

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 7.1. Zoning By-law Amendment Application for property municipally known as 1920 Grove Avenue; Applicant: Olivia Construction Homes Ltd.; File No. Z-016/24, ZNG/7206; Ward 2 **(S 96/2024)**

Clerk's Note: Louise Gagne, area resident, submitting the **attached** letter dated July 23, 2024 as a written submission; Linda MacKenzie, Neighbourhood Committee Representative, submitting the **attached** letter dated August 2024 as a written submission; Crystal McKenzie, area resident, submitting the **attached** letter dated August 2, 2024 as a written submission

DELEGATIONS:

PLANNING ACT MATTERS

- 7.1. Zoning By-law Amendment Application for property municipally known as 1920 Grove Avenue; Applicant: Olivia Construction Homes Ltd.; File No. Z-016/24, ZNG/7206; Ward 2 **(S 96/2024)**

- a) Justina Nwaesei, Planner III – Development (**PowerPoint**)
- b) Tracey Pillon-Abbs, RPP, Principal Planner, available for questions (via Zoom)
- c) Crystal McKenzie, area resident, available for questions (in person)
- d) Joanne Verschraegen, area resident (in person)
- e) Rick Hobbs, area resident (in person)
- f) Linda MacKenzie, Neighbourhood Committee Representative (in person)

HERITAGE ACT MATTERS

- 10.2. Request for Heritage Permit – 567 Church Street, Revell-D'Avignon House (Ward 3) **(S 72/2024)**

Clerk's Note: Administration is providing the **previously distributed** additional information **(AI 17/2024)**

- a) Xiaoliang Duan, property owner (in person)

- 10.3. Request for Partial Demolition and Removal from Municipal Heritage Register for Heritage Listed Property – 232 Thompson Boulevard, House (Ward 6) **(S 90/2024)**

- a) Robert & Melanie Polewski, property owners, available for questions (in person)

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- 11.3. Amendment to Sign By-law 250-04 for 2545 Howard Avenue, File No. SGN-001/24 - Ward 10 **(S 88/2024)**
 - a) David Meikle, Signal Out of Home, available for questions (in person)
 - b) Shawna Petzold, General Manager, Permit World, available for questions (via Zoom)

Honoured members of the City Council and of the Development & Heritage Standing Committee,

I am writing to express my **opposition to the proposed rezoning and development** of the vacant land located on the north side of Grove Avenue between Josephine Avenue and Partington Avenue, municipally known as 1920 Grove Avenue. Instead of the development proposal under discussion, I instead propose **preserving this land**, bolstering the city's number of green spaces and improving the quality of life for city residents living nearby.

The City's Official Plan declares the importance of "creating balance between human activities and natural systems", yet this proposed development would be removing a natural system that swept over the land after the previous structures were removed: a field of wildflowers, which has been attracting a variety of pollinators like butterflies, as well as birds and insects that help control local mosquito populations, not to mention residents who like to walk near these wildflowers to get regular exposure to nature.

The two next-nearest naturalized areas are Gateway Public Park Trail and South Cameron Woodlot, each of which is over a twenty minute walk away. None of the parks closer to here than those two have much biodiversity at all, which is not only an environmental concern but also a detriment to the quality of life in our neighbourhood.

Therefore, I urge the Council to **consider rezoning this parcel of land as a Green District** (specifically GD1.1: Public Park), and instead **create naturalized trails** on this land to complement the more open and manicured Bridgeview Park on the other side of Grove Avenue. Such a plan would help our city make great strides towards "creating balance between human activities and natural systems" and also "enhancing the image of Windsor as an attractive and livable city" where people "feel comfortable and are inspired by their surroundings" – all of which are important features of (and direct quotes from) the Official Plan.

