Windsor has three screens similar to ours. These include E liquid media, the Windsor Star, and Pattison. These signs are all within one city block of our sign and have been approved for 3rd party advertising. We would not be setting any precedents downtown.

Lastly, we believe it's a great asset for downtown Windsor and have received nothing but great feedback from the community. We have also spoken with the downtown residence association and received there support in this matter, please see the attached letter.

Thanks again and I look forward to discussing the matter personally.
February 9, 2017

Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee
350 City Hall Square West
Windsor, Ontario
Canada
N9A 6S1

RE: REPORT S 17/2017

Good Day,

The Downtown Residents Association (Windsor) (DRA) Board of Directors have reviewed the request from 29 Entertainment Group as is outlined in the above mentioned report. It should be noted that the DRA represents approximately 12,000 residents who live within the DRA boundaries.

The DRA does not object to the request from the 29 Entertainment Group as it relates to their sign.

For your information,

Mike Holdsworth, President
Downtown Residents Association (Windsor)