Members:

Chairperson Bill Marra (Chairperson)
Councillor Chris Holt, Ward 4
Councillor Irek Kusmierczyk, Ward 7
Councillor Hilary Payne, Ward 9
Councillor Ed Sleiman, Ward 5

Member Lynn Baker
Member Barb Bjarneson
Member Simon Chamely
Member Michael DiMaio
Member Andrew Foot
Member Anthony Gyemi
Member John Miller
Member Dorian Moore
1. CALL TO ORDER

2. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

3. REQUEST FOR DEFERRALS, REFERRALS OR WITHDRAWALS

4. COMMUNICATIONS

5. ADOPTION OF THE PLANNING ACT MINUTES
   5.1. Planning Act Minutes of the meeting of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting held March 21, 2016 (SCM 41/2016)

6. PRESENTATION & DELEGATIONS (PLANNING ACT MATTERS)

7. PLANNING ACT MATTERS

8. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES
   8.1. Minutes of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting held March 21, 2016 (SCM 40/2016)

9. PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS (COMMITTEE & ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS)

10. HERITAGE ACT MATTERS
11. **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**


11.2. Interim Control By-law Exemption - 3230 to 3232 and 3236 to 3238 Sandwich St. (S 71/2015)

11.3. Request under the Alley Closing Subsidy Program (ACSP) to close one north-south alley located between Albert Rd. and St. Luke Rd., south of Alice St. and north of Milloy St. (S 68/2015)

11.4. Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan (CIP) application submitted by 1109045 Ontario Limited for 775 Riverside Drive East (Ward 4) (SCM 39/2016)

11.5. Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan (CIP) application made by Windsor Mold Inc. for 4035 and 4011 Malden Road (Ward 2) (S 68/2016)

12. **COMMITTEE MATTERS**

13. **QUESTION PERIOD**

14. **ADJOURNMENT**
Subject: Planning Act Minutes of the meeting of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting held March 21, 2016
Planning Act Minutes
Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee
City of Windsor

Monday, March 21, 2016
4:31 PM

Members Present:

Chairperson
Ward 8—Councillor Marra

Councillors
Ward 7 - Councillor Kusmierczyk
Ward 4 - Councillor Holt
Ward 9 – Councillor Payne

Planning Act Citizens
Anthony Gyemi (4:34)
Dorian Moore
Barb Bjarneson

Members absent:
Ward 5 – Councillor Sleiman (Vice Chairperson)

Delegations
None

ALSO PRESENT ARE THE FOLLOWING FROM ADMINISTRATION:
Wira Vendrasco, Deputy City Solicitor
Thom Hunt, Executive Director Planning, Building Services/City Planner
Jim Abbs, Planner III ((A) Manager of Development Applications)
Adam Szymczak, Planner III
Justina Nwaesei, Planner II
Laura Diotte, Planner III
Greg Atkinson, Planner III
Kristina Tang, Planner II
Samantha Leger, Co-Op Student
John Calhoun, Heritage Planner (4:34)
Adam Pillon, Engineering
Matthew MacCullough, Public Works
John Revell, Chief Building Official
Anna Ciacelli, Supervisor of Council Services
Marianne Sladic, Senior Steno Clerk, Planning
1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson calls the meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee to order at 4:31 o’clock p.m.

2. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None Disclosed.

3. REQUEST FOR DEFERRALS, REFERRALS OR WITHDRAWALS

None Requested.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

None Presented.

5. ADOPTION OF THE PLANNING ACT MINUTES

5.1. Minutes of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting held February 8, 2016 (Planning Act Matters)

Moved by: Member Bjarneson
Seconded by: Member Moore

6. PRESENTATION & DELEGATIONS (PLANNING ACT MATTERS)

Please see section 7.1
7. **PLANNING ACT MATTERS**


Mr. Szymczak presents the item.

Mr. Jeff Slopen – Shibley Righton LLP (agent) representing the Applicant. Available for questions.

Mr. Karl Tanner & Mr. Harry White – Dillon Consulting (architect) – Mr. Tanner presents the application and advises the applicant is in agreement with the recommendations.

The Chair inquires if there is anyone in the audience to speak on this item.

The following residents spoke on the item:
- John Sennema (R) – 464 Belle Isle View
- Doug Diet (R) – 461 Belle Isle View
- Gail Tolmie (R) – 442 Fairview Blvd.
- Al Nevin (R) – 461 Fairview Blvd.
- Jim Adam (R) – 410 Fairview Blvd.
- Katrina Holland (R) – 444 Belle Isle View
- Jasna Aldea, with her sister Ivanka Van-Schaik, speaks on behalf of their mother, Ivanka Bakic (R) – 463 Fairview Blvd.
- Evelyn Sennema (R) – 464 Belle Isle View

Their concerns were:
- Privacy
- Traffic - increases on an already crowded, narrow street with no sidewalk, parking
- Added crime
- Safety – pedestrian, children
- Change to the neighbourhood – compatibility, property value
- Negative impact of additional refuse – rodents, odour, etc.

A list of complaints and a petition signed by 120 residents were provided.

Mr. Slopen addresses the concerns, pointing out location of the proposed condominium, location of windows and advises refuse will be kept indoors. Mr. Harry White (Dillon Consulting) correlates information regarding building height, location in respect to neighbours and window location.

The Chair opens the floor for Members to ask questions of the Agent and/or Applicant.

Ms. Bjarneson inquires whether the Applicant considered having a 2-storey building? Mr. Slopen advises a smaller building wouldn’t be economically feasible.
Mr. Gyemi seeks further clarification as to how refuse will be dealt with. Mr. Slopen elaborates there will be ample space internally for storage of refuse/Herby Curby bins. The Chair interjects this subject is and will be addressed through Site Plan process.

Mr. Gyemi reconfirms the units will be sold as Condos. Mr. Slopen affirms. Mr. Gyemi inquires whether there will be another application coming to the committee for Condo Conversion. Mr. Slopen advises that isn’t necessary once they have Condo approval. It is not part of this particular process, advises Mr. Szymczak.

The Chair asks if there are questions of any of the delegates.

The Chair asks if there are any questions for Administration.

Councillor Kusmierczyk inquires what options are available to mitigate, through landscaping, any type of privacy concerns. Mr. Szymczak advises privacy fencing is required, however, that is all addressed through Site Plan Control. As to landscaping, there is no zoning by-law which requires landscaping as a buffer. However, an agreement can be made with the landscape architect and the applicant, taking concerns of the residents into consideration, whether trees or hedges can be used as screening. Councillor Kusmierczyk inquires whether direction is required by Council to consider landscaped screening. Mr. Szymczak cannot speak to privacy. There is no requirement within the Official Plan nor the Planning Act regarding privacy.

Councillor Kusmierczyk inquires whether there are any concerns regarding water egress with the new development. Mr. Szymczak informs that will be handled through Site Plan Control where maintenance of pre-development flows will be addressed, as well as storm water calculations.

Councillor Kusmierczyk inquires how does the unit further down the street compare to the proposed development? Mr. Szymczak advises it is on a smaller parcel of land.

Mr. Hunt further addresses the concern over privacy, giving another application of a larger scale as an example of how privacy screening through landscaping was agreed upon to benefit residents. Mr. Hunt advised the residents can be brought into the process in order to ensure their concerns are addressed to their satisfaction.

Mr. Moore inquires about the residential intensification process. Is it focused or on a site-by-site basis? Mr. Moore’s concern is, if this application is approved, what is to stop another developer from buying up other residential lands along Wyandotte and constructing even larger units? Mr. Szymczak clarifies that the Official Plan is selective and does not allow intensification everywhere.

Ms. Bjarneson adds further inquiring whether it is the foresight of the Planning Department to encourage that type of development along Wyandotte St. or is there thought to keeping certain neighbourhoods together? Mr. Szymczak advises each application is reviewed individually as received accordingly with the Official Plan and Planning Act.
Ms. Bjarneson inquires the zoning along Wyandotte St. Mr. Szymczak advises the zoning is residential between two (2) commercially zoned areas.

Ms. Bjarneson questions the parking requirements. Mr. Szymczak explains the requirements for parking spaces, including accessible space. Mr. Szymczak further clarifies the requirements do not distinguish numbers for accessibility between tenant or visitors.

Councillor Payne addresses Mr. Hunt regarding the resident’s concerns over urban sprawl. Mr. Hunt elaborates on the direction and general plan for urban intensification and infill situations.

Councillor Payne seeks neighbourhood compatibility and impact to existing neighbourhood and whether this was taken into account? Mr. Hunt notes the intent of the developer to limit the negative effects of the proposed development through setbacks, window and parking location, etc.

Councillor Payne inquires about a previous OMB decision to deny a similar development in the past. Mr. Hunt confirms previous applications were denied by the OMB, however, as Official Plans change and times change, new developments with less adverse effects can be approved. Mr. Hunt notes that OMB decisions are not binding on current and future decisions.

Councillor Payne notes a concern that a larger unit is being proposed than was intended, simply due to the acquisition of another single family dwelling/property. Mr. Hunt advises that due to economic situation, a smaller unit was not economically viable, therefore the single family dwelling was purchased in order to make it viable. Mr. Hunt compares this application with applications received on Dougall Ave., where most residential dwellings have been converted to commercial uses.

Councillor Holt inquires regards how the application travels through the process, when is this application seen again? The Chair advises this particular application goes to Council next, regardless of the outcome. Site Plan is dealt with through Administration. Site Plan applications are only seen by Council when they’re regarding City Centre or City owned properties.

Councillor Holt asks if this was an appropriate time to give direction for the Site Plan process. The Chair confirms it is.

Ms. Bjarneson seeks clarification how the size of a development can almost double from the acquisition of a single parcel of land. Mr. Hunt gives a brief explanation.

Ms. Bjarneson requests that Administration confirm for the residents the definition of high density residential, stating in the report that the development is at the high end of a low profile residential classification. Mr. Hunt confirms the statement and provides an example of a high profile or high density residential classification (Victoria Park Place).

Moved by Councillor Payne to deny the application. (No seconder)

Moved by Councillor Kusmierczyk with Amendment to invite residents in the Site Plan Approval Process.
Seconded by Councillor Holt with the added Amendment to address privacy, landscaping and lighting through Site Plan.

The Chair clarifies whether the intent to hold a Public Meeting for residents to voice their concerns or is it to invite residents within a 120 metre radius to participate in the Site Plan Approval process. Councillor Kusmierczyk states his intent is the latter.

Decision Number: 359

THAT an amendment to Zoning By-law 8600 BE APPROVED changing the zoning of Part of Lot 108, Part of Closed Alley and Lots 165, 166 and 167, Registered Plan 1164 (PIN 01070-0148; 01070-0128), known municipally as 7400 and 7448 Wyandotte Street East, situated at the northeast corner of Wyandotte Street East and Fairview Boulevard, from Residential District 1.2 (RD1.2), Residential District 3.1 (RD3.1) and site specific provision 20(1)87 to RD3.1 and deleting S.20(1)87.

THAT abutting residents, within 120 meters of the proposed development, BE INVITED to participate in the site plan process.

Councillor Kusmierczyk speaks as to why he is in support of the application and also notes the validity of the resident’s concerns and hope they will be addressed.

Mr. Moore speaks to his concern for the hodge podge nature of that corridor. Is this something we want to perpetuate or correct? Something to consider moving forward.

Ms. Bjarneson notes the resident’s concerns but also notes the developer’s willingness to address those concerns. Mentioning the Dougall Avenue situation, Ms. Bjarneson hopes the intent is to maintain the nature and clear idea of the neighbourhoods we want to keep. A condominium on an arterial road is desirable and in that perspective is in agreement with the recommendation.

Councillor Holt speaks on his decision to support the motion and believes most of the obstacles will be addressed for the residents.

The Chair closes the floor to further discussion and addresses the residents/delegates on the procedures to become delegates at the Council Meeting, noting the procedures are strictly followed.

The Chair asks the author if he stands by his recommendation. The answer is affirmative.

Motion CARRIED

   In Favour:  Councillor Holt, Councillor Kusmierczyk, Member Bjarneson, Member Gyemi
   Opposed:  Councillor Payne, Member Moore

Ms. Samantha Leger presents the item.

Greg Ditty, representing U-Haul Moving & Storage is available for questions.

Mike Dufault (R) – 1657 Factoria Rd. – Speaking on behalf of the area residents, would like to see the green space (former rail owned property) currently in place as buffer between residents and the industrial property remains. Mr. Ditty advises they intend to continue to provide the natural buffer which is currently zoned residential and greenspace.

The Chair opens the floor for questioning of Members to Applicant and Administration.

Ms. Bjarneson inquires Administration whether the heavier trucks will exit onto St. Luke and are there any concerns about heavier trucks on that road? Ms. Leger advises Transportation was consulted and they had no concerns. Ms. Bjarneson inquires how large are the trucks? Mr. Ditty advises their intention is for the trucks to enter off of Walker Road to Seneca, in the south parking lot.

Councillor Holt requests clarification as to why Planning is not in agreement with Transportation’s request for a 10m conveyance next to the Hydro Station on the site. Ms. Leger, using visual aid, explains why the recommendation cannot be included at this time due to the Hydro Station being there. It is a long-standing lease with no potential for its removal, therefore the conveyance is not appropriate but can be possible in the future. Mr. Hunt advises it is an unusual situation where Enwin does not own the land but leases it from the owner.

Mr. Gyemi inquires what the intended use is of the parcel facing St. Luke? Mr. Ditty advises the intent is rent their UHaul trucks, however they have no particular plans for the parking lot at St. Luke, at this time. All their plans focus on the south parking lot, near Walker Rd. If there are any future plans, they won’t be too disimilar to a UHaul rental.

Mr. Gyemi inquires whether direction can be given to include a screening fence on the south side of the property? Mr. Szymczak advises they cannot. There is no new development, therefore Site Plan does not apply to the property, so there is no opportunity to incur a screening fence at this time. The application is for a rezoning to add one use to the property.

Mr. Gyemi to Mr. Hunt, inquires whether there is mechanism to add that as a concern to Council to add as an amendment to provide a buffer/screening to the neighbouring properties. Mr. Hunt advises they cannot. It would be up to the owner/applicant to consider, should they choose to. The Chair adds the concerns the neighbours had have already been addressed and are satisfied. Ms. Bjarneson adds there is a fence and trees. Her only concern for having larger vehicles is the need for improvement of the road. The Chair adds the cost will cause more work and improvement which will benefit the economy.
Moved by Councillor Kusmierczyk  
Seconded by Member Bjarneson  

Decision Number: PHED 360  

THAT an amendment to Zoning By-law 8600 BE APPROVED changing the zoning of Part of Lot 96 and 97, Concession 1 designated as Parts 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, Plan 12R-21005, PIN 01128-0277(LT) and Part of Lot 97, Concession 1 designated as Part 1, Plan 12R-21005, PIN 01128-0202(LT) and Part of Lot 97, Concession 1 (being the former Chesapeake and Ohio railway right of way) PIN 01128-0213(LT) as defined in the included zoning map by deleting Section 20(1)261 and replacing it with the following paragraph:  

“261  (a).  For the lands comprising of Part of Lots 96 and 97, Concession 1 designated as Parts 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, Plan 12R-21005 situated on the east side of Walker Road between Seminole Street and Seneca Street, a Public Hall, a Place of Entertainment and Recreation and a Motor Vehicle Dealership shall be additional permitted uses   

(b).  For the lands comprising of Part of Lot 97, Concession 1 designated as Part 1, Plan 12R-21005 and Part of Lot 97 Concession 1 (being the former Chesapeake and Ohio Railway right of way) excluding the portion zoned RD1.3 and GD1.1 situated on the west side of St. Luke Road south of Seminole Street, a Motor Vehicle Dealership shall be an additional permitted use (ZDM 7; ZNG/4606).”

The Chair asks the author if she stands by her recommendation. The answer is affirmative.  

Motion CARRIED  

There being no further business, the meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee is adjourned at 6:39 o’clock p.m  

Ward 8 Councillor Marra  
(Chairperson)  

Jim Abbs  
Secretary (A)
Subject: Minutes of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting held March 21, 2016
Members Present:

Chairperson
  Ward 8 – Councillor Marra

Councillors
  Ward 4 - Councillor Holt
  Ward 7 - Councillor Kusmierczyk
  Ward 9 - Councillor Payne

Councillors-Regrets
  Ward 5 - Councillor Sleiman

Planning Act Citizens
  Member Bjarneson
  Member Gyemi
  Member Moore

Heritage Act Citizens
  Member DiMaio
  Member Foot

Heritage Act Citizens-Absent
  Member Baker
  Member Miller
  Member Chamely

ALSO PRESENT ARE THE FOLLOWING FROM ADMINISTRATION:

  Thom Hunt, Executive Director Planning, Building Services/City Planner
  Wira Vendrasco, Deputy City Solicitor
  John Revell, Chief Building Official
  Jim Abbs, Planner III Subdivisions
  Adam Pillon, Right of Way Supervisor
1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman calls the meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee to order at 4:31 o’clock p.m.
Carried.

2. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None Disclosed.

3. REQUEST FOR DEFERRALS, REFERRALS OR WITHDRAWALS

None Requested.
4. COMMUNICATIONS

None presented.

5. ADOPTION OF THE PLANNING ACT MINUTES

5.1. Planning Act Minutes from the meeting held February 8, 2016

Moved by: Member Bjarneson
Seconded by: Member Moore

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee (Planning Act Matters) held February 8, 2016 BE ADOPTED as presented.

Carried.

Agenda Item: SCM 31/2016

6. PRESENTATION & DELEGATIONS (PLANNING ACT MATTERS)

None.

7. PLANNING ACT MATTERS

ZNG/4605 - Ward 6

Moved by: Councillor Kusmierczyk
Seconded by: Councillor Holt

Decision Number: PHED 359
THAT an amendment to Zoning By-law 8600 BE APPROVED changing the zoning of Part of Lot 108, Part of Closed Alley and Lots 165, 166 and 167, Registered Plan 1164 (PIN 01070-0148; 01070-0128), known municipally as 7400 and 7448 Wyandotte Street East, situated at the northeast corner of Wyandotte Street East and Fairview Boulevard, from Residential District 1.2 (RD1.2), Residential District 3.1 (RD3.1) and site specific provision 20(1)87 to RD3.1 and deleting S.20(1)87; and,

THAT abutting residents, within 120 meters of the proposed development, BE INVITED to participate in the site plan process.

Carried.

Councillor Payne and Member Moore vote nay.

Agenda Item: S 50/2016
Clerk’s File: ZB/12421

Moved by: Councillor Kusmierczyk
Seconded by: Member Bjarneson

Decision Number: PHED 360

THAT an amendment to Zoning By-law 8600 BE APPROVED changing the zoning of Part of Lot 96 and 97, Concession 1 designated as Parts 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, Plan 12R-21005, PIN 01128-0277(LT) and Part of Lot 97, Concession 1 designated as Part 1, Plan 12R-21005, PIN 01128-0202(LT) and Part of Lot 97, Concession 1 (being the former Chesapeake and Ohio railway right of way) PIN 01128-0213(LT) as defined in the included zoning map by deleting Section 20(1)261 and replacing it with the following paragraph:

"261 (a). For the lands comprising of Part of Lots 96 and 97, Concession 1 designated as Parts 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, Plan 12R-21005 situated on the east side of Walker Road between Seminole Street and Seneca Street, a Public Hall, a Place of Entertainment and Recreation and a Motor Vehicle Dealership shall be additional permitted uses

(b). For the lands comprising of Part of Lot 97, Concession 1 designated as Part 1, Plan 12R-21005 and Part of Lot 97 Concession 1 (being the former Chesapeake and Ohio Railway right of way) excluding the portion zoned RD1.3 and GD1.1 situated on the west side of St. Luke Road south of Seminole Street, a Motor Vehicle Dealership shall be an additional permitted use (ZDM 7; ZNG/4606)."

Carried.

Agenda Item: S 47/2016
Clerk's File: ZB/12420

The meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee (Planning Act Matters) portion is adjourned at 6:39 o'clock p.m.

The meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee (Heritage Act Matters) is called to order at 6:41 o'clock p.m.

8. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES
8.1. Minutes of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting held February 8, 2016

Moved by: Member DiMaio
Seconded by: Councillor Payne

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee held February 8, 2016 BE ADOPTED as presented.Carried.

Agenda Item: SCM 32/2016

9. PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS (COMMITTEE & ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS)

See Heritage Act Matter Item 10.1, and Administrative Items 11.1, 11.4, and 11.6

10. HERITAGE ACT MATTERS

10.1. Jasperson-Appel House, 224 Sunset Avenue - Built Heritage Fund Grant for Garage Door (Ward 2)

John Calhoun, Heritage Planner, appears before the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee and provides a brief explanation of the report regarding Jasperson-Appel House, 224 Sunset Avenue – Built Heritage Fund Grant for Garage Door.

Michael and Donna Appel, property owners

Michael and Donna Appel, property owners, appear before the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee and provide a brief description of the work that they hope to undertake, specifically the replacement of the door on the detached garage.

Councillor Holt inquires about the Heritage Designation of the garage portion of the property. Mr. Calhoun indicates that he will follow up with the Clerk’s records to determine the appropriate status.
Moved by: Councillor Kusmierczyk
Seconded by: Member Foot

Decision Number: PHED 361
THAT the owners of the Jasperson-Appel House at 224 Sunset Avenue BE GRANTED an upset amount of $1,122 from the Built Heritage Fund (Reserve Fund 155) for a replica replacement door on the detached garage, provided that the City Planner and the Chief Building Official determine that the work is completed in a good workmanlike manner.

Moved by: Councillor Holt
Seconded by: Member Foot
THAT the process BE UNDERTAKEN to add the garage at 224 Sunset Avenue to the Heritage Designation.
Carried.

10.2. Doors Open - Contribution from Heritage Committee Fund, and City Hall as Site
John Calhoun, Heritage Planner provides a brief explanation of the report regarding Doors Open – Contribution from Heritage Committee Fund, and City Hall as site.

Moved by: Member Foot
Seconded by: Councillor Holt

Decision Number: PHED 362
I. That Doors Open Windsor 2016 BE GRANTED $5,000 from the fund formerly known as the Windsor Heritage Committee Operating Fund (operating budget 001-0111610) carried over from 2015 to be used for publicity costs for the Doors Open locations on September 24-25, 2016; and

II. That City Hall BE INCLUDED as a site for Doors Open Windsor 2016, and costs for that activity be funded from the Windsor Heritage Committee Operating Fund carried over from 2015.
Carried.

There being no further business, the Heritage Act Matters portion of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting is adjourned at 6:46 o’clock p.m.

The chair calls the Administrative items portion of the Planning, Heritage & Economic Development Standing Committee meeting to order at 6:47 o’clock p.m.
11. **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

11.1. **Alley Closing of East/West Alley North of Grand Marais Road East from Francois Road to Ellrose Avenue SAA/4597, Ward 5**

Samantha Ledger, Development Section Research Assistant appears before the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee and provides a brief outline of the Administrative report regarding Alley Closing of East/West Alley North of Grand Marais Road East from Francois Road to Ellrose Avenue.

Joe Lucier and Alex Lopetrone, area residents

Joe Lucier and Alex Lopetrone, area residents, appear before the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee and are in agreement with the Administrative Recommendation in the report—Alley Closing of East/West Alley North of Grand Marais Road East from Francois Road to Ellrose Avenue however they express some concern about the centre line of the alley.

Moved by: Councillor Holt
Seconded by: Councillor Kusmierczyk

Decision Number: **PHED 363**

I. That the 5.5 metre (18 feet) wide east/west alley, located north of Grand Marais Road East from Francois Road to Ellrose Avenue, as shown on Drawing No. CC-1685 **attached** hereto as **Appendix “A”**, **BE ASSUMED** for subsequent closure;

II. That the 5.5 metre (18 feet) wide east/west alley, located north of Grand Marais Road East from Francois Road to Ellrose Avenue, as shown on Drawing No. CC-1685 **attached** hereto as **Appendix “A”**, **BE CLOSED AND CONVEYED** to the abutting property owners subject to the following:

i. Easements, subject to their being accepted in the City’s standard form and in accordance with the City’s standard practice, be granted to:

   - Bell Canada, Cogeco Cable Canada LP, & Enwin Utilities Ltd.

ii. THAT Conveyance Cost **BE SET** as follows:

   - For properties zoned RD1.2 - $1.00 plus deed preparation fee and proportionate share of the survey cost as invoiced to The Corporation of the City of Windsor by an Ontario Land Surveyor.
III. THAT The City Planner **BE REQUESTED** to supply the appropriate legal description, in accordance with Drawing Number. CC-1685, *attached* hereto as Appendix “A”.

IV. THAT The City Planner, or designate, **BE AUTHORIZED** to publish the required legal notice.

V. THAT The City Solicitor **BE REQUESTED** to prepare the necessary by-law(s).

VI. THAT The Chief Administrative Officer and City Clerk **BE AUTHORIZED** to sign all necessary documents approved as to form and content satisfactory to the City Solicitor.

VII. THAT the matter **BE COMPLETED** electronically pursuant to By-law Number 366-2003. Carried.

Agenda Item: S 48/2016  
Clerk’s File: SAA2016, SAA/4597

11.2. **Request to close the east/west alley between Vanier Street and Edinborough Street, west of Remington Avenue; Ward 10; File No.: SAA/4572 - WFT Investments Ltd.**

Justina Nwaesei, Planner II – Development Review, appears before the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee and provides a brief outline of the Administrative Report – Request to close the east/west alley between Vanier Street and Edinborough Street, west of Remington Avenue- WFT Investments Ltd..

Moved by: Councillor Holt  
Seconded by: Councillor Payne

Decision Number: **PHED 364**

I. That the 16ft (4.9m) wide east/west alley between Vanier Street and Edinborough Street, west of Remington Avenue, abutting the properties municipally known as 526, 534, 542, 566, 574, 582 & 590 Vanier Street, and 527, 535, 551, 567, 581 & 591 Edinborough Street, shown on Drawing No. CC-1684 *attached* hereto as Appendix “A”, **BE ASSUMED** for subsequent closure;

II. That the 16ft (4.9m) wide east/west alley between Vanier Street and Edinborough Street, west of Remington Avenue, abutting the properties municipally known as 526, 534, 542, 566, 574, 582 & 590 Vanier Street, and 527, 535, 551, 567, 581 & 591 Edinborough Street, shown on Drawing No. CC-1684 *attached* hereto as Appendix “A”, **BE CLOSED AND CONVEYED** to the abutting property owners, subject to the following:
a. Easements, subject to their being accepted in the City’s standard form and in accordance with the City’s standard practice, be granted to:

- Bell Canada, Cogeco Cable Canada LP, & Enwin Utilities Ltd.;

III. Conveyance Cost **BE SET** as follows:

Abutting properties zoned RD1.3: $1.00 plus deed preparation fee and proportionate share of the survey cost as invoiced to The Corporation of the City of Windsor by an Ontario Land Surveyor.

IV. That The City Planner **BE REQUESTED** to supply the appropriate legal description, in accordance with Drawing Number. CC-1684, *attached* hereto as *Appendix “A”*;

V. That The City Planner, or designate, **BE AUTHORIZED** to publish the required legal notice;

VI. That The City Solicitor **BE REQUESTED** to prepare the necessary by-law(s);

VII. That The Chief Administrative Officer and City Clerk **BE AUTHORIZED** to sign all necessary documents approved as to form and content satisfactory to the City Solicitor; and

VIII. That the matter **BE COMPLETED** electronically pursuant to By-law Number 366-2003. Carried.

Agenda Item: S 70/2015
Clerk’s File: SAA2016, SAA/4572

11.3. **Land Use Study of Parking Areas Within Business Improvement Areas (Wards 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6)**

Greg Atkinson, Senior Planner, appears before the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee and provides a brief outline of the Administrative Report – Land Use Study of Parking Areas Within Business Improvement Areas.

Councillor Holt suggests that design guidelines be used in an effort to preserve the main street appearance.

Councillor Payne requests confirmation that the study is only looking at the status of current parking and not the lack of parking in the Business Improvement Areas. Administration confirms that they are looking at what is currently in place.
Moved by: Councillor Holt  
Seconded by: Councillor Payne

Decision Number: PHED 365  
THAT Council ENDORSE the terms of reference for undertaking of a land use study of parking areas within the City's Business Improvement Areas; and

THAT Council DIRECT Administration to report back with study recommendations or a recommendation to extend Interim Control By-laws 126-2015, 127-2015, and 142-2015 prior to October 5, 2016; and

THAT Administration EXAMINE the appropriateness of implementing design guidelines for surface parking within the City’s Business Improvement Areas.  
Carried.

Agenda Item: SCM 26/2016  
Clerk’s File: MI2016

11.4. Application for Small Business Investment Grant under the Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan for 2862 Kew Drive (Biwell Holdings Inc.—Ward 8)

Greg Atkinson, Senior Planner, provides a brief outline of the Administrative Report – Application for Small Business Investment Grant under the Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan for 2862 Kew Drive (Biwell Holdings Inc.)

Colby Wu, representing Stratus Plastics

Colby Wu, representing Stratus Plastics appears before the Planning Heritage Economic Development Standing Committee provides a brief description of his company and states that his goal is to keep business local.

Moved by: Councillor Payne  
Seconded by: Councillor Holt

Decision Number: PHED 366  
THAT the request made by Biwell Holdings Inc. to participate in the Small Business Investment Grant Program BE APPROVED for the property located at 2862 Kew Drive pursuant to the City of Windsor Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan; and

THAT, Administration BE DIRECTED to prepare an agreement to implement the Small Business Investment Grant Program in accordance with all applicable policies, requirements, and provisions contained within the Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan to the satisfaction of
the City Planner as to content, the City Solicitor as to legal form, and the CFO/City Treasurer as to financial implications; and

THAT, the CAO and City Clerk **BE AUTHORIZED** to sign the Small Business Investment Grant Agreement.
Carried.

**Agenda Item: S 51/2016**
Clerk’s File: SPL/10759

11.5. **Amendment to Walkerville Business Improvement Area Boundary (Ward 4)**

Greg Atkinson, Senior Planner, provides a brief outline of the Administrative Report – Amendment to Walkerville Business Improvement Area Boundary.

Moved by: Councillor Holt
Seconded by: Councillor Payne

Decision Number: **PHED 367**
THAT the request from the Walkerville Business Improvement Association to expand the boundary of the Walkerville Business Improvement Area (BIA) to include 543 and 553 Lincoln Road **BE APPROVED**;

THAT Administration **BE DIRECTED** to circulate notice of the draft amending by-law to all property owners and tenants within the existing and proposed BIA boundary; and

THAT Council **PASS** the amending by-law provided that at least one third of the total number of persons entitled to notice of this by-law have not filed objections to this by-law with the Clerk within 60 days after the mailing thereof.
Carried.

**Agenda Item: S 29/2016**
Clerk’s File: MI2016

11.6. **Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Application Submitted by Strathan Corporation for 804 McDougall Street (Ward 3)**

Greg Atkinson, Senior Planner, provides a brief outline of the Administrative Report – Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Application Submitted by Strathan Corporation for 804 McDougall Street.
Christine Davison, President, Strathan Corporation

Christine Davison, President, Strathan Corporation appears before the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee and thanks the committee for considering the grant application.

Details regarding the building are discussed.

Greg Atkinson explains that the purpose of the grant is to gather data on the property, including the cost to clean it up and to determine feasible reuse for the property.

Councillor Holt inquires whether there are funds available to assist in restoration of the building. G. Atkinson confirms that there is some funding available through various city programs such as the Building Rehabilitation fund and through Heritage Grants should the property be designated.

Moved by: Councillor Holt  
Seconded by: Councillor Payne

Decision Number: PHED 368  
THAT the request made by Strathan Corporation to participate in the Feasibility Study Grant Program BE APPROVED for the proposed feasibility study at 804 McDougall Street pursuant to the City of Windsor Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan;

THAT the request made by Strathan Corporation to participate in the Environmental Study Grant Program BE APPROVED for the proposed Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Study and Designated Substances Survey at 804 McDougall Street pursuant to the City of Windsor Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan; and

THAT the City Treasurer BE AUTHORIZED to issue payment upon the completion and submission of a Feasibility Study and/or Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Study in a form acceptable to the City Planner and City Solicitor.
Carried.

Agenda Item: S 33/2016  
Clerk’s File: SPL/10759 Z/8955
12. COMMITTEE MATTERS

None Presented.

13. QUESTION PERIOD

None.

14. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting of the Planning, Heritage and Economic Development Standing Committee is adjourned at 7:25 o’clock p.m.

Ward 8—Councillor Marra  
(Chairperson)  

Supervisor of Council Services
MISSION STATEMENT
“Our City is built on relationships – between citizens and their government, businesses and public institutions, city and region – all interconnected, mutually supportive, and focused on the brightest future we can create together”
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Author’s Contact:
Thom Hunt, City Planner
thunt@citywindsor.ca
519-255-6543, ext 6897
Date to Council: 4/11/2016
Clerk’s File #: SPL2016

To: Mayor and Members of City Council

Subject: Status Update Report – Development Approval Business Process Review (BPI) Implementation

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report BE RECEIVED for information and that the City Planner BE DIRECTED to report back to the Committee in 12 months regarding the continued progress on implementing the BPIs that remain.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A business process review was conducted to analyze and address issues the Planning Department was experiencing when trying to achieve their service objectives. The exercise produced a total of 88 Business Process Improvements (BPIs). A total of 78 BPIs were deemed to be immediately actionable, meaning that there were no significant technical, financial or structural impediments to implementation. Another 10 BPIs were deemed to require further consideration or much longer term implementation horizon (if any).

Today (18 months after the first reporting of the BPIs to Council), close to 80% of all the BPIs under consideration have been implemented. Implementing the changes to positions, processes and technology was a significant effort and accomplishment for the staff that work in the development approval sections of the Corporation. As such they needed the assistance of a larger team to accomplish the overall goal.

The response from the development industry to the changes implemented has been very positive, and a significant number of process improvements that have been put into place have resulted in customers having experienced positive changes in application
process time, improved communication and understanding of the requirements of a particular development application. The appendix of the report documents the many BPIs implemented and the body of the report groups the BPIs under common themes, and provides a more thorough understanding of the goals, rationale and changes that were made in each business process improvement.

The next 15-20% of the changes to be implemented requires ongoing dedication and resources to enable their completion. The majority of which require the City to implement technology solutions such as a dynamic web service that aligns with new information flows, and makes it more convenient for the public to access such data – e-permits and e-approvals type systems will require significant effort to implement and will require future reporting on progress.

BACKGROUND:

A business process review was conducted to analyze and address issues the Planning Department was experiencing when trying to achieve their service objectives. These issues ranged from customer complaints about the speed of service, to the inconsistency of approval recommendations and/or customer guidance. The business process review took into its consideration multiple stakeholders’ viewpoints and expectations, and looked deeply into competing staff objectives and stakeholder interests.

In summary, the exercise produced a total of 88 Business Process Improvements (BPIs) and these were the subject of The City Planner’s report adopted by City Council at its meeting of October 6, 2014. Following the unveiling and discussion of the Business Process Improvements, it was moved [by M384-2014] that the City Planner report back in 18 months time regarding the progress on implementing the recommendations. A complete list of the recommended BPIs is listed in Appendix ‘A’.

DISCUSSION:

A total of 78 BPIs were deemed to be immediately actionable, meaning that there were no significant technical, financial or structural impediments to implementation. Another 10 BPIs were deemed to require further consideration or much longer term implementation horizon (if any). The BPIs were then categorized into themes. Below is the summary list of the recommended BPIs, sorted by theme and the rationale of each theme:

Theme A - Govern and manage property developments based on outcomes and not process:

Rationale - By looking at developments as a project consisting of multiple phases and processes to work through versus a single application, or on an application-by-application basis, staff can focus on outcomes versus processes. An outcome-based
view allows the primary focus be on results, allowing good quality developments to be implemented on time, and at a reasonable cost.

Scope - Improving the governance structure to encompass guidance and oversight of all the property development approval processes, as well as potentially dependent processes such as building permit approval, will ensure management of customer expectations. Such improvements included, but were not limited to, reorganization of staff, implementation of a development triage team governing body, and improved reporting / communication to governing bodies to allow developments to be reviewed holistically and cross functionally, and to guide the project through multiple property development processes. Each project is managed by a role (i.e. a development coordinator or file manager) to ensure developments move systematically through City development processes and use subject matter expert (SME) resources (i.e. specialized planners, cross functional specialists, etc.) to meet the development’s vision and objectives. Updates and issues needing clarification or resolution should be brought and achieved through an improved governance function (Development Triage Team).

Theme A - BPIs

The following BPIs were recommended for implementation under this theme:

1. Review developments holistically (i.e. rather than on a per process basis) at the beginning of a conceptual idea or plan by creating a governing body (i.e. Development Triage Team) to provide oversight and guidance. **(Status - 100% complete)**

2. Restructure the organization to create a property development division that includes representation from Building and Planning departments, which they and key supporting departments (i.e. Operations and Engineering) report to one CLT position. **(Status - 100 % complete)**

3. Establish a single point of contact role (i.e. a property development coordinator or file manager) that is responsible for driving the development through various processes and acts/delegates as a spokesperson on the file at meetings. **(Status - 90% complete)**

4. Engage in a pre-consultation process where the lead planner will gather information prior to an application being submitted both from the applicant and supporting departments to prompt conceptual decision making, understand issues/concerns up front, and/or mitigate risks with the application. This will also help vet any unattainable applications early in the process. **(Status - 90% complete)**

5. Ensure all stakeholders are using AMANDA as intended and manage appropriately to track application status and ensure all internal stakeholders are adequately trained with AMANDA. (i.e. ensure site plan approval information is centralized into AMANDA including: signed agreement, comments, applications,
approvals, conditions, supporting pdfs, correspondence) – (Status - 90% complete)

6. Create an internal heritage team, representative of all key departments, to improve communications and define roles/responsibilities of each related to site plan, heritage and demolition control (status 75% complete)

Summary of Theme A Implementation (Total 91% complete)

Creation of a Development Triage Team which meets weekly allows for multi-disciplinary discussion on the roster of development applications received or in process in any given week. Proactive action is taken on applications with dissemination of information across departments, and the resulting staff conversation keeps development application and issues needing resolution top-of-mind for key staff. Formal agenda and listing of projects allows for ‘bring forward’ items if not resolved at current meeting.

Planning and Building was reorganized under one Executive Director, with City Planner reporting to City Solicitor as CLT. Although two CLT members are generally needed to ultimately resolve development issues (with City Engineer), the City Planner recognized the need for the creation of a Transportation and Development Triage Team, and established this group as part of this work. This structure allows for the resolution of development issues/concerns through a weekly forum without need for further reorganization or alignment under one CLT for both oversight of Planning and Transportation functions. Some challenges remain with ensuring accuracy of information entered into AMANDA and to ensure information is current. Improvements still requiring implementation include automatic e-mails to customers notifying them of an application’s status.

Theme B - Improve Distribution of Information to Approving Governing Bodies

Rationale - Information provided to governing bodies such as the Standing Committees and Council should be clear, concise, inclusive of lower governing body comments/recommendations, and produced and distributed as efficiently as possible.

Scope – examine all of the governing bodies and determine where efficiencies and/or process improvements and outcomes can be made in both formal and informal settings.

Theme B - BPIs

The following BPIs are recommended for implementation under this theme:

7. Send the amended zoning bylaw to Council at the same time as the application for full approval. (I.e. same day decision). (Status – 100% complete)
8. For official plan and rezoning amendments, put the discussion/comments from the PEDSC into an Addendum to the report for Council rather than revising the original Committee report (leaving the option to revise if necessary). (Status – 100% complete)

9. Make a Windsor Heritage Committee recommendation specific to the proposed features via a drawing of the redevelopment rather than text descriptions of the heritage features that are to be protected / incorporated, thus reducing risk of inconsistent interpretations. (Status - 100% complete)

10. Ensure photographs and drawings are reproduced clearly in reports for decision-makers. This was especially noted in the heritage approval sessions (Status 100% complete)

Summary of Theme B Implementation (Total 100 % Complete)

Zoning Bylaw is now placed on same agenda as the impending decision, except in instances where a description (i.e. plan of survey or reference plan) is required to be provided by the applicant as these take time to produce and are thus beyond the control of staff. With an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning Bylaw Amendment (ZBA) combined, the challenge is that the OPA requires the minutes from the public meeting (PHEDSC). Opportunities to determine how minutes can be approved prior to waiting for the next PHEDSC meeting need to be further explored and determined if possible. Changes to reproduction of supporting documentation such as photos and drawings are the subject of the agenda management project (Agenda.net) and are in progress.

Theme C - Determine the delegation of approvals

Rationale - Currently most planning matters are brought to Council for final approval either directly through the Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee (PEDSC) or the CAO. Some of these matters have minimal risk or impact to the Corporation or communities. Prudent oversight is typically a welcomed practice; however the cost to this complete oversight translates into a higher cost per approval, longer times until an approval is given, risk of violating legislation, and occasionally inconsistent decisions.

Scope – look at all opportunities to improve process efficiencies by delegating approvals. Determining which governance level (i.e. Council, PEDSC, or administration) is required for various types of approvals should be reviewed.

Theme C - BPIs

The following BPIs are recommended for implementation or further review (as stated above) under this theme:
11. Develop criteria around what types of applications / requests can be delegated to the City Planner. (i.e. partial demolitions tied to site plan approval, heritage alterations, approvals of subdivisions and condominiums (both new and conversions) (Status 100% complete)

12. Revisit what types of applications are required to go to Council. (Status 75% complete)

13. Include the Windsor Heritage Committee (WHC) within the PEDSC. WHC members should have their own discussion/voting session within PEDSC meetings. (Status 100% complete)

Summary of Theme C Implementation (Total 92% Complete)

Wherever possible all application that can be approved administratively are done so and are not going to Council for approval, unless the Planning Act legislation gives no option for administrative approval, or where Council has by resolution directed their approval is required, including:

- Site Plan Control for the downtown area
- waterfront lands development
- demolition control
- additions or deletion to heritage register
- heritage grants and loans
- other incentives approvals per CIPs

The Windsor Heritage Committee function has now been included within the PHEDSC meeting, resulting in better public notice/communication on heritage matters, and is now meeting deadlines in a quicker, consistent and more efficient manner.

Theme D - Improve Communication with Customer/Applicant

Rationale - The customer expectation research that was conducted at the beginning of the project highlighted that stronger communication was required to improve service level and customer satisfaction.

Scope – look at opportunities to improve the communication with the customer both prior to the process beginning and during the process.

Theme D BPIs

The following BPIs were recommended for implementation under this theme:
14. Enhance the property development service website to provide more static functionality (i.e. relevant application information, FAQ's, posting of approved applications). (Status 25% Complete)

15. Provide more education to the customer about the process and common pitfalls, an understanding how applications are processed, and that there is a greater community will be impacted by their development. (Status 10% complete)

16. Identify through a process map the roles/responsibilities of each site plan approval staff and provide adequate training / cross-training to staff. Also create clear and concise process material to ensure applicants understand the proper steps of the process and typically what documentation is required to complete the process. (Status 100% complete)

17. Educate the applicant on expected city design guidelines/standards (i.e. step by step direction, showcase good examples). (Status 75% complete)

18. Applicants will receive a report going to the Windsor Heritage Committee (WHC) within a specified reasonable time. (Note – almost all of the WHC recommendations and subsequent Council decisions are tied directly to development and have tight legislated timelines). (Status 100% complete)

19. Train development professionals on planning processes. - (i.e. Offer municipal planning information sessions). (Status 10% Complete)

20. Improve Planning Department service website (dynamic portion). (Status 25% Complete)

21. Prepare detailed development guidelines plans for strategic areas of the City to better communicate expectations or development. (Status 25% complete)

Summary of Theme D Implementation (Total 46% Complete)

Many of the BPIs in this theme are regarded as longer term efforts as they require significant staff resources to accomplish. With current resource challenges it is thought that these will take longer to achieve 100% completion. We are currently exploring what technologies are best suited and able to deliver the desired customer experience and enable staff to easily consolidate & exchange information from multiple data sources with customers, which will fill service gaps within existing corporate systems (i.e. Amanda). Committing to this direction would require cooperative dependencies in both workflow integration and support resources outside of Planning (specifically within IT).

Theme E -Centralize Representation of an Application

Rationale - Building on the file manager concept, Lead Planners in a process should take an active role of collecting and consolidating information into a recommendation
that benefits the corporation as whole. Reports provided to governing bodies for approval should consolidate and provide pertinent information for decision making; and the development recommendations should be consistent throughout and not offer conflicting objectives.

Scope – explore all communication standards as to ensure staff are consistent when commenting on applications and provide a consistent message to the client.

The following BPIs were recommended for implementation under this theme:

22. Ensure administrative reports consolidate the facts and comments that support an administrative recommendation and identifies/mitigates risks (i.e. rather than providing all comments, which is sometimes conflicting and difficult for decision makers). (Status 100% Complete)

23. Create a more standardized way for how comments are written for consistent messaging (i.e. focus the comments on what we do want vs. what we don’t). (Status 25% complete)

24. Develop a standardize comment requirements checklist for site plan approvals to reduce time for responses. (Status 100% Complete)

25. The Lead Planner represents the file for the City at Committee of Adjustment, especially when there is a related active site plan approval review. (Status 90% complete)

26. Only the Heritage Planner communicates with the public (i.e. process and heritage aspects) as a subject matter expert and assists in multi-process development applications as needed. Further clarification of the related roles and responsibilities should be defined and communicated. (Status 75% Complete)

Summary of Theme E Implementation (Total 78% Complete)

Theme F - Centralize Information for Application and Process

Rationale - A strategic decision was made years ago to maintain a central property database and build workflow functionality around this database. This information and functionality is currently housed within the AMANDA ERP system. Continuing to use and migrate as much information as possible to AMANDA as the central repository for information will benefit the review of developments holistically and empower those who are responsible for the outputs of the process with accessible and accurate information.

Scope - Relevant information related to property development still exists outside of this central repository (AMANDA), which would be valuable for cross-functional groups to better meet their objectives. Including information in AMANDA such as applicant notes,
plans / diagrams, agreements, flagging properties with special characteristics, and other relevant information should be considered.

The following BPIs are recommended for implementation under this theme:

27. Utilize AMANDA to track notes on development applications and condition approvals, provide quicker access to plans and drawings, accessible to staff and support training and knowledge of application. (Status 100% complete)

28. Use AMANDA as a central repository of information and track progress of approval and conditions for development approvals not yet in AMANDA (i.e. Sub-divisions, Condos, and Heritage.) (Status 25% Complete)

29. Add a heritage designation flag in AMANDA for heritage properties that ensures related approvals are granted (or conditions fulfilled) before permits are issued on properties on the heritage register. This mitigates unauthorized changes to heritage properties. (Status 0% Complete)

30. Use a centralized and accessible location (i.e. likely AMANDA) to store/find all legal agreements and previous comments. (Status 100% Complete)

31. Track inquiries and responses for individual properties using technology (i.e. AMANDA) (Status 100% Complete)

32. Manage street and alley closing applications (including comments) in AMANDA. (Status 0% Complete)

Summary of Theme F Implementation (Total 54% Complete)

All of the BPIs in this theme are focused on the work program of AMANDA – there have been good strides made in getting more information into the system as to enable a comprehensive history and database of properties and developments. Already completed in the AMANDA work program are Site Plan approval and zoning bylaw information. Subdivisions, condominiums, OPA, H removal, part lot control, and heritage information and street and alley information data are still on the horizon for future AMANDA work schedules. In terms of completing some BPIs like #29 and #32 above, the trigger for success and increasing the completion rate for these BPIs is to get on the approved work plan for IT – however, there is a considerable queue due to competing Corporate capacity/priority issues (i.e. completion of new payroll process project) and as previously discussed in Theme D.

Theme G- Automate property development process workflow and management

Rationale - When mixing cross-functional processes within areas that have experienced resource change over the past few years, it can become challenging to manage workflow. Processes requiring manual work which are heavily dependent on multiple
departments are good candidates for automating workflow management. This has started with some of the property development processes and should continue.

Scope- Building upon the current system functionality for site plan approval, use AMANDA to manage the workflow of development applications (where justified) including notifications, collection of comments, standardizing comments, approvals, and enforcing process controls such as property demolition approvals.

The following BPIs are recommended for implementation under this theme:

33. Use AMANDA for reminder notification to staff and/or supervisor (I.e. when comments are due/overdue) (Status 100% complete)

34. Add a control in AMANDA to prevent the issuance of a demolition / building permit for a heritage property unless authorization is provided. (Status 0% complete)

35. Standardize comments in AMANDA for site plan approval in a template (I.e. pull down items in AMANDA, updated checklist) (Status 100% complete)

36. Use AMANDA or other technology to auto fill basic data into a template for a planner’s reports. (Status 25% Complete)

Summary Theme G Implementation (Total 56% Complete)

Staff have embraced the electronic reminder tool – it has been very effective. Request has been made to set up a ‘flag’ system in AMANDA. Some completions of existing modules i.e. site plan in AMANDA have allowed some report to import AMANDA data into word template for planner’s reports. However more work needs to be done for other modules (i.e. subdivision, etc.) to allow all reports can flow from this automatically.

Theme H - Create a flexible resource pool

Rationale - Many administrative job functions have become specialized over time and are specific to individual services or very select application processes. The business process changes recommended from this review will require an agile staffing model.

Scope - Begin by looking at the current resource allocations and determine if they match up with the current supply of work; and determine if there is this agility within the process to meet customer's expectations this may require reorganization of staff and potential job description changes.

The following BPIs are recommended for implementation under this theme:

37. Revise the duties of existing position(s) to help shepherd applications and conditions. (Status 25% Completion)
38. Within the street and alley closing process, have a Planning Technician review the submitted surveys rather than the Senior Planner. (Status 50% Completion)

39. Address resource capacity issues by revamping site plan staff roles to shift paperwork process to different staff. (Status 100% Completion)

Summary of Theme H Implementation (Total 58 % Complete)

The file manager concept is being implemented as has achieved some positive results and has made the BPI related to changing position duties less important. The strategy for creating less-specialized job descriptions is underway and knowledge and skill transference is being achieved through other related BPIs as well and is progressing nicely. As job descriptions and vacancies allow, changes are being made to make duties more generic and thus less specialized for achievement of a more flexible and knowledgeable staff resource pool. Some oversight of other staff or of multiple staff involved in review exercises is still required for quality control reasons, however, as opportunities arise, continuous improvement efforts are making positive impacts on Department process capacity.

Theme I - Improve internal communications

Rationale - With such a cross-functional group of processes, communication is a critical supporting element.

Scope – Explore opportunities to improve internal communications before an application is entered in a process, during the process, and follow up afterwards.

The following BPIs are recommended for implementation under this theme:

40. When necessary, use a pre-submission activity to review a prospective proposal prior to a formal application submission. (i.e. advise the client early of concerns/issues with current development vision/plans and likely required conditions or supporting documents). (Status 100% Completion)

41. To minimize meetings, engage in conference calls with affected staff and the applicant in lieu of meetings that take time to schedule and involve travel. (Status 100% Completion)

42. Facilitate targeted meetings with select staff representing internal departments. (i.e. smaller meetings with specific groups when warranted vs. the ‘family dinner’) (Status 50% Completion)

43. Communicate to all comment contributing departments the final outcome of an approval (i.e. conditions required) and allow the opportunity to understand why commented items were not carried forward. (Status 100% Completion)
44. Within the site plan approval process, have regularly scheduled standing meetings both internal and with customers. *(Status 100% Completion)*

45. Distribute one electronic copy to stakeholders rather than 3 paper copies of the amending by-law after Council approval. *(Status 100% Completion)*

46. Standardize notification for public communication (reduce cost/improve communication). *(Status 100% Completion)*

Summary of theme I Implementation (Total 93% Complete)

Pre-submission process has achieved a value-added component to the services provided. It has resulted in a faster timeline to provide end product (i.e. a complete application) and has addressed clients’ issues up front in the process, which saves time rather than resolving them later in the process. Teleconferencing also saves time for both staff and clients and respects the developers’ and agents’ time, thus making it more efficient and less costly to them. Also, pre-submission helps to better define and narrow the issues needing attention. As mentioned earlier, a Transportation and Development Triage Team (TDTT) has been formed to support improved feedback loop with Public works staff. This has been more efficient communication model for staff to resolve issues and challenges and at the same time much easier for customers to communicate with staff consistently.

Theme J- Embrace Continuous Improvement

Rationale - Some of our property development processes are based upon a model that is now obsolete by today’s standards. Legislative changes tend to be the catalyst for change. With an increase in the pace of work and increased expectations by our customers, a cultural shift towards continuous improvement with respect to how we do business has started to happen and needs to continue down this path.

Scope- Explore ways of understanding our customers’ needs and expectations through periodic reality checks allowing us to recognize which way to drive our efforts towards improvement and utilizing this information to set strategic direction and priorities. By learning from our successes and failures we can continuously improve the services we provide.

The following BPIs are recommended for implementation under this theme:

47. Quarterly post-mortems of completed application approval decisions. This will give an understanding as to why a lead planner or the Site Plan Approval Officer made decisions, what trade-offs were made, what lessons can be learned, and are there any improvements to our processes do we need to consider. *(Status 100% Completion)*
48. Audit select developments after they are completed to identify further opportunities to improve / constraints in process. **(Status 100% Completion)**

49. Develop priorities and main areas of focus (i.e. prioritize what matters most and focus on this) through setting of standards, realistic expectations and scheduled reviews of the process. **(Status 100% Completion)**

50. Review and change if needed current policies/procedures for consistent messaging. **(Status 90% Completion)**

Summary of Theme J Implementation (Total 98% Complete)

Theme K- Improve Committee of Adjustment processes

Rationale - Approvals governed by the Committee of Adjustment have experienced unique challenges different from the other development approvals by other governing bodies. The uniqueness of these challenges are such that they are highlighted in a separate theme. The current process mitigates some of these challenges but in turn has created new challenges. In particular, there are a number of non-value added steps that are not only inefficient, but can also create risk to the Corporation.

Scope - There is technology currently in place (i.e. AMANDA) that helps to centralize the information and manage workflow. A deeper review including a gap analysis is needed to understand what process changes are needed and if any technology changes should follow in support of these process changes.

51. For minor variances and severances, stop the applicant from getting department signatures as part of the application through centralized pre-consultation.

52. Improve on-going training for Committee of Adjustment members so they understand their role, goals of the committee, and the general processes of Planning.

53. Increase the number qualified members of the Committee of Adjustment to create more efficient meetings with a high quality output of decision.

54. Send Committee of Adjustment orders that require an agreement or land conveyance to the Legal department.

Other BPI's for all development approval processes

The following BPIs could be applied across all development approval processes:
55. Ability to process payment for the applicant immediately (in the Planning department) to avoid the customer from traveling to another building to pay. This should include taking various forms of payment for small transactions (i.e. Under $50).

56. Conduct further review on shifting role/responsibilities for public notices and minutes under the Planning department.

57. Define each stakeholder or “customer” the process serves, clearly state the customer service standards for each, and evaluate the service with each group. (i.e. a customer satisfaction or “exit” survey to applicants after a decision of approval is made, periodically engage the public if expectations have changed, and an internal review survey or follow up interview with internal departments after any major change)

58. Provide acknowledgement to front line staff for customer service excellence.

59. Require only necessary support studies from our customers. Put in place guidelines or standards of support studies based on assumptions and justification for needing them.

60. Establish standards or guidelines for non-complex and complex applications, and then integrate and communicate these standards within current processes (Criteria to consider – require certain studies at the appropriate time, minimal the amount of public consultation, streamline urgent or well planned corporate development projects, streamline internal review processes, review checklists, realistic and legislatively compliant timelines, and consequences for missed timelines.)

61. Educate the applicant by managing expectations and the public through lay terms about the property development approval processes (i.e. simplified flow chart, customized checklist, identify typical documentation required, individualize expected timelines per application, and follow up with updates.)

62. Offer web conferencing services, especially for out of town developers.

63. Switch to electronic signatures on reports instead of personal signatures requiring delivery of reports.

**BPI's specific to the site plan approval process**

The following BPIs could be applied for the site plan approval process:

64. Give administration the authority to charge a premium rate to applicants for site plan approval applications that are complex, very time sensitive, include multiple and/or include concurrent processes. (i.e. white glove treatment)
65. Update old site plan control agreements (since 1998) information into AMANDA.

**Other BPI's for the heritage approval process**

The following BPIs could be applied for the heritage approval process:

66. Address the process related issues of ensuring the enforcement of heritage attributes / violations and the closing of permits officially when work is complete.

67. Update the old heritage designation by-laws in order to adequately protect the heritage characteristics intended. Currently some old heritage designation by-laws are not defendable when challenged.

68. Clarify the application process for demolition permits (including research of heritage relevance).

69. Incentives for applicants who use high quality products for heritage development improvements. (I.e. financial or promotion of product).

70. Provide more incentives for heritage building reuse / preservation.

71. Educate heritage designated property owners on options for building reuse.

72. Improve the online heritage register (i.e. accessible, adding photos, searchable, or include pdf or designation bylaws).

**Other BPI's for the street and alley closing process**

The following BPIs could be applied for the street and alley closing process:

73. Make garbage route and alley surface mapping available in EIS for alleys.

74. Vet the sustainability / limits of an alley or street closure by the planner or manager prior to circulation, and give the applicant a realistic perspective of the challenges, or lack of, before submitting an application (I.e. reduce low probability of success applications).

75. Mitigate risks for street and alley closing GIS drawing revisions before final approval by: 1) include a package checklist accompanying distributed reports for signature to mitigate forwarding an incomplete report for CAO / Clerk signature; 2) Send in advance all known drawing revision comments to GIS in advance of final approval to allow more time to address changes to prepare for a quick turn around on any final changes.
76. Prioritize or encourage street and alley closing applications that are of the whole alley and remove parts as necessary (i.e. do not allow or discourage small portions of allies to be requested for closure).

77. Accept payment of Street and Alley Closure application fees from multiple sources/applicants to reduce burden of the whole application fee on one individual applicant/landowner.

78. Implement technology that assists in collecting video footage for on-site field reviews, particularly for street and alley closings (i.e. Go-pro camera / video created by one staff and shared digitally to other departments) to reduce the number of individual on-site field visits.

Other BPI's Identified for Consideration in the Future

Rationale - During the LEAN workshops there were brainstormed BPI's that have potential for improving service levels; however the BPI was either not in scope for this project or the Corporation is not currently in a position to implement them. It is worthy of noting them below as they are something stakeholders can work towards for future consideration:

79. Position all key staff related COA applications in the same building (i.e. department located in same building)

80. Pre-screen all city alleys to determine potential closures (i.e. prioritize closures)

81. Implement an online interactive pre-consultation process for street and alley closings (i.e. internet based application that allows property owners to create a street and alley map, and visualize its characteristics, and understand the requirements and costs for the closure).

82. Applicant's landscape architect confirms all planting is complete and in good condition (i.e. no City staff is required after planting to inspect for landscaping compliance).

83. Standardize the cost of creating a building lot (i.e. consent vs. subdivision vs. part lot)

84. Establishing a development fee for the entire development (vs. each process) to provide incentives for developers to complete a full development. The fee could be based on the number of processes they have to complete.

85. Create a fee structure based on the complexity of the development. (i.e. lower fees for less complex and higher fees for more complex applications)
86. Reduce the fee for Committee of Adjustment applications that are driven by site plan approval (i.e. duplication of reviews is unnecessary.)

87. Engage the public input with mandatory neighbourhood meetings / open house provided by the developer.

88. Implement a development permit system on select City areas.

**RISK ANALYSIS:**

A total of 88 Business Process Improvements (BPI's) were recommended and the majority is being implemented as to reduce the Corporations development approval risks by establishing an ongoing work program for an improved development approval process.

**FINANCIAL MATTERS:**

N/A

**CONSULTATIONS:**

In 2014 a Public Survey was promoted through Corporate Communications and the Planning Department producing 213 responses, of those that responded, 79% were distributed across the City's 10 wards, while 14% were outside of Windsor and 7% were unsure or chose not to answer.

Fifty-nine direct invitations via email for survey participation were sent to external partners "aka developer" producing 27 responses. Respondents included developers, contractors, consultants, architects, property owners and realtors that have used the City's property development approval services in the past. Of the 27 responses five respondents participated in a follow up interview.

Twenty-nine direct invitations via email for survey participation were sent to internal partners "aka administration", producing 27 responses. Respondents were from the following departments/agencies: Planning, Building, Engineering, Legal, Operations, Parks & Facilities, Fire & Rescue Services, and Windsor Police Services. Of the 27 responses, 12 respondents participated in a follow up interview.

Twenty-six direct invitations via email for survey participation were sent to External Governance bodies or agencies producing seven responses from a pool of the following governing bodies/associations: Chamber of Commerce, Old Walkerville Residents Association, Planning & Economic Development Standing Committee, Committee of Adjustment, Heritage Committee, Essex Region Conservation Authority, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Windsor Construction Association, Greater Windsor Homebuilders Association and Downtown Windsor Business Improvement Association.
As part of on-going work in implementing the recommended Committee of Adjustment BPI program, in late 2015 The University of Windsor MBA program, lead by Mr. Jim Marsh, undertook a study (student report/paper) with assistance and guidance of City Administration, that looked at ways to improve the process (communications and efficiencies, etc.) for Committee of Adjustment.

**CONCLUSION:**

Close to 80% of all the BPIs under consideration have been implemented to date (within the 18 month period following the September 15, 2014 Report to the Standing Committee). Implementing the changes to positions, processes and technology was a significant effort and accomplishment for the staff that work in the development approval sections of the Corporation. As such they needed the assistance of a larger team to accomplish the goal.

Trevor Bennet, Manager of Business Process Centre of Excellence (IT Department) was instrumental in the ongoing implementation and documenting the many and varied process changes identified in this report.

In 18 months more than three quarters of the recommended changes (Business Process Improvements identified) have now been implemented by Development Approval staff.

The next 15-20 % of the changes to be implemented requires ongoing dedication and resources to enable their completion. The majority of which require the City to implement technology solutions such as a dynamic web service that aligns with new information flows, and makes it more convenient for the public to access such data – e-permits and e-approvals type systems will require significant effort to implement and will require future reporting on progress.

**PLANNING ACT MATTERS:**

N/A

**APPROVALS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Deputy City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Acting City Solicitor, approving on behalf of Shelby Askin Hager, City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onorio Colucci</td>
<td>CAO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NOTIFICATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecttura Inc.</td>
<td>Carmen Brunone or Dan Amicone</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carmen@architecttura-inc.com">carmen@architecttura-inc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecttura Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle@architecttura-inc.com">michelle@architecttura-inc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Associates (ADA)</td>
<td>Jerry Kavanaugh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ada-architect.ca">info@ada-architect.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Associates (ADA)</td>
<td>John Gillis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgillis@ada-architect.ca">jgillis@ada-architect.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Associates (ADA)</td>
<td>Stephen Berrill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sberrill@ada-architect.ca">sberrill@ada-architect.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS&amp;P Architects Inc.</td>
<td>Craig Goodman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cgoodman@csparch.com">cgoodman@csparch.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiMaio Design Associates Architect Inc.</td>
<td>M. DiMaio</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mdimaio@dimaiodesign.ca">mdimaio@dimaiodesign.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiMaio Design Associates Architect Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sstiers@dimaiodesign.ca">sstiers@dimaiodesign.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.P. Thomson Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>Colin McDonald</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcdonald@jpthomson.com">mcdonald@jpthomson.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.P. Thomson Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>S. Stiers</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbeaulieu@jpthomson.com">mbeaulieu@jpthomson.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMA Architect Inc.</td>
<td>Stuart Miller</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmarch@mnsi.net">mmarch@mnsi.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passa Associates Inc.</td>
<td>Joseph Passa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joseph@passa.ca">joseph@passa.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passa Associates Inc.</td>
<td>Randi Glos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randi@randi.ws">randi@randi.ws</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeAngelis Construction Inc.</td>
<td>Frank DeAngelis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frank@deangelis.ca">frank@deangelis.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeAngelis Construction Inc.</td>
<td>Max DeAngelis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastercraft Homes</td>
<td>Laura Fanelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petretta Construction</td>
<td>Davide Petretta</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@petcon.net">info@petcon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Construction Association</td>
<td>Jim Lyons</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlyons@wca.on.ca">jlyons@wca.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall Construction</td>
<td>Kerry Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coco Group</td>
<td>Patti Fraise or Sandy Stankov</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sstankov@cocogroup.com">sstankov@cocogroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosatti Development</td>
<td>Cathy Hengl</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kathy.Hengl@rosatiqroup.com">Kathy.Hengl@rosatiqroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mady Development Corporation</td>
<td>Hal Kersey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hkersey@mady.com">hkersey@mady.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valente Real Estate Ltd.</td>
<td>Peter Valente</td>
<td><a href="mailto:valentep1@gmail.com">valentep1@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintru Development Corporation</td>
<td>Murray Troup</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmt@wintru.com">jmt@wintru.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleo &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Vince Aleo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:valeo@bellnet.ca">valeo@bellnet.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon Consulting</td>
<td>Karl Tanner or Melanie Lafoiret</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ktanner@dillon.ca">ktanner@dillon.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nmuir@dillon.ca">nmuir@dillon.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering Initiatives Ltd. (P.E.I.L.)</td>
<td>Scott Arbuckle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@peil.net">info@peil.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC Spencer Associates Inc</td>
<td>Rick Spencer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGS Ltd.</td>
<td>Mark Hanna</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhanna@hgslimited.com">mhanna@hgslimited.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhaegen Surveyors</td>
<td>Andrew Mantha; Roy Simone; Brian Coad</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amantha@vshbbsurveys.com">amantha@vshbbsurveys.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTague Law Firm LLP</td>
<td>Rashid Farhat or Jerry Udell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:judell@mctaquelaw.com">judell@mctaquelaw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Cirvi Attorney</td>
<td>Michael Cirvi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcervi@bellnet.ca">mcervi@bellnet.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Canfield P.L.C.</td>
<td>Mary Ann Keefner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keefner@millercanfield.com">keefner@millercanfield.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petro-Canada Real Estate Department - Manager, Real Estate Development</td>
<td>Dave Weaver</td>
<td><a href="mailto:weaver@petro-canada.ca">weaver@petro-canada.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellings Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>Glenn Wellings</td>
<td><a href="mailto:glenn.wellings@sympatico.ca">glenn.wellings@sympatico.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezaire &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Paul Bezaire</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pbezaire@bezaire.ca">pbezaire@bezaire.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Developer</td>
<td>Kevin Flood</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin_flood@hotmail.com">kevin_flood@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Architect Inc.</td>
<td>Phillip D. McCullough</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salmcc@netscape.net">salmcc@netscape.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Group 547</td>
<td>Perz Tom</td>
<td><a href="mailto:design547@netcore.ca">design547@netcore.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoDevelopments Windsor Inc.</td>
<td>Terry Aldea</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terryaldea@sympatico.ca">terryaldea@sympatico.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GECDSB</td>
<td>Larry Groves</td>
<td><a href="mailto:larry_groves@gecdsb.on.ca">larry_groves@gecdsb.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddad Morgan &amp; Associates Ltd</td>
<td>Larry Groves</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hma@haddadmorgan.com">hma@haddadmorgan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph p. Toth Architect Inc.</td>
<td>Joseph Toth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jptotharch@yahoo.ca">jptotharch@yahoo.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCM Construction</td>
<td>Mike Leslie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elaine@cogeco.net">elaine@cogeco.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCloskey Engineering Ltd</td>
<td>Dawd McCloskey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmccloskey@mccloskeyengineering.com">dmccloskey@mccloskeyengineering.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Facility Management</td>
<td>Dan Jaworski</td>
<td><a href="mailto:djaworski@city.windsor.on.ca">djaworski@city.windsor.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogue Management</td>
<td>Richard Pogue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rich@essexhybrid.com">rich@essexhybrid.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simmons Architects Inc.</td>
<td>P. Moffet</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmoffert@rsarchitects.ca">pmoffert@rsarchitects.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Building Supplies</td>
<td>Greg Drouillard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gregdr@mnsi.net">gregdr@mnsi.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TDL Group</td>
<td>Mark Bodrug</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bodrug_mark@timhortons.com">bodrug_mark@timhortons.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Walter Fredy Partnership</td>
<td>John Van Schubert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jvanschubert@twfp.com">jvanschubert@twfp.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay Vasantgadkar Architect</td>
<td>Vijay Vasantgadkar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vijaywindsor@yahoo.com">vijaywindsor@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylko Architect Inc.</td>
<td>Mykola Wasylko</td>
<td><a href="mailto:myk@warchs.com">myk@warchs.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yablonsky Auto Service</td>
<td>John Yablonsky</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnyablonsky@hotmail.com">johnyablonsky@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelinka Priamo Ltd.</td>
<td>Greg Priamo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jonathan.n@zpplan.com">Jonathan.n@zpplan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWSWA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:emaadus@ewswa.org">emaadus@ewswa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Matt Marchand</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmarchand@windsorchamber.org">mmarchand@windsorchamber.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Walkerville Residents Association (OWRA)</td>
<td>Shane Mitchell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:williamsmitchell@gmail.com">williamsmitchell@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of Adjustment</td>
<td>Mike Sleiman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msleiman@windsor-realty.com">msleiman@windsor-realty.com</a>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERCA</td>
<td>Mike Nelson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MNelson@erca.org">MNelson@erca.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing</td>
<td>Scott Oliver</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.oliver@ontario.ca">scott.oliver@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Construction Association</td>
<td>Jim Lyons</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlyons@wca.on.ca">jlyons@wca.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Windsor Homebuilders Association</td>
<td>Dennis Gerrard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwhba@primus.ca">gwhba@primus.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Windsor BIA</td>
<td>Debi Croucher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:debi@downtownwindsor.ca">debi@downtownwindsor.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDICES:**

1. Appendix A - PDA - BPI Project Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Complete Mar 1, 2016</th>
<th>Business Process Improvement (BPI)</th>
<th>Responsible Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>PDA Business Process Improvement Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>A - Govern &amp; manage property developments based on outcomes &amp; not process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1. Review developments holistically - Development Triage Team</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2. Restructure to create a property development division encompassing Building &amp; Planning departments under one CLT.</td>
<td>Corporate Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3. Establish a single point of contact role (i.e. a property development coordinator or file manager).</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4. Establish a standardized pre-consultation process up front managed by lead Planner.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5. Use Amanda to manage applications through process &amp; mitigate risk.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6. Create an internal heritage team.</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>B - Improve distribution of information to approving governing bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7. Send the amended zoning bylaw to Council at the same time as the application for full approval. (i.e. same day decision).</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8. For official plan &amp; rezoning amendments, put the discussion/comments from the PEDSC into an addendum of the report for Council rather than revise the report (leaving the option to revise if necessary).</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9. Use drawings over text for WHC recommendations.</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10. Use original photos/drawings for Heritage approval sections.</td>
<td>Manager of Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>C - Determine the delegation of approvals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11. Determine what application/requests approvals are delegated to City Planner.</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12. Determine what types of applications are required to go to Council.</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13. Integrate Windsor Heritage Committee (WHC) within the PEDSC.</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>D - Improve communication with customer / applicant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14. Improve PD service website (static portion).</td>
<td>Data Entry/Microfilm Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15. Customer education material on process &amp; common pit falls.</td>
<td>Chief Building Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16. Role / responsibility process maps for staff - education/training material</td>
<td>Manager of Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17. Expected city design guidelines/standards for applicants.</td>
<td>Planner II - Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18. Establish time metrics for WHC reports distributed to applicants.</td>
<td>Manager of Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19. Train development professionals on planning processes. - (i.e. Offer municipal planning information sessions)</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20. Improve PD service website (dynamic portion; i.e. Online engagement / applications).</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21. Prepare detailed development guideline plans for strategic areas of the City to better communicate expectations for development.</td>
<td>Manager of Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete Mar 1, 2016</td>
<td>Business Process Improvement (BPI)</td>
<td>Responsible Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
<td><strong>E - Centralize representation of an application</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22. Consolidation of the facts and comments in administrative reports.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23. Standardize how comments are written for consistent messaging (i.e. focus the comments on what we do want vs. what we don’t).</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24. Develop a standardized comment requirements checklist for site plan approvals.</td>
<td>Site Plan Approval Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>25. Lead Planner represents the file for the City at Committee of Adjustment</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>26. Refine Heritage Planner role as a subject matter expert and assists in multi-process development applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>F - Centralize information for application &amp; process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27. Consolidate all notes on development applications &amp; condition approvals in Amanda. (as modules become available)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28. Centralize information &amp; track progress for applications &amp; condition approvals in Amanda - implement workflow where cost beneficial.</td>
<td>Planning Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29. Create &amp; populate heritage designation field in Amanda</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30. Create a centralized &amp; accessible location (i.e. likely Amanda) to store/find all legal agreements &amp; previous comments.</td>
<td>Legal Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31. Track inquiries &amp; responses for individual properties using technology (i.e. Sharepoint)</td>
<td>Manager of Business Process Center of Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32. Manage street &amp; alley closing applications (including comments) in Amanda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
<td><strong>G - Automate property development process workflow &amp; management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33. Establish Amanda reminder notification to staff &amp; supervisor governance (i.e. what comments are due/overdue)</td>
<td>Manager of Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34. Add an authorization control in Amanda to prevent the issuance of a demolition / building permit for a heritage property.</td>
<td>Manager of Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35. Standardize comments in Amanda for site plan approval in a template (i.e. pull down items in Amanda, updated checklist)</td>
<td>Site Plan Approval Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36. Automatically import Amanda data into a Word template for a planner's reports.</td>
<td>Planning Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
<td><strong>H - Create a flexible resource pool</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37. Revise the duties of existing position(s) to help shepherd applications and conditions.</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38. Planning Technician review the submitted street/alley closing surveys (rather than the Senior Planner).</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39. Address resource capacity issues by revamping site plan staff roles to shift paperwork process to different staff.</td>
<td>Manager of Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>93%</strong></td>
<td><strong>I - Improve internal communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete Mar 1, 2016</td>
<td>Business Process Improvement (BPI)</td>
<td>Responsible Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40. Establish a standard for a pre-submission activity to review a prospect proposal prior to a formal application submission.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41. To have more effective meetings (i.e. face to face vs. conference calls with affected staff &amp; the applicant)</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42. Establish communication standards for meetings (i.e. Facilitate targeted meetings with key stakeholders.)</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43. Establish internal communication standards for application decision making &amp; status.</td>
<td>Site Plan Approval Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44. Establish regularly scheduled standing meetings both internal and with customers (Site Plan).</td>
<td>Manager of Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45. Distribute one electronic copy to stakeholders rather than 3 paper copies of the amending by-law after Council approval.</td>
<td>Development Applications Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46. Standardize notification requirements for public communication (reduce cost / improve communication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98%</td>
<td>J - Embrace continuous improvement</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47. Quarterly post-mortem of completed application approval decisions.</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48. Audit select developments after completion.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49. Establish development priorities through setting of standards, realistic expectations &amp; scheduled reviews of processes.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>50. Review &amp; change if needed current policies/procedures for consistent messaging.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>K - Improve Committee of Adjustment processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51. For minor variances &amp; severance's, stop the applicant from getting department signatures as part of the application through centralized pre-consultation.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52. Improve on-going training for Committee of Adjustment members so they understand their role, goals of the committee, and the general processes of Planning.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53. Increase the number qualified Committee of Adjustment members.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54. Send Committee of Adjustment orders that require an agreement or land conveyance to the Legal department.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Other independent BPI's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55. Process all payments in the Planning department.</td>
<td>Financial Planning Analyst - Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56. Conduct further review on shifting role/responsibilities for public notices &amp; minutes under the Planning department.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57. Define each stakeholder or &quot;customer&quot; the process serves, clearly state the customer service standards for each, and evaluate the service with each group.</td>
<td>Manager of Business Process Center of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58. Provide acknowledgement to front line staff for customer service excellence.</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>Business Process Improvement (BPI)</td>
<td>Responsible Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2016</td>
<td>10% 59. Establish guidelines / standards for required support studies based on assumptions &amp; justification for needing them.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% 60. Establish standards or guidelines for non-complex &amp; complex applications, and then integrate &amp; communicate these standards within current processes.</td>
<td>City Planner / Manager of Business Process Center of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% 61. Educate the applicant by managing their expectations and the public through laymen terms about the property development approval processes.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 62. Offer web conferencing services, especially for out of town developers.</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 63. Switch to electronic signatures on reports instead of personal delivery of reports.</td>
<td>Supervisor of Council Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 64. Give administration the authority to charge a premium rate to applicants for site plan approval applications that are complex, very time sensitive, include multiple &amp;/or include concurrent processes.</td>
<td>Development Triage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 65. Update old site plan control agreements (since 1998) information into Amanda.</td>
<td>Planner III - Subdivisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% 66. Address the process related issues of ensuring the enforcement of heritage attributes / violations &amp; the closing of permits officially when work is complete.</td>
<td>Manager of Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 67. Update the old heritage designation by-laws in order to adequately protect the heritage characteristics intended.</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 68. Clarify the application process for demolition permits (including research of heritage relevance).</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 69. Incentives for applicants who use high quality products for heritage development improvements.</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 70. Provide more incentives for heritage building reuse / preservation.</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% 71. Educate heritage designated property owners on options for building reuse.</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% 72. Improve the online heritage register (i.e. accessible, adding photos, searchable, or include pdf or designation bylaws)</td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 73. Make garbage route &amp; alley surface mapping available in EIS for alleys.</td>
<td>Manager of Geomatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 74. Lead planner / Manager assesses street / alley closure prior to circulating application.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 75. Mitigate risks for street &amp; alley closing GIS drawing revisions before final approval.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 76. Prioritize or encourage street &amp; alley closing applications that are of the whole alley and remove parts as necessary.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 77. Accept payment of Street and Alley Closure application fees from multiple sources/applicants to reduce burden of the whole application fee on one individual applicant/landowner.</td>
<td>Manager of Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 78. Implement technology that assists in collecting video footage for on-site field reviews, particularly for street &amp; alley closing.</td>
<td>Planner II-Development Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10% BPI's for Consideration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Business Process Improvement (BPI)</th>
<th>Responsible Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2016</td>
<td>79. Position all key staff related COA applications in the same building (I.e. Department located in same building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 80. Pre-screen all city alleys to determine potential closures (I.e. prioritize closures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81. Implement an online interactive pre-consultation process for street &amp; alley closings (I.e. internet based application that allows property owners to create a street &amp; alley map, and visualize its characteristics, &amp; understand the requirements &amp; costs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 82. Applicant's landscape architect confirms all planting is complete and in good condition (I.e. no City staff is required after planting to inspect for landscaping compliance).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83. Standardize the cost of creating a building lot (I.e. consent vs. subdivision vs. part lot)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84. Establishing a development fee for the entire development (vs. each process) to provide incentives for developers to complete a full development. The fee could be based on the number of processes they have to complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 85. Create a fee structure based on the complexity of the development. (I.e. lower fees for less complex &amp; higher fees for more complex applications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86. Reduce the fee for Committee of Adjustment applications that are driven by site plan approval (I.e. duplication of reviews is unnecessary.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 87. Engage the public input with strongly encouraged neighbourhood meetings / open house provided by the developer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 88. Implement a development permit system on select City areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI #</td>
<td>Business Process Improvement</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Position all key staff related COA applications in the same building (I.e. Department located in same building)</td>
<td>Volume is not high enough. Perhaps if more development supports such a review. Requires a lot of physical &amp; positional change. Core depts. include Planning, Building, Engineering, &amp; Transportation - Potentially look at new City Hall model to house BPI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Pre-screen all city alleys to determine potential closures (I.e. prioritize closures)</td>
<td>Try to keep the assessment high level to identify alleys with high risk. Conditions data may be available to expedite this assessment with less effort than evaluated. Drawback is that applications are solely customer driven; however this BPI may become</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Implement an online interactive pre-consultation process for street &amp; alley closings (I.e. internet based application that allows property owners to create a street &amp; alley map, and visualize its characteristics, &amp; understand the requirements &amp; costs for</td>
<td>Financial ROI is not there; however there may be a positive ROI with regards to diminishing liability. A business case would have to be done to determine if there is value &amp; appetite to do this. Better understanding of need after the Alley Closing Subsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Applicant's landscape architect confirms all planting is complete and in good condition (I.e. no City staff is required after planting to inspect for landscaping compliance).</td>
<td>Conflicting objectives arise between the developer's landscaper &amp; the City. This may be beneficial to explore for much larger projects where development budgets permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Standardize the cost of creating a building lot (I.e. consent vs. subdivision vs. part lot)</td>
<td>Opportunity - Not in project's scope OPPORTUNITY - Not in project's scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Establishing a development fee for the entire development (vs. each process) to provide incentives for developers to complete a full development. The fee could be based on the number of processes they have to complete.</td>
<td>Opportunity - Not in project's scope OPPORTUNITY - Not in project's scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Create a fee structure based on the complexity of the development. (I.e. lower fees for less complex &amp; higher fees for more complex applications)</td>
<td>Not in scope - Something to consider when reviewing development fee structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Reduce the fee for Committee of Adjustment applications that are driven by site plan approval (I.e. duplication of reviews is unnecessary.)</td>
<td>Opportunity - Not in project's scope Opportunity - Not in project's scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI #</td>
<td>Business Process Improvement</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Engage the public input with mandatory neighbourhood meetings / open house provided by the developer.</td>
<td>Making this meeting mandatory would be difficult to put in place. Encouraging the developer to do so will work if you can convince them the value of communication up front. MC - Strongly encourage public meeting – is not ‘mandatory’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Implement a development permit system on select City areas.</td>
<td>There is no need for a DPS at this time due to the tremendous effort &amp; lack of development requests. This could be considered at a later date as needed should development requests significantly increase in the future or in specific geographic areas with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSION STATEMENT
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REPORT #: S 71/2015
Report Date: 12/17/2015
Author’s Contact:
Kevin Alexander
519-255-6543 ext. 6732
kalexander@citywindsor.ca

date to Council: April 11, 2016
Clerk’s File #: ACO2016

To: Mayor and Members of City Council
Subject: Interim Control By-law Exemption - 3230 to 3232 and 3236 to 3238 Sandwich St.

RECOMMENDATION:
That an exemption from the Interim Control By-law 126-2015, BE GRANTED to 1433341 Ontario Inc, the owner(s) of the property located at 3230 to 3232 (Sandwich Brewing Co.) and 3236 to 3238 (Rock Bottom) Sandwich Street to construct a parking area for the existing commercial establishments, on condition that the Sandwich Heritage Conservation District Plan policies and Olde Sandwich Towne Community Improvement Plan, and the Olde Sandwich Towne Supplemental Development and Urban Design Guidelines be incorporated into this development.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
N/A

BACKGROUND:
On September 8, 2015, Windsor City Council passed Interim Control By-law 126-2015 and 127-2015 (CR170/2015) prohibiting the approval of any new parking areas in the 9 Business Improvement Areas (BIAs) within the City of Windsor, other than those lawfully existing on the day the Interim Control By-laws came into effect, in order to allow Council to review and if deemed appropriate, implement the findings of a study and review of Zoning By-law 8600 (by the Planning and Building Department) with respect to the provisions and regulations related to all parking areas for the areas which comprise the City’s 9 BIAs.
As permitted through CR170/2015 Council will review, on a case-by-case basis, amendments to the Interim Control By-laws where there is a determination that the creation of a new parking area would not conflict with the general purpose and intent of these Interim Control By-laws.

The proposed parking area at the rear of 3230 to 3232 (Sandwich Brewing Co.) and 3236 to 3238 (Rock Bottom) Sandwich Street is located within the Olde Sandwich Towne BIA and subject to Interim Control By-law 126-2015.

DISCUSSION:

On January 14, 2016, the Planning and Building Department received a Site Plan Control Application for a parking area located at the rear of 3230 to 3232 (Sandwich Brewing Co.) and 3236 to 3238 (Rock Bottom) Sandwich Street (See Appendix ‘A’). Considering this proposal is consistent with CR170/2015 permitting Council to review on a case-by-case basis any exemptions to Interim Control By-law 126-2015 where it is determined that the creation of a new parking area would not be in conflict with the purpose and intent of the Interim Control By-law. The purpose of the Interim Control By-law is to ensure that new parking areas would not negatively impact the outcome of a study and review of Zoning By-law 8600 with respect to the provisions and regulations related to all parking areas in the Olde Sandwich Towne BIA.

The property is located within the Sandwich Heritage Conservation District (HCD) area and Olde Sandwich Towne Community Improvement Plan (CIP) area and subject to the Sandwich HCD policies and Olde Sandwich Towne Supplemental Development and Urban Design Guidelines.

The Sandwich HCD and Sandwich CIP

Locating a parking area at the rear of the subject properties is consistent with concepts developed within the Sandwich CIP. Recommendation 13 of the CIP suggested that the “City work with the BIA and existing businesses to develop a complete rear lane system west of Sandwich Street to address employee parking needs”

The proposed parking area will provide parking for not only employees but also customers of these establishments. Although the proposed Parking area does not form a complete rear lane parking system as suggested in the recommendation, it will initiate the process that will make this concept achievable in the future.

Council may also recall that on April 28, 2014 Council approved the application by the owner of 3230-3232 Sandwich Street (Sandwich Brewing Co.) for Financial Incentives under the Sandwich CIP Incentive Program for the repurposing of the vacant property for a micro brewery. The microbrewery is nearing completion and approval of the proposed parking area will further support this new business.

Through the Site Plan Review process Administration will ensure that the proposed parking area not only addresses all Sandwich HCD policies and Sandwich CIP Urban Design Guidelines but all City policies as it relates to the creation of a Parking area.
Access will be achieved through a reciprocal access agreement from an adjacent property.

The property is also located within an area of High Archaeological Potential as identified on Schedule C1 of the City’s Official Plan. Any archaeological concerns will be dealt with through the Site Plan Control Process. Construction of the proposed Parking area will be subject to approval of the City Planner prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

**RISK ANALYSIS:**

Administration is following the process set out in CR170/2015 permitting the review of the proposed parking area on a case-by-case basis. Amendments to Interim Control By-law 126-2015 may be permitted by Council where there is a determination that the creation of a new parking area would not be in conflict with the purpose and intent of the Interim Control By-law. The ultimate goal is to preserve and enhance the unique built form and main street character of BIAs and to ensure their success.

The proposed parking area is also in keeping with Sandwich HCD and Olde Sandwich Towne CIP.

**FINANCIAL MATTERS:**

There are no matters of direct financial consequence to the Corporation arising from the recommendation of this report.

**CONSULTATIONS:**

Administration has consulted with professional staff regarding the Site Plan Control Application and requirements of the Interim Control By-law. Through the Site Plan Review process the owner(s) of 3230 to 3232 and 3236 to 3238 Sandwich Street and members of Administration who form part of the Site Plan Control Committee will be consulted.

**CONCLUSION:**

Permitting the creation of a parking area located at the rear of 3230 to 3232 (Sandwich Brewing Co.) and 3236 to 3238 (Rock Bottom) Sandwich Street would not be in conflict with Interim Control By-law 126-2015 and would not negatively impact the outcome of a study and review of Zoning By-law 8600 with respect to the provisions and regulations related to all parking areas in the Olde Sandwich Towne BIA. The proposed Parking area meets the intent of Recommendation 13 of the Sandwich CIP and all Sandwich HCD policies and Sandwich CIP Supplemental Development and Urban Design Guidelines will be addressed through the Site Plan Review process. The proposal will
create a parking lot behind existing buildings that front Sandwich Street and thus preserves the unique built form and main street character of the two properties referenced. Administration supports the exemption to Interim Control By-law 126-2015. Final approval of the City Planner will be required prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

APPROVALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thom Hunt</td>
<td>City Planner / Executive Director Planning &amp; Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Deputy City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Acting City Solicitor, approving on behalf of Shelby Askin Hager, City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Nantais</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onorio Colucci</td>
<td>Chief Administrative Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTIFICATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC Spencer Associates Inc.</td>
<td>261 Shepherd Street East Windsor, ON N8X 2K6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Sekela Blunt</td>
<td>3236 to 3238 Sandwich Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicole@rockbottom.ca">nicole@rockbottom.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX “A” - Location Map-230 to 3232 and 3236 to 3238 Sandwich Street

APPENDIX “B” - Preliminary Site Plan
MISSION STATEMENT
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To: Mayor and Members of City Council

Subject: Request under the Alley Closing Subsidy Program (ACSP) to close part of the north-south alley located between Albert Rd. and St. Luke Rd., south of Alice St. and north of Milloy St.; File No.: SAA/4370

Ward 5

RECOMMENDATION:

I. That part of the north-south alley having the width of 4.27m (14ft), located between Albert Rd. and St. Luke Rd., south of Alice St. and north of Milloy St., as shown on Drawing CC-1681 attached hereto as Appendix “A”, BE ASSUMED for subsequent closure;

II. That part of the north-south alley having the width of 4.27m (14ft), located between Albert Rd. and St. Luke Rd., south of Alice St. and north of Milloy St., as shown on Drawing CC-1681 attached hereto as Appendix “A”, BE CLOSED AND CONVEYED to the abutting property owners subject to the following:

   i. Easements, subject to their being accepted in the City’s standard form and in accordance with the City’s standard practice, be granted to:

      a. Bell Canada, Cogeco Cable Canada LP, Union Gas and Enwin Utilities Ltd (Hydro)

   ii. Conveyance Cost BE SET as follows:
Abutting properties zoned RD 1.3:

1. $1.00 plus alley subsidy cost of $99.00 during the alley subsidy program;

2. $1.00 plus alley subsidy cost of $99.00 after the expiration of the alley subsidy program

III. That The City Planner BE REQUESTED to supply the appropriate legal description, in accordance with Drawing Number. CC-1681, attached hereto as Appendix “A”

IV. That The City Planner, or designate, BE AUTHORIZED to publish the required legal notice

V. That The City Solicitor BE REQUESTED to prepare the necessary by-law(s)

VI. That The Chief Administrative Officer and City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to sign all necessary documents approved as to form and content satisfactory to the City Solicitor

VII. That the matter BE COMPLETED electronically pursuant to By-law Number 366-2003

VIII. If the existing alley approach at the south end of the ally becomes obsolete after the alley closure, the City shall remove the existing southerly alley approaches in the future when budget funds exist. Alternatively should property owners that abut the southerly approach to the closed alley wish to retain the alley approach as driveways, permits from Public Works shall BE REQUIRED.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

N/A

BACKGROUND:

At its meeting on October 1, 2012, Councillor Payne asked the following question:

CQ24-2012 “Asks for a report on the feasibility of a proactive program to offer certain alleys for sale, possibly for a nominal payment to abutting property owners so as to relieve the City of the cost of maintaining such alleys in perpetuity.”

On December 2nd, 2013, City Council adopted B38/2013 which approved a Capital Budget for 2014 that included enhanced funding for specific Capital Projects. One of
the projects was the Alley Closing Subsidy Program (ACSP) outlined in CR240/2013, attached hereto as Appendix “F”. On December 21, 2015, City Council adopted B28-2015 which approved the Alley Closing Subsidy Program be continued for an additional 2 years (through 2017), using the balance of funds remaining from the previously approved 2014 Enhanced Capital Funding Plan.

Prior to the ACSP program being approved by City Council, there was interest expressed by 3 of the residents on this block to close the alley. In 2015 one of those residents on the block, Mr. Keith Morris, agreed to be the main contact for the ACSP program and circulate the petition with the help of another neighbour on the block Mr. Ronald Colombe. Subsequently Mr. Keith Morris moved away from the neighbourhood and Mr. Ronald Colombe remained as the primary contact person for the ACSP process. This alley is the ninth qualified alley on the waiting list of 137 applicants (as of March 18, 2016) for the ACSP program. The completed petition document was returned to the City’s Planning Department for processing.

At the time of circulating the petition the entire length of the alley from Alice St. to Milloy St. was considered for closure and the petition was circulated to all abutting property owners from Alice St. to Milloy St. A total of 41 private properties abut the entire length of the alley that is being considered for closure. The 41 private properties were provided with a petition, and 30 property owners signed the petition (73%), and 22 of the property owners supporting the closure of the alley have paid the $100 alley subsidy program fee (54%). (see Appendix “B” for a map of the properties abutting the alley.)

The site visit by Planning Department staff confirmed that the alley is a good candidate for closure. Currently the alley is accessible through the curb cuts at its south and north ends. The alley does not seem to be utilized for much vehicular traffic as driving through the alley was exceptionally difficult while travelling from south to north. The only property that utilizes the alley to gain vehicular access to their rear garage is 1729 Albert Rd. The staff at Planning Department contacted the owner of 1729 Albert Rd. (Mr. Philip Allen) and he indicated that he requires access to the rear of the property through the north entrance to the alley, therefore only partial closure of the alley is recommended (south of 1729 Albert Rd.) Those residents on this block whose properties are located north of 1729 Albert Rd., and have signed the petition in support of the closure of the entire length of the alley and paid the $100.00 fee, will be refunded the full amount of $100.00, as they will not be able to purchase the alley abutting their properties. A total of 12 properties are located north of 1729 Albert Rd. and they are: 1723 Albert Rd., 1719 Albert Rd., 1717 Albert Rd., 1711 Albert Rd., 1707 Albert Rd., 1703 Albert Rd., 1726 St. Luke Rd., 1720 St. Luke Rd., 1716 St. Luke Rd., 1712 St. Luke Rd., 1708 St. Luke Rd. and 1702 St. Luke Rd.

There are no municipal sewers or manholes in the alley. There are hydro poles and overhead hydro lines throughout the alley. No encroachments appear to exist along the entire length of the alley. (See Appendix “D”, Site visit photos).

Planning Department has received comments from a variety of City Departments and outside agencies. There have been no objections to closing part of the alley as shown on Drawing No. CC-1681 attached hereto as Appendix “A”. Windsor Police strongly supports the closure of this alley, and they have indicated in their comments that “closure is optimal as it eliminates what is otherwise an area of refuge for criminals to
gain discrete access to property with reduced detection capability. When opportunities for unlawful behaviour persist, the neighbourhood becomes more susceptible to acts of crime and disorder.” Also during the site visit by Planning Department, a couple of the neighbours approached the Planner and indicated that there has been a variety of unsavoury activities taking place in the alley and Windsor Police have been called many times to the neighbourhood due to these activities.

**DISCUSSION:**

Planning Department’s analysis of the requested alley closure:

The first test is to determine whether the subject alley is dispensable or not. To make such determination the guideline attached herein as “Appendix “F” would be relevant as shown below.

- **a.** Does the subject alley serve commercial properties or serve properties fronting on heavily traveled streets i.e. major arterial routes?
  The answer is NO. The properties are zoned RD 1.3 and the abutting properties are used for residential purpose.

- **b.** Does the subject alley contain sewers, and must the alley remain accessible for servicing?
  The answer is NO.

- **c.** Does the subject alley serve as the only vehicular means of access to rear parking areas and garages where the property has insufficient lot width for a side drive?
  The answer is Yes for one property only, 1729 Albert Rd., therefore only partial closure of the alley is recommended (south of 1729 Albert Rd.)

- **d.** Does the subject alley contain Fire Department connections that are deemed to be necessary for firefighting access?
  The answer is NO.

- **e.** Does the subject alley have some usefulness?
  The answer is NO for that part of the alley which is being recommended for closure. The south portion of the alley does not seem to be utilized for much vehicular traffic as driving through the alley was exceptionally difficult while travelling from south to north. The only property that does utilize the alley for vehicular access to their rear garage is 1729 Albert Rd., therefore only partial closure of the alley is recommended (south of 1729 Albert Rd.) There are utility poles located in the alleys (servicing Cogeco, Bell and Windsor Utilities), also Union Gas has services within the alley and easements are required for the utility companies mentioned above.
f. Does the alley have no useful purpose?

It should be noted that alleys that appear to serve no useful purpose are typically alleys in residential areas and locations where generally the lots are wide enough for side drives, or those alleys abutting parks and other parcels of land that do not require any servicing from the alley.

The subject alley falls under the above category of alleys, so the answer is NO, currently it does not serve any useful purpose to 40 of the 41 abutting properties. “Alleys that serve no useful purpose should be closed, if at all possible, and in fact, the owners abutting thereon should be encouraged to accept conveyance.” (Excerpt from Appendix “F” attached).

g. Is the subject alley lying in holding zones and other similar undeveloped areas where the alley system is clearly obsolete and has never been developed, but where the City needs to keep its options open until new area plans are prepared and development is imminent?

The answer to the question is NO.

In consideration of the above analysis, Planning Department recommends partial closure of the subject alley, as its characteristics are consistent with the Street and Alley Closing Classification (see Appendix “F” attached.) There are many properties on this block that have no driveway access from the street and they do not utilize the alley for rear yard parking either. Street parking is very common on this block. Planning Department recommends partial closure of the alley (south of 1729 Albert Rd.) Planning Department is recommending conveyance of the closed alley to the abutting property owners. The Planning Department fully supports the closure of the subject alley shown on Drawing No. CC-1681, attached herein as Appendix “A”.

RISK ANALYSIS:

The only property that seems to utilize the alley for vehicular access to their rear garage is 1729 Albert Rd. The staff at Planning Department contacted the owner of 1729 Albert Rd. (Mr. Philip Allen) and he indicated that he requires access to the rear of the property through the north entrance to the alley, therefore only partial closure of the alley is recommended (south of 1729 Albert Rd.) Those residents on this block whose properties are located north of 1729 Albert Rd., and have signed the petition in support of the closure of the entire length of the alley and paid the $100.00 fee, will be refunded the full amount of $100.00, as they will not be able to purchase the alley abutting their properties. A total of 12 properties are located north of 1729 Albert Rd., and they are: 1723 Albert Rd., 1719 Albert Rd., 1717 Albert Rd., 1711 Albert Rd., 1707 Albert Rd., 1703 Albert Rd., 1726 St. Luke Rd., 1720 St. Luke Rd., 1716 St. Luke Rd., 1712 St. Luke Rd., 1708 St. Luke Rd., and 1702 St. Luke Rd.
Should all of the partial closed alley not be purchased by the abutting property owners, there is a risk that the City would still be liable for any remnant parcels remaining in City ownership.

There are no other known risks associated with the proposed closure of the alley shown on Drawing No. CC-1681 attached herein as Appendix “A”.

**FINANCIAL MATTERS:**

Conveyance Cost **BE SET** as follows:

- Abutting properties zoned RD 1.3:
  1. $1.00 plus alley subsidy cost of $99.00 **during** the alley subsidy program;
  2. $1.00 plus alley subsidy cost of $99.00 **after** the expiration of the alley subsidy program

**CONSULTATIONS:**

Consultations were held with City Administrative Departments and Utility Companies, which resulted in the information outlined in Appendix “C”. Also the staff at Planning Department contacted the owner of 1729 Albert Rd. (Mr. Philip Allen) and he indicated that he requires access to the rear of the property through the north entrance to the alley, therefore only partial closure of the alley is recommended (south of 1729 Albert Rd.)

Planning Department has received comments from a variety of departments and outside agencies. There have been no objections to closing the entire alley system as shown on Drawing No. CC-1681 attached hereto as Appendix “A”. Windsor Police strongly supports the closure of this alley, and they have indicated in their comments that “closure is optimal as it eliminates what is otherwise an area of refuge for criminals to gain discrete access to property with reduced detection capability. When opportunities for unlawful behaviour persist, the neighbourhood becomes more susceptible to acts of crime and disorder.”

Easements are required in favour of Bell Canada, Cogeco Cable Canada LP, Enwin Utilities Ltd (Hydro) and Union Gas.

**CONCLUSION:**

The Planning Department has considered all the comments received and recommends closure of part of the subject alley as shown on the attached Appendix “A”, subject to conveyance costs.
APPROVALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Wilson</td>
<td>Manager Development Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom Hunt</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Wright</td>
<td>Coordinator, Real Estate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Acting City Solicitor, approving on behalf of Shelby Askin Hager, City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Nantais</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onorio Colucci</td>
<td>CAO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix “E” – CR240/2013  
Appendix “F” – Alley Classifications according to CR240/2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell Canada</td>
<td>Requires Easement Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogeco Cable Systems Inc.</td>
<td>Requires an easement over the entire portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enwin Utilities – Hydro</td>
<td>No Objection, however, an easement named to Enwin Utilities Ltd. will be required upon closing for the entire alley to accommodate existing 16kV and 120/240 volt hydro overhead distribution &amp; poles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Utilities – Water</td>
<td>Water Engineering has no objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works – Engineering</td>
<td>This alley appears to be a well maintained grass alley with some brush and dirt. There are no municipal sewers or manholes in this alley. There is a concrete approach off of Milloy Road and a gravel approach off of Alice Road. If the alley gets closed, the residents will be responsible for the concrete approach. If this approach has no useful purpose to the resident, reinstatement of the concrete barrier curb may be required by the resident or by future road rehabilitation. There are hydro poles and overhead hydro lines throughout this alley. No encroachments appear to exist within the alleyway however it is bordered by fences from residents of both St. Luke Road and Albert Road. This alley appears to serve no useful purpose by CR146/200; therefore we have no objections to the closure of this alley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works - Environmental</td>
<td>In general, Environmental Services is supportive of this closure. However, if abutting homeowners purchase their section of the alley, while others do not, there could be a risk of inaccessibility to a small pocket left in the City’s possession, but surrounded by private property (leaving it inaccessible for maintenance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works – Transportation</td>
<td>There are three properties abutting this alley that have garages with access to the alley. Unless these property owners agree that they do not require the access to their garages we cannot support this closure request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Gas</td>
<td>Please be aware there is 8” steel main, 420 kPa running along the alley, between Milloy St, and Alice St and the main is tying into the existing services for addresses on St Luke St. <em>(Requires Easement)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Police Services</td>
<td>The Windsor Police Service supports closure of this alley. It is a grassed over alley that, while clearly being used to some degree, is not required to facilitate police patrol or incident response activities in the neighbourhood. In these situations where an alley is located in an established residential neighbourhood but is not required for municipal service delivery (emergency vehicle access, garbage collection, etc.), closure is optimal as it eliminates what is otherwise an area of refuge for criminals to gain discrete access to property with reduced detection capability. When opportunities for unlawful behavior persist, the neighbourhood becomes more susceptible to acts of crime and disorder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Approach to the alley from the South end.

Figure 2: Underutilized alley.
Figure 3: Graffiti in the underutilized alley.

Figure 4: Underutilized alley.
Figure 5: Garage and parking at the rear of 1729 Albert Rd. The owner of 1729 Albert Rd. has not signed the petition in support of the closure.

Figure 6: Approach to the alley from the North end.
CR240/2013

That the report of the City Engineer dated October 28, 2013 entitled “Options for Expansion and/or Acceleration of Proactive Sale of Alleys Pilot Program approved by Executive Committee” BE RECEIVED; and further,

That Council APPROVE the Alley Closing Subsidy Program (Appendix A) as follows:

**Option V – Expand Zoning Eligibility / Increase Pilot Program Funding Level**

Expand the zoning beyond the current parameters of the proposed pilot program to include other zoning districts with low density residential use (i.e. RD2.1) plus add *proactive* sale of previously closed alley lands that remain as remnant parcels. At this time this would apply only to those alleys which were closed prior to 1980. Maintain the pilot program as a 2-year program. Increase funding to $200,000 per year. Approximately 10 alleys and some remnant parcels will be able to be closed annually under this option. (These 10 alleys are above the number of alleys which will be closed which do not qualify for any subsidy under the Program). This option expands the eligibility and addresses the strong demand for the program.

In order to complete the work described above, additional departmental resources are required; specifically 2 additional temporary staffing resources (Planner II and Street and Alley Legal Clerk ($168,159 per year)).

This option expands the eligibility and better addresses the strong demand for the program.
The City’s alleys fall into one of four general classifications based on their usefulness. Alleys may move from one category to another based on changes in circumstances. (i.e. relocation of utilities). The four classifications of alleys are:

1. **Indispensable**
   These are alleys serving commercial properties and properties fronting on heavily traveled streets i.e. major arterial routes and alleys which contain sewers and must remain accessible for servicing.

   These alleys should not be closed, conveyed, reduced or otherwise jeopardized through minority interests unless a suitable substitute alley is opened in lieu thereof. They are essential from the viewpoint of fire protection, police protection, loading or unloading of goods, refuse collection, servicing of blocked sewers and utility services. Without such alleys, the above noted services would at least be more costly if not impossible to a complete or adequate extent; and would noticeably interfere with street traffic, thereby reducing the capacity of the adjacent arterial, collector, or business access street.

2. **Dispensable**
   These alleys are typically alleys in residential areas and locations where generally the lots are wide enough for side drives, or those alleys abutting parks and other parcels of land which do not require any servicing from the alley. In short, they serve no useful purpose, either now or anticipated.

   The alleys in this category should be closed if at all possible, and the owners abutting the alleys should be encouraged to accept conveyance. If an abutting property owner requires access through the public right-of-way, access cannot be denied. Therefore, unless an alternate access can be found, the right-of-way cannot be closed.

3. **Have Some Level of Usefulness**
   These alleys are alleys which, having some usefulness, are nevertheless not indispensable nor on the other hand, a complete liability. (e.g. Alley is grass or gravel and may have a sewer or access to garages).

   These alleys should be considered for closing only upon request of abutting owners rather than by encouragement of the City.

4. **Located in Planned Development Districts**
   These alleys are those located in the Planned Development Districts and other similar undeveloped areas where the alley system is clearly obsolete and has never been developed, but where the City needs to keep its options open until new area plans are prepared and development is imminent.

   These alleys should not be closed unless specific development proposals acceptable to the City are submitted.

In addition to the four general classifications of alleys above, there may be further complicating specific attributes to individual alleys:

- the alley may be fully or partially closed;
- the alley may be encroached upon.
MISSION STATEMENT
“Our City is built on relationships – between citizens and their government, businesses and public institutions, city and region – all interconnected, mutually supportive, and focused on the brightest future we can create together”

REPORT #: SCM 39/2016
Report Date: 3/22/2016

Author’s Contact:
Greg Atkinson
519-255-6543 ext. 6582
gatkinson@citywindsor.ca

Date to Council: April 11, 2016
Clerk’s File #: SPL/10759

To: Mayor and Members of City Council

Subject: Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan (CIP) application submitted by 1109045 Ontario Limited for 775 Riverside Drive East (Ward 4)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the request made by 1109045 Ontario Limited to participate in the Brownfield Tax Assistance Program BE APPROVED for the proposed remediation and redevelopment at 775 Riverside Drive East for up to 3 years pursuant to the City of Windsor Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan; and

THAT, Administration BE DIRECTED to prepare a tax cancellation by-law to implement the Brownfield Tax Assistance Program in accordance with the Municipal Act and that the appropriate information and material be sent to the Minister of Finance requesting relief from the education portion of the taxes for 775 Riverside Drive East in accordance with the Provincial Brownfield Financial Tax Incentive Program; and

THAT the request made by 1109045 Ontario Limited to participate in the Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program BE APPROVED for 70% of the municipal portion of the tax increment resulting from the proposed redevelopment at 775 Riverside Drive East for up to 10 years or until 100% of the eligible costs are repaid pursuant to the City of Windsor Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan; and

THAT, Administration BE DIRECTED to prepare an agreement between 1109045 Ontario Limited, and/or any future owner, and the City to implement the Brownfield Tax Assistance and Rehabilitation Grant Programs in accordance with all applicable policies, requirements, and provisions contained within the Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan to the satisfaction of the City Planner as to technical
content, the City Solicitor as to legal form, and the CFO/City Treasurer as to financial implications; and

THAT, the CAO and City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to sign the Brownfield Tax Assistance and Rehabilitation Grant Agreements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

N/A

BACKGROUND:

Glengarry-Marentette Waterfront Village Community Improvement Plan (G-M CIP)

The City’s Planning Department completed a neighbourhood study between 2001 and 2003 for the area east of Glengarry Ave, south of Riverside Dr E, west of Marentette Ave, and north of University Ave E. The study resulted in the adoption of a Glengarry-Marentette Community Improvement Plan (G-M CIP) in 2003, which was intended to direct future growth and change in the neighbourhood.

Brownfield Redevelopment Community Improvement Plan (CIP)

Brownfield sites are properties that may be contaminated due to previous industrial or commercial uses such as a manufacturing facility or gas station. City Council approved a Brownfield Redevelopment CIP at its April 19, 2010 meeting for the purpose of encouraging the study, clean-up, and redevelopment of contaminated properties.
The approval of the CIP was the result of nearly five years of study and consultation, which began in October 2005. The CIP contains a number of financial incentive programs that encourage brownfield redevelopment. The application submitted by 1109045 Ontario Limited is the eighth request the City has received for incentives under the Brownfield Redevelopment CIP. This is the second request for brownfield incentives under the Brownfield Property Tax Assistance and third request under the Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program.

**Importance of Brownfield Redevelopment**

In 2009 the City’s Planning Department identified 137 brownfield properties (i.e. 226 hectares or 559 acres) that are available for redevelopment. While the inventory is not exhaustive, it illustrates the significance of Windsor’s brownfield stock and the need to work with land owners to put these properties back into productive use.

Historically, there has been little interest in redeveloping brownfield sites due to the uncertainty surrounding the extent of contamination and the potential cost of clean-up. The CIP provides financial incentives to undertake the necessary studies and remedial work necessary to redevelop brownfield sites and reduce the potential negative impacts to the City's environment and neighbourhoods.

The benefits associated with brownfield redevelopment go far beyond the boundaries of the property. For example, they are often strategically located within existing built up areas of the City where services and other infrastructure, such as roads, schools, community facilities and public transit are already available, therefore additional infrastructure costs are not incurred to service these areas. The redevelopment of these sites also remove the negative stigma often associated with some brownfield properties, which increases the value of the subject property and adjacent properties.

Brownfield sites also represent a significant underutilization of the land base. According to the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (2003), every hectare redeveloped through a brownfield project saves up to an estimated 4.5 hectares of greenfield land from being developed (i.e. agricultural land on the edge of the City); and for every dollar invested in a brownfield redevelopment, it is estimated that $3.80 is invested in the economy.

**Site Background**

775 Riverside Drive (Site) is approximately 0.27 hectares (0.67 acres) in size and is situated on the south west corner of Riverside Drive East and Marentette Avenue. The Site has been vacant since approximately 1990 before which a gas station and service centre occupied the Site for the preceding 60 years. Prior to 1947 a residential dwelling occupied the southern portion of the Site (i.e. fronting Chatham Street East) and two other residential dwellings existed on the western portion of the Site (i.e. fronting Riverside Dr E), which were demolished along with the service station in the early 1990s.
Council recently approved an application submitted by 1109045 Ontario Limited under the Environmental Study Grant Program, which provided $15,000 toward the completion of a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA).

The property is owned by a local property developer 1109045 Ontario Limited (i.e. Mastercraft Homes), which has authorized Mr. Bill Salzer to act on its behalf. The Site is designated for medium profile residential in the Official Plan and zoned RD 3.1 (Residential District), which permits a range of residential dwelling types.

DISCUSSION:

Proposed Brownfield Clean-up

Based on the results of the Phase II ESA a remedial work plan has been created to clean up the Site to residential standards and file a Record of Site Condition (RSC). The work plan involves:

- the removal of and disposal of approximately 950 tonnes of contaminated soil;
- documenting the remaining soil conditions;
- backfilling the site with clean fill;
- confirming condition of clean fill against standards for residential land use;
- preparation of a report; and
- filing a RSC.

The estimated cost of the remedial work is $73,000 and would be managed by a qualified environmental consultant.
Redevelopment Proposal

The Current owner (1109045 Ontario Limited) intends to cleanup the property and file a RSC, however it does not intend to redevelop the property. The property would be sold after a RSC is filed to an individual or corporation that would likely construct a multi-unit residential building. It is expected that the new owner would redevelop the property in accordance with the current residential RD 3.1 zoning, which would permit a four storey building, containing an estimated 40 residential rental or condominium units.

Brownfield Property Tax Assistance Program

The Brownfields Property Tax Assistance Program may cancel any increase in municipal property taxes on a brownfield property for up to three years during rehabilitation and redevelopment (or until 100% of eligible remediation costs have been repaid). Through the municipality—property owners may also apply to the Province for a matching cancellation of any increase in education property taxes. Under the tax cancellation provision of the Municipal Act (i.e. section 365.1) the program may continue for up to three years during which time it’s assumed remediation and redevelopment are taking place.

The value of tax cancellation must be offset by eligible costs, which are the costs of any action taken to reduce the concentration of contaminants on, in, or under the property to permit a RSC to be filed (e.g. Phase II ESA, Risk Assessment, environmental remediation, placing of clean fill, installing environmental controls, monitoring, environmental insurance premiums, etc.).

To enact the program, Council must pass a tax cancellation by-law and make application to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (i.e. on behalf of 1109045 Ontario Limited) for cancellation of the education portion of the tax levy under the Provincial Brownfield Financial Tax Incentive Program (BFTIP). A tax cancellation agreement between the City and 1109045 Ontario Limited is also required, which would cause any tax cancellation be repaid should a RSC not be filed.

Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program

The Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program starts after the Brownfield Property Tax Assistance Program and Provincial BFTIP end. The purpose of the program is to encourage the remediation, rehabilitation and adaptive re-use of brownfield sites by providing grants to help pay for remediation costs not fully disbursed by the Brownfield Tax Assistance Program and BFTIP as well as non-environmental rehabilitation costs normally associated with brownfield site redevelopment (e.g. demolishing buildings, building rehabilitation and retrofit works, development application and building permit fees, and upgrading on-site/off-site infrastructure).

The program offers annual grants funded through the increase in municipal property tax levy created by the investment for up to 10 years to help offset eligible costs. In total the Tax Assistance and Rehabilitation Grant programs may offer up to 13 years of tax-based incentives. The CIP specifies Brownfield Rehabilitation Grants will equal 70% of the municipal property tax increase for a project that employs standard construction
methods and 100% of the municipal property tax increase for projects that achieve any level of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification.

Annual grants are only paid out following the filing of a RSC, reassessment of the property and the payment of the property taxes for the year in which the grant is to be provided.

Brownfield Development Charges Exemption Program

There is no application form for this program, however if approved under the Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program 1109045 Ontario Limited (or subsequent property owner that has been assigned the right to receive the grant) would automatically receive a 60% reduction in development charges owing in accordance with the Brownfield Redevelopment CIP and the City’s Development Charges By-law (No. 60-2015).

CIP Goals

City staff are supportive of the application as it meets all of the eligibility requirements specified within the Brownfield Redevelopment CIP. The proposed filing of a RSC and redevelopment of the former gas station supports the following CIP goals:

- To promote the remediation, rehabilitation, adaptive re-use and redevelopment of brownfield sites throughout the City of Windsor in a fiscally responsible and sustainable manner over the long term;
- Improve the physical and visual quality of brownfield sites;
- Improve environmental health and public safety;
- Provide opportunities for new housing, employment uses, and commercial uses;
- Increase tax assessment and property tax revenues;
- Promote Smart Growth, including the reduction of urban sprawl and its related costs, energy efficiency through the construction of buildings that meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards, and green planning and building practices;
- Improving the land use compatibility of potential brownfield sites with surrounding land uses;
- Increase community awareness of the economic, environmental and social benefits of brownfield redevelopment; and
- Utilize public sector investment to leverage significant private sector investment in brownfield remediation, rehabilitation, adaptive re-use, and redevelopment.

Policy Support

The clean up and redevelopment of the Site is supported by numerous policies within the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, the City’s Official Plan, the City’s Environmental Master Plan, and Community Strategic Plan.
RISK ANALYSIS:

There is little risk associated with the approval of the CIP application. Staff resources are required for the upfront administration of the grant programs, finalization of the legal agreements, and making application to the Province under the BFTIP.

Should Council refuse the request for financial incentives from 1109045 Ontario Limited there is a risk of the project not moving forward. Should the clean up and redevelopment not occur the property would remain vacant and continue to be underutilized.

Approval to participate in the Tax Assistance Program is a prerequisite for participation in the Provincial BFTIP. Refusing the request to participate in this program would preclude the leverage of any Provincial tax cancellation.

FINANCIAL MATTERS:

Assuming the Site is developed to its full potential under the residential RD 3.1 zoning, Administration estimates the post RSC and redevelopment property value assessment to be approximately $8,000,000.

Brownfield Property Tax Assistance Program

Increases in municipal and education tax levies would be cancelled by City Council via by-law and not collected in accordance with Section 365.1 of the Municipal Act for up to three years or until 100% (i.e. $73,000) of the eligible remediation costs are repaid. The municipal portion would be charged to the annual provision for property tax write-offs. The education portion would be charged back to the Province as a deduction from its quarterly payments.

Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program

The Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program would apply if less than 100% of the eligible remediation costs are repaid through the Brownfield Tax Assistance Program. Assuming standard construction methods are used and a multi-residential tax class is applied, the corresponding post-redevelopment annual municipal tax levy would be approximately $332,225. This would yield a maximum annual grant of $225,406 (i.e. 70% of the increase)—far exceeding the estimate of eligible remediation costs (i.e. $73,000). Assuming the units were condominiums, the corresponding post-redevelopment municipal tax levy would be $130,780. This would yield an annual grant of $84,395—which also exceeds the estimate of eligible remediation costs (i.e. $73,000).

Based on the estimated grant calculations 1109045 Ontario Limited would recover 100% of its investment in remediation during the first year of the grant program. The City would retain the base taxes as well as 30% of the municipal tax increase.
throughout the lifespan of the grant program, which is estimated to total one year. Following completion of the grant program, the City would retain the full increase in municipal taxes for the life of the development.

**Brownfield Development Charges Exemption Program**

Section 11 of the Development Charges (DC) By-law provides a partial exemption for infill development within core areas of the City. The general development charge for an apartment unit is $10,067—but at 775 Riverside Drive East the rate is reduced to $3,090 per unit. If approved by Council to participate in the Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Program the owner would receive an additional 60% reduction in development charges owing provided under section 10 of the Development Charges By-law. This could be applied in addition to the partial exemption under Section 11, which would reduce the total development charge to $1,236 per unit.

**Payment of Incentives**

The intent of the Brownfield Redevelopment CIP is to provide financial incentives to the entity undertaking the remediation. Where a property is sold prior to redevelopment—the seller and purchaser must agree on which entity will receive the grants. The arrangement would be set out in a legal agreement registered on the title of the property between the current owner, new owner, and the City.

**CONSULTATIONS:**

The development and approval of the Brownfield Redevelopment CIP was subject to extensive stakeholder and public consultation, which sought input from a wide range of stakeholders and internal City departments.

Planning staff have consulted with the applicant prior to accepting the Brownfield CIP applications. Staff from the Planning, Finance, Building and Legal Departments were consulted in the preparation of this report.

**CONCLUSION:**

City Staff recommend Council approve the requests from 1109045 Ontario Limited to participate in the Tax Assistance and Brownfield Rehabilitation Grant Programs and direct Administration to make application to the Province under the BFTIP program on 1109045 Ontario Limited’s behalf. It is also recommended that the CAO and City Clerk be authorized to sign any CIP agreements with the 1109045 Ontario Limited and/or any future owner of the property.

The proposed clean-up, and redevelopment of this brownfield site conforms to the Brownfield Redevelopment CIP; assists the City in the achievement of a number of CIP, Official Plan, Environmental Master Plan, and Community Strategic Plan goals; and exemplifies the purpose for which the Brownfield Redevelopment Strategy was created.
PLANNING ACT MATTERS:

N/A

APPROVALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thom Hunt</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Deputy City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Acting City Solicitor, approving on behalf of Shelby Askin Hager, City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Nantais</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onorio Colucci</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer and CAO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTIFICATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Salzer</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kdg321@hotmail.com">Kdg321@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MISSION STATEMENT
“Our City is built on relationships – between citizens and their government, businesses and public institutions, city and region – all interconnected, mutually supportive, and focused on the brightest future we can create together”

REPORT #: S 68/2016
Report Date: 22/03/2016

Author’s Contact:
Greg Atkinson
519-255-6543 ext. 6582
gatkinson@citywindsor.ca

Date to Council: April 11, 2016
Clerk’s File #: SPL/10759

To: Mayor and Members of City Council

Subject: Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan (CIP) application made by Windsor Mold Inc. for 4011 and 4035 Malden Road (Ward 2)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the request made by Windsor Mold Inc. to participate in the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program BE APPROVED for 100% of the municipal portion of the tax increment resulting from the proposed development located at 4011 and 4035 Malden Road for up to 10 years or until 100% of the eligible costs are repaid pursuant to the City of Windsor Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan; and

THAT, Administration BE DIRECTED to prepare an agreement between the City and Windsor Mold Inc. to implement the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program in accordance with all applicable policies, requirements, and provisions contained within the Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan to the satisfaction of the City Planner as to technical content, the City Solicitor as to legal form, and the CFO/City Treasurer as to financial implications; and

THAT, the CAO and City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to sign the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Agreement.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

N/A
BACKGROUND:

City Council approved the Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan (CIP) at its January 31, 2011 meeting via CR 50/2011. The adopting By-law 30-2011 was passed by Council at its February 14, 2011 meeting.

The Economic Revitalization CIP provides financial incentives to encourage new investment in targeted economic sectors for the purposes of diversifying the local economy and creating/retaining jobs. The CIP allows the City to take a variety of measures to further the objectives of the Economic Revitalization CIP that would otherwise be prohibited by Ontario’s Municipal Act. This includes the acquisition and preparation of land; construction, repair, rehabilitation or improvement of buildings; the sale, lease or disposal of land and buildings; and the provision of grants to owners or tenants of land—all of which must conform with the objectives and policies contained within the CIP.

To date, City Council has approved 15 applications made under the CIP representing a range of targeted economic sectors including manufacturing, research and development, creative industries, logistics, health & life sciences, and tourism. Windsor Mold Inc. has applied for financial incentives under the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program.

The Windsor Mold Group of companies provides products and services for domestic and international customers in the tooling and automotive plastic molding injection industries. The company’s headquarters and largest tooling facility (located on Malden Road) designs and builds plastic injection molds for various original equipment manufacturers (OEM) across North America. The Windsor Mold Group also owns a smaller manufacturing facility in Pharr, Texas.

Windsor Mold Inc. owns two abutting properties on Malden Road: 4011 and 4035 (see Map 1). 4011 Malden Road, which is 0.56 hectares (1.38 acres) in size and formerly contained a 1,850 square metre (19,913 square foot) industrial building that was demolished in January 2016. 4035 Malden Road contains a 9,200 square metre (100,000 square foot) industrial building. Both properties are designated ‘Industrial’ in the City’s Official Plan and zoned Manufacturing District (MD 1.1), which permits a range of industrial uses.

DISCUSSION:

Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program

The Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program is intended to stimulate investment in targeted economic sectors for the purpose of retaining and encouraging existing businesses to grow in Windsor. Manufacturing businesses retaining a minimum of 50 jobs are eligible to apply under the program.
Successful applicants are eligible to receive an annual grant for up to 100% of the municipal property tax increase created by an investment in development or redevelopment of a building or property—provided it conforms with the Economic Revitalization CIP. The annual grants may continue, at Council’s discretion for up to 10 years or until up to 100% of the eligible investment costs are repaid.

**Eligible Sector**

Windsor Mold Inc. is eligible under the manufacturing sector:

*Manufacturing*

Companies engaged in the fabricating, processing, assembling, packaging, producing or making goods or commodities, including ancillary repair, storage, wholesaling or office uses.

**Employment**

According to the CIP application the proposed development would retain 211 jobs at the existing manufacturing facility and add 20 new jobs over the lifespan of the grant program. Windsor Mold Inc. has added approximately 65 full time positions over the past five years.

**Proposed Construction**

Windsor Mold Inc. requires an additional 2,500 square metres (27,000 square feet) of manufacturing space to accommodate additional CNC machines as well as new technology automation processes. The addition will be constructed on 4011 Malden Road to the north of the existing facility (see Appendix A). The total eligible cost of the construction and is estimated at $3,700,000. The cost of demolishing the building at 4011 Malden Road is not eligible for inclusion in the program as it was incurred prior to the submission of the CIP application.

**CIP Objectives**

The proposed expansion of the Windsor Mold Inc. facility and recommended Business Retention and Expansion Grant supports the following CIP objectives:

- Encourage investment that results in the productive use of lands and/or buildings for the purposes of establishing or maintaining a business enterprise, or the expansion of existing businesses to realize more effective use of the land’s potential;
- Encourage capital investments that create new and/or maintain existing permanent jobs, as well as short-term construction jobs that contribute to the reduction of the unemployment rate;
- Support investments in specified high potential economic sectors that contribute to the diversification of the local economy;
- Provide financial incentive programs that are attractive to potential investors and corporate decision-makers, but are balanced with expectations of City taxpayers and the City’s ability to fund financial incentive programs;
- Facilitate the development of the City’s vacant employment lands and other areas that have the potential to be new employment areas;
• Attract investment based on the community’s strengths and competitive advantages; and
• Support investment and development that results in an increase in property assessment and grows the non-residential municipal tax base over the long-term.

**RISK ANALYSIS:**

There is little risk associated with the approval of the CIP application. Staff resources are required for the upfront administration of the grant program and finalization of the legal agreement. Limited staff resources related to on-going monitoring of the employment use and issuance of annual grants will also be required over the next ten years.

Should Council refuse the CIP request there is a risk of Windsor Mold Inc. losing its competitive edge in relation to other OEM manufacturers in the southern United States and Mexico.

**FINANCIAL MATTERS:**

**Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program**

The tax increment portion of the Business Retention and Expansion Grant is not calculated or paid out until all eligible work is completed and the property is reassessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). Reassessment of the property must result in an increase in assessment value. The grant amount is recalculated annually based on the actual assessed property value, tax class, and municipal tax rate.

**Summary of Potential Financial Incentives**

The applicant proposes to invest $3,700,000 on new building construction which is estimated to increase the cumulative property value assessment by $1,036,000 (i.e. 4011 and 4035 Malden Rd). Planning and Finance staff have prepared pro-forma calculations (Figure 1) to provide an understanding of the potential grant magnitude.

The estimated annual increase in municipal tax levy would be $71,302—which would yield a total grant value of $713,016 over the 10 year lifespan of the program. This would represent approximately 19% of the eligible investment in the property made by Windsor Mold Inc. Costs incurred prior to the submission of the CIP application (i.e. March 15, 2016) would not be eligible for inclusion in the grant program.

Because the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program does not cancel taxes, the applicant must pay the full amount of property taxes annually and will subsequently receive a grant for the difference between the pre and post-development municipal taxes. The City will retain the amount of pre-development (base) municipal taxes...
throughout the lifespan of the grant program, however will be foregoing any incremental property taxes which could otherwise be used to offset future budget pressures.

**Figure 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Grant</th>
<th>Pre-Development Municipal tax Levy</th>
<th>Estimated Post-Development Municipal Tax Levy</th>
<th>Estimated Value of Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$100,728</td>
<td>$172,030</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,007,285</td>
<td>$1,720,301</td>
<td>$713,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details**
- Current Property Value Assessment (4011 Malden Rd) $537,000
- Current Property Value Assessment (4035 Malden Rd) $2,098,000
- 2015 Municipal Industrial Tax Rate (Occupied) 0.03822713
- Estimated Eligible Investment Costs $3,700,000
- Estimated Post-Redevelopment Property Value Assessment (4011 & 4035 Malden Rd) $3,671,000
- 2015 Municipal Industrial Tax Rate (Large Industrial) 0.04686192
- Percentage of Eligible Investment Offset by Grant 19.27%

**CONSULTATIONS:**

The Economic Revitalization CIP was subject to extensive stakeholder and public consultation as part of the approval process, including two public open houses, a statutory public meeting of Council and circulation among internal City staff and the Province.

Planning staff have consulted with the applicant prior to accepting the application for the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program. Staff from the Planning, Finance, and Legal departments were consulted in the preparation of this report.

**CONCLUSION:**

Administration recommends that Council approve the request from Windsor Mold Inc. to participate in the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program. Specifically, that 100% of the municipal portion of the tax increment resulting from the planned development located at 4011 and 4035 Malden Road be provided as an annual grant.
for up to 10 years or until 100% of the eligible costs are repaid pursuant to the City of Windsor Economic Revitalization CIP.

The planned expansion of the building and parking area conforms with the Economic Revitalization CIP, assists the City in the achievement of a number of the CIP objectives, and exemplifies the intent of the Business Retention and Expansion Grant Program.

**PLANNING ACT MATTERS:**

N/A

**APPROVALS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thom Hunt</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Deputy City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wira Vendrasco</td>
<td>Acting City Solicitor, approving on behalf of Shelby Askin Hager, City Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Nantais</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onorio Colucci</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer and CAO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTIFICATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Mastronardi</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmastronardi@windsormoldgroup.com">dmastronardi@windsormoldgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Rovansek</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrovansek@windsormoldgroup.com">mrovansek@windsormoldgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDICES:**
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Appendix A: Business Plan Summary
Business Overview – March 2016

The Windsor Mold Group of companies provides world class products & services for domestic and international Customers in the tooling and automotive plastic molding industries. The Tooling Division is focused on designing and building plastic injection molds for various OEM’s and tier one manufacturers across North America.

The Tooling Division has two facilities: the larger facility and headquarters in Windsor, Ontario and a smaller facility in Pharr, Texas. The Windsor facility is approximately 9200 square metres (100,000 square feet) and employs over 210 people.

The Tooling Division has experienced significant growth over the last five years driven by increased market share and our strengthening position of being a technology solutions provider to our Customers. Through investment in R&D and cutting edge manufacturing technology, the Tooling Division is recognized as a global player in high technology plastic injection molds.

This growth has driven job creation in Windsor and ultimately the need for more manufacturing space. From an employment standpoint, the Tooling Division has added over 65 full time positions in the last 5 years and continues to grow the team to meet the demands of the business. With respect to our footprint, there is a need to add an additional 2500 square metres (27,000 square feet) of manufacturing space to the Malden Road facility to accommodate additional CNC machines and high technology automation to ensure we remain at the cutting edge of technology in the global mold industry.

The City of Windsor’s Economic Revitalization Community Improvement Plan grant application plays a key role in ensuring our operations in Windsor, Ontario continue to be competitive, continue creating and retaining jobs in Windsor, and continue to encourage future investment in technology to ensure the mold manufacturing cluster in Windsor-Essex remains strong and globally competitive. Given a shifting of the OEM’s and hence automotive supply base to the Southern United States and Mexico, it is vital for Windsor that support is available to accelerate our expansion plans by offsetting some of the costs associated with infrastructure investments to ensure a sustainable future in manufacturing in Canada.