Preserving this land as green space would also satisfy several noteworthy goals listed in Ontario's Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2000. In particular:

- Policy 1.1.1 (c) encourages "avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns". Although the development proposal attempts to claim that "No environmental or public health and safety concern is triggered by the proposed change of the use of the subject land," I contend that the study hasn't fully accounted for the way the land is actually being used. This land has become a valuable resource that helps us naturally boost our physical and mental health by providing us the opportunity to meander alongside a beautiful natural area. Losing this would be detrimental to our well-being and health.
- Policy 1.1.1 (h) supports "promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity". The proposed residential development would disrupt the biodiversity absolutely, while the counter-proposal of curating a naturalized green space would provide much better alignment with this policy.
- Policy 1.1.1 (i) promotes "preparing for the regional and local impacts of a changing climate", which the green space counter-proposal directly supports. Plants and trees not only help offset carbon emissions, but they also help mitigate the heat island effect of densely developed areas. Plus, green spaces naturally absorb more rainwater than developed areas; perhaps more

importantly, this parcel of land has a tendency to collect rainwater into a pond that lasts long enough in the springtime that I've seen several pairs of mallards attempting to nest there over the past few years. It could be valuable to investigate whether such a naturalized pond area would be helpful for the city's stormwater management strategies, which may become increasingly challenged as extreme weather continues to rise.

- Part IV of the PPS states that “Strong, liveable and healthy communities promote and enhance human health and social well-being, are economically and environmentally sound, and are resilient to climate change.” Increased housing density does nothing to promote environmental resilience or the health of communities or its residents, whereas whereas a naturalized area with trails would be capable of enhancing all these and more.

The Climate Change Risks discussed in the development proposal only address the risks of proceeding with the development, while completely disregarding the risks of removing more green space from the city. While I understand the need for more housing, I believe it is also crucial to retain pockets of nature within urban settings. Once a green space is gone, it would be nigh-impossible to reclaim... and the satellite view of Windsor would end up marred with yet another grey block that had the all-too-brief opportunity to be green.

I have prepared a collection of photos highlighting the natural beauty that has arisen from this parcel of land over the past several years. These provide a much-needed contrast to the site photos provided by the developers, which have been staged to show only the apparent emptiness that they want you to see.

I have spoken to several of my neighbors who also wish to see this land preserved as green space rather than redeveloped. I hope for all our sakes (and those of our children) that you **halt the discussion of developing this land**, and take the time to **thoroughly investigate the value of preserving green space to protect biodiversity and provide community benefits**.

My counter-proposal of providing trails would encourage local residents to appreciate and engage with that biodiversity, supporting both environmental protection and quality of life. This aligns well with the City of Windsor's goals of enhancing residents' well-being.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Crystal McKenzie
resident on Bridge Avenue since 2020,
resident of Windsor since 1997.

Design Concerns Regarding

Planning Rationale Report Regarding Zoning Bylaw Amendment

Proposed Development of 1920 Grove Avenue as Submitted by Pillon Abbs Inc.

The Provincial Policy Statement stipulates, “To provide an appropriate range and mix of housing options and diversities required to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area¹.” The PPR response indicates, “There is currently a need for more housing in the City.” While there is indeed a need for housing, particularly affordable housing, in the City as a whole; this report has failed to analyze the needs particular to the market area – the geographical surroundings of the University of Windsor, specifically Bridgeview. A high percentage of the existing homes are transitioning into rentals: mostly student, many with absentee landlords. We fail to see the rationale of how a market-value condominiums meet the requirements of this market area.

PPS states “Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities to meet projected market-based and affordable housing needs of current and future residents of the regional market area.²” PPR’s response includes the statement, “The development will broaden the range and mix of housing available in the area.” It certainly will, but a market-value condominium complex neither meets the needs of the likely future area residents nor is ‘affordable housing’.

The surrounding area of this development has been referred to several times in the Planning Rationale Report (PPR), citing that “The proposed buildings will blend in with the surrounding area¹” and “The proposed development is low profile, which is similar to the surrounding area².” In fact, the surrounding area is 90% one-and-a-half storey houses built 90-110 years ago whereby the second floor comprises of sloping roofs toward the front and back of the property without windows. The proposed development is neither similar nor will ‘blend in’. In fact, the modern concept of the new development is in stark contrast to the architectural design of the existing properties.

The PPR says “The proposed development is compatible in terms of scale, massing, height, siting, setbacks, parking and amenity areas³”. The two ‘elevated buildings’ (three-storey height) facing Grove Avenue are not in compliance with scale and height; they do overlook Bridgeview Park and not really any residential area. However, the two buildings containing 6 townhouse units on the north of the property are an anomaly. These two buildings overlook lots 241 to 243 on Partington, 167 and 168A on Bridge, and lots 115 through 119 on Josephine. Although the exact measurements of setback are not provided, the distance from the rear and side of the buildings to the property edge appears close enough to infringe on the aforementioned abutting lots.

The PPR response claims, “Building Height – There are no impacts on privacy or shadowing on abutting properties based on the proposed building height. This is similar to the height of a single detached dwelling.”⁴ This is a false statement. While it is correct for the central complex, the two buildings on the north side will severely impact the view, shadowing and privacy of the lots surrounding the cul-de-sac.

Minimum Rear Yard Depth request to change from 7.5 metres to 5.48 metres (25 to 18 feet) – the PPR indicates “reduction in the rear yard does not impact the abutting property” applies to the centrally located buildings, but it does not apply to the separate two buildings on the north side of the plan. In addition, while the PPR indicates that the Minimum Side Yard Width of 2.5 metres complies, as the buildings on the north side of the property are ‘side-facing’, the Minimum Rear Yard Depth requirement should be applied to the buildings’ side yards.

1. Provincial Policy 1.4.1
2. Provincial Policy 1.4.3
3. Official Plan 3.3.3
4. Official Plan 6.32.5
5. Official Plan 6.3.2.5
6. Official Plan 8.7.2.3

Submitted by Linda MacKenzie August 2024

July 23, 2024

I start with this quote per “The Windsor Star” on Jan. 31, 2024:

Unlike those other successful applicants, Windsor refused to change its zoning bylaw to allow fourplexes on any residential lot.

Okay. Imagine that—the city refusing millions of dollars for new housing based on that issue.

Now imagine a 43-unit townhouse dwelling right smack in the middle of **your** neighbourhood—all pending on a zoning change.

The composition of our neighbourhood has already been transformed from long-term home owners to an increasing amount of missing-in-action investors at this time. A large majority of our “single dwelling” homes in our neighbourhood have already been remodeled from 2 to up to 6 bedroom rental units OFTEN without building permits. Parking along parallel Josephine Avenue is at a premium with often four cars per rented house.

The Olivia plan calls for 43 units of one, two, three and four bedrooms. The math doesn’t add up for 56 parking spaces, let alone their visitors.

Parking along Grove Avenue has always been tight around the corner from Campbell onto Grove because of parking which reduces the width of the lane plus it is a busy intersection for the nearby West Gate grade school.

Our street is already used as a speeding course by those avoiding Partington Avenue’s speed bumps. I can’t imagine more traffic.

The report stated “No impacts on climate change is anticipated.” I’m calling that debatable.

I’m worried about the noise issue. How long will construction take? Will we have to endure years of construction noise? And the influx of hundreds of people?

The owners of the property bought it as zoned residential. I’m all for progress but would prefer that residential homes NOT 2 storey townhouses sardined together butted against the perimeter of our homes be built by changing the zoning bylaws and with their request of a reduction in the required rear yard setback AND exempt the development from the building material requirement in section 11.5.5.50.

It’s a no for me.

Louise Gagne,

Windsor, ON

P.S. By the way, we also have the homeless hub that was thrust upon us coming to the area of Wellington within our radius in the future. Thanks, at least, for a chance to voice our opinions on this matter of the Olivia Construction proposal.