



Summary of Correspondence Received on Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment at 639 Front Road North

Below is a summary of the comments received by the Planning Services division, as of April 13, 2023 on the proposed ZBA for lands located at 639 Front Road North.

Windsor Police

I have reviewed this application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law to allow a multiple residential dwelling development of the lands in question, and would advise the Windsor Police Service has no concerns or objections with it. If site plan control ends up being a requirement at some point once the lands are physically developed, we will provide more detailed comments that specifically address issues of public safety and security.

Infrastructure Services

No comments relative to the zoning change, although there will be some comments regarding proposed development listed, but not limited to the following;

1. That the development obtain the legal right for stormwater to drain by statute (Drainage Act). Either by S.4 for a new drain leading from the development to the White Drain, or by the current S. 78 report that is active for the White Drain.
2. That the proposed development have a minimum set back from the White Drain be as set out by ERCA (8 meters plus $\frac{1}{2}$ the depth of the drain) and obtain approvals for same.
3. That the development as a whole is subject to stormwater management.
4. That the development complete a drainage report under S. 4 or S. 78 of the Drainage Act to obtain item 1 above, as well as to clearly establish a working corridor for the White drain by by-law.

Fire Department

No issue

Essex Region Conservation Authority

Town of Amherstburg has received an Application for a Zoning By-Law Amendment for the subject property. We understand that this rezoning, if approved, will amend the zoning of the lands noted below from the "Residential Type 1A/Special Provision Commercial Neighbourhood (R1A/CN-4) Zone" to "Special Provision Residential Multiple Second Density (RM2-11) Zone" and "Special Provision Residential Second Density (R2-8) Zone". The proposed Amendment to the Zoning By-law is in conformity with the policies

in the Official Plan. The lands are designated as Special Policy Area 9 in the Town's Official Plan, which permits neighbourhood commercial and high-density residential uses.

The effect of the amendment to the RM2-11 Zone will be to allow for a multiple dwelling construction with special provisions including a reduced exterior side yard from 6 m or half the height of the building, whichever is greater, to 7.5 m, a reduced interior side yard from 6 m or half the height of the building, whichever is greater, to 7.5 m, and a reduced front yard depth from 25 m from Front Road N to 16 m.

The effect of the amendment to the R2-8 zone will be to allow for general residential uses on the subject properties with a reduced minimum exterior side yard width from 6 m to 4.1 m, an increased maximum lot coverage for single detached dwellings from 35% to 42% and an increased maximum lot coverage for semi-detached dwellings from 35% to 56%.

The amendment will allow for multiple types of residential development including single detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and multiple residential buildings.

The following is provided as a result of our review of Zoning By-Law Amendment ZBA-20-22.

DELEGATED RESPONSIBILITY TO REPRESENT THE PROVINCIAL INTEREST IN NATURAL HAZARDS (PPS) AND REGULATORY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

The following comments reflect our role as representing the provincial interest in natural hazards as outlined by Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement of the Planning Act as well as our regulatory role as defined by Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act.

The above noted lands are subject to our Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation under the Conservation Authorities Act (Ontario Regulation No. 158/06). The parcel partially falls within the regulated area of the White Drain - Outlet Portion. The property owner will be required to obtain a Permit and/or Clearance from the Essex Region Conservation Authority prior to any construction or site alteration or other activities affected by Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act.

It should be noted that any proposed future development on the parcel would be subject to setback restrictions from top of bank of the White Drain - Outlet Portion. The setback is determined on a site-specific analysis.

The above-mentioned drain is a municipal drain that falls under the jurisdiction of the Town of Amherstburg. The municipal drain typically has an unregistered working space in which the municipality has the right to use to maintain or repair the drain. In addition, it is the owner's responsibility to obtain all necessary permits and/or clearances from the

Town of Amherstburg for any works to the drains. All inquiries regarding Drainage Act approvals should be made with the Drainage Superintendent of the Town of Amherstburg.

Stormwater Management

There may be concern with the potential impact of the quality and quantity of runoff in the downstream watercourse due to future development of this site. If this property is subject to Site Plan Control / Plan of Subdivision or Condominium, we request to be included in the circulation of those applications. We reserve to comment further on storm water management concerns until we have had an opportunity to review the specific details of the proposal through these applications.

NATURAL HERITAGE

Please be advised that, pursuant to Bill 23 and regulations enacted as a result, Planning Authorities are now solely responsible for ensuring consistency with section 2.1 (i.e., natural heritage policies) of the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Effective January 1, 2023, the current amended Conservation Authorities Act, specifically sections 21.1.1 (1.1) and 21.1.2 (1.1), prohibit Conservation Authority staff from providing this service. Should Planning Authorities lack internal expertise, they have the option to outsource this function to consulting firms.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION

The property owner will be required to obtain a Permit and/or Clearance from the Essex Region Conservation Authority prior to any construction or site alteration or other activities affected by Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act. Setback restrictions will apply.

If this property is subject to future Planning Applications, as noted above, we request to be included in the circulation of these applications. We reserve to comment further on storm water management concerns, until we have had an opportunity to review the specific details of the proposal through these applications.

Gordan Freeman, Resident, Front Road:

I have several serious concerns regarding the proposed zoning amendment to lot 639 Front Rd. N. The first concern is the reduction in exterior side yard, interior side yard and exterior front yard without knowing the plan of the subdivision. We don't know what is going to be built on the lot, yet we are giving the builder carte blanche to add more dwellings of unspecified size to the lot. Variances should be made once the builder submits a plan.

The second concern is sewage capacity. The existing line services homes from Texas Rd. and flows to the north by gravity to the 722 Front Rd. N. relay pumping station. This station was overwhelmed by Kingsbridge subdivision a few years back and new housing builds had to be stopped for a period of time. A large pumping station in Kingsbridge was built to intercept the new force main running under Front Road. We don't know the density of population on lot 639 and I am afraid it could again overwhelm the 722-pump station and if it does who pays for the corrective work?

The third concern is the natural ravine south of or included in 639. At the bottom is a small rock-strewn stream and the whole is a unique woodland setting. This area I firmly believe is environmentally significant and should be preserved.

Sincerely,

Gordon Freeman

Chris and Alicia Peltier, Residents, Front Road:

I am writing in response to the notice I received regarding the proposed amendment to Zoning By-Law 1999-52 for the property located at 639 Front Rd N. The meeting for this proposed amendment is Monday March 13, 2023. Due to previous commitments, I am unable to attend the meeting.

My wife and I reside at Front Rd N. We are not fully opposed to this Zoning By- Law change, but have two concerns that we would like considered before Town Council would approve this change.

Our first concern is the drainage from the property at 639 Front Rd N. There is a large drainage ditch on the south side of the property that flows beneath the road, under our property and out into the Detroit River. This drain has collapsed in the past and we fear that with the added runoff from multi-residential buildings this could occur again.

Our second concern is the amount of traffic that will be increased coming and going from these new multi residential buildings. It is difficult and dangerous for us and our neighbours to leave our driveways now.

Adding more vehicles that are coming and going from 639 Front Rd N will make the problem worse. The speed limit on Front Rd N is 70 km/h but most vehicles are exceeding that speed.

If the zoning By-Law is approved, we would like to see a traffic control signal put up at the entrance of the driveway for 639 Front Rd N. This will slow traffic down and allow for residents to enter and exit their driveways safely.

Thank you for your consideration,
Chris & Alicia Peltier

Nick Minardi, Resident, Front Road:

Council of the Corporation of the Town of Amherstburg, I, Nick Minardi, am in strong opposition to the proposed amendment to the Town of Amherstburg Zoning By-law 1999-52, under Section 34 of the Planning Act.

This rezoning application affects 2.3 ha of land described as Part Lot 13, Concession 1 S, municipally known as 639 Front Road N. The amendment would create a "Second Density R2-8 Zone". The amendment would allow the developer to build multiple types of residential buildings. This amendment will allow for multiple dwelling construction with special provisions including a reduced exterior side yard, a reduced interior side yard, and a reduced front yard depth.

The amendment would allow an increased maximum lot coverage for single detached dwelling from 35% to 42% and an increased maximum lot coverage for semi-detached dwellings from 35% to 56%.

The amendment would also reduce front yard depth from 25 m from Front Road N to 16 m.

For these reasons, I am in strong opposition to the proposed amendment. Please keep me informed as to the result from the amendment application.

Peter Dunn, Resident, Gold Coast Drive:

Re: Anderdon building lots.

I would like to address the situation of the Anderdon vacant property. We had heard that Norbert Bolger was looking to develop the property and this was exactly what we are looking for. We have seen for years this empty land and wondered why no one would step forward and develop this great piece of property. As a lot of us in the town are getting older and would like to move into a great place where there is less work to do and no yard maintenance as well as security. We would ask that the town of Amherstburg please look at this and realize once and for all that is good for the town and tax base. If there is any further discussion that we can participate in please contact us as soon as possible.

Best regards
Peter Dunn

John Dalimonte, Realtor:

As a licensed Realtor now in my 35th year, born and raised in Amherstburg, I am wishing to express my support for the development of the subject property known as The Former Anderdon Tavern site located at Front Rd North.

This residential development would fit well with the neighbourhood and pay respect to the abutting properties with now a residential use rather than the many previous years of commercial Tavern enterprise days.

I wish to state that as a Realtor I am not a representative of Norbuilt Construction but simply a support Realtor of the project as I personally have received inquiries from prospective clients for more information and who are specifically interested in Condominium purchase as well as single family detached and attached.

This project will greatly assist with the supply and demand issues we are currently experiencing in Amherstburg for more residential/Condominium living.

On behalf of myself and clients thus far, I hope that this letter conveys to you my support of this project and my wishes to see it developed as proposed.

I respectfully ask the Mayor and Council vote in favour of approving this development for the betterment of the Town of Amherstburg.

Sincerely

John D'Alimonte

Sales Representative

The Sign of Experience Real Estate Team, Mitchell Deslippe and Jason Laframboise:

We are writing to express our strong support for the proposed condo project on the former Anderdon Tavern site in Amherstburg. We understand the real estate needs and wants of the local residents, and we can attest to the fact that many residents of the town have shown a keen interest in this project.

The location of the property is undeniably stunning, with a view of the water that is truly breathtaking. It is no surprise that so many people are eager to see this site developed into a beautiful condo complex that would offer residents the chance to enjoy this view from the comfort of their own homes.

We have heard from many residents who are attracted to the idea of living in a condo because it offers them the opportunity to enjoy low maintenance living and energy efficiency, without having to worry about maintaining a yard or a larger home. This is especially appealing to those who are retired or who have busy lifestyles that leave them with limited time to take care of a larger property.

In addition, a well-designed condo project would not only provide residents with a comfortable and convenient living space, but it would also bring economic benefits to the town of Amherstburg. The project would create jobs, attract new businesses to the area and increase the taxes revenues for the town of Amherstburg which would help to boost the local economy.

We believe that the proposed condo project would be a great addition to the town of Amherstburg and we fully support Nor-Built Construction's efforts to bring this project to fruition.

In conclusion, we strongly support the proposal to develop the Former Anderdon Tavern site into condominiums. It is a perfect opportunity to create a unique living space in Amherstburg, which will attract new residents, increase economic activity, and promote sustainability. We urge the town council to approve this project. Thank you for considering our letter.

The Dunn Group Resident of Front Rd:

The Dunn Group of companies is the owner of lot Front Road adjacent to the proposed development of 2833983 Ontario Limited apartment building and numerous duplexes. We are in discussions with 2833983 Ontario Limited for their company acquire approximately 6.096 meter of our land for their future road allowance. This agreement is not finalized at this time.

Further privacy between the 2 properties is being discussed at this time and not finalized.

I believe these items should be finalized prior to final approval.

Thank
Michael Dunn

you

Annie Kisch Resident of Front Rd. N:

I am opposed to the high-density amendment to the zoning of the property on 639 Front Rd north for many reasons.

As a little girl, my grandparents lived in Amherstburg on Brunner Ave. They understood the history of this beautiful town and passed their love for this beautiful town to me. Our school field trips were to Fort Malden and to the Black History Museum where we learned about the important history of this amazing town. Fast forward to 2020 when our family made the commitment to buy a piece of the town's rich history and purchased Island View, located at 671 Front Road North.

When the municipal election came around, we were able to vote for the first time as Amherstburg residents. When speaking with the candidates each welcomed us to their historic town giving us information about the importance of our rich history. One candidate even came to our home on his bicycle proudly stating his passion for the environment. I believed we had a council that would help to preserve our town's history and that held this town with the highest regard. I hope that this commitment will hold fast in the decisions made for the zoning for 639 Front Rd N.

My concerns about the high-density zoning are valid and I am astounded that it is even being considered.

Would you as a resident of Historic Amherstburg want the population equivalent to that of a small school moving into the lot next door to yours? If you look at the history of the footprints of the homes along the river and highway, there aren't any condominiums until the recent ones being built near Brunner Avenue. This raises

safety and environment concerns that should be red flags for your decisions. These acre lots typically have one or two dwellings with the gifts of nature of many birds, mammals, and reptiles. This is not the space for a condo and townhomes. I am not opposed to homes and duplexes and these folks would be welcomed into this historic neighbourhood. We have a commitment to preserving the nature that call this lot and surrounding areas their home. How is the waste management infrastructure able to sustain such a jump in population and if it is able to sustain this increase at what cost?

Another safety concern is the amount of traffic this high-density zoning will create. Conservatively there will be 70+ cars leaving and returning to this lot several times a day. How is this even a thought when the previous owners of 671 wanted to put a separate drive exiting their house, so that 671 and 669 would not have to share a driveway. It was denied! The reason given was that it would not be safe to add another mouth to the highway. That would have only been 2-3 cars leaving and

returning. And you are okay adding the amount of traffic from a condo and duplexes? The same rationale should be considered for both, no? The speed limit is 70 km/h along this part of the highway and sometimes you take your life into your own hands just pulling out and you hope that the people behind you can see your signal when turning in.

One of Amherstburg invitations to visit our town says, "Come to historic Amherstburg". In order to keep this statement, we as the residents and you as the council delegates have a huge responsibility. This is not an easy task but one that needs to be taken seriously. We purchased our home knowing its heritage designation and making the huge commitment to uphold all that this designation entails. We cannot make changes to the outside of our home or property without special permission. This whole strip of land along the drive into Amherstburg needs to be held with the same intents of keeping within the historic traditions we all hold so dear. How is changing the zoning and adding a 5- storey condominium keeping with Amherstburg's historic heritage? Homes and duplexes would be better suited in keeping Amherstburg's rich history.

We in Canada are governed by rules and regulations, and we are lucky enough to elect members who are our voices when decisions are made. This is sometimes a hard position to be in when many voices need to be heard. I hope that in this case it is not only the voices that also have deep pockets that are heard. We have a responsibility to uphold and preserve our town's history. The history that lured my husband and I to purchase our home in a town that totes historic values in its motto.

Again, I am opposed to the amendment allowing the 5-storey condominium but am not opposed to family homes and duplexes. This compromise would help preserve Amherstburg's history as well as lower the huge increase in traffic that would in turn create safety issues.

Thank you for your time and please, if you have any concerns or questions, please contact me or better yet come see our little piece of history by visiting our neighbourhood.

Sincerely,
Annie Kisch

[Anthony & Linda Hall Resident of Front Rd. N:](#)

Dear Council Members,

As longtime residents at Front Rd N., we are in strong opposition to the proposal to amend the zoning for 639 Front Rd N., Amherstburg.

In our opinion, this proposed housing development should work within the zoning regulations currently in place and strive to develop dwellings at this location that does not change setbacks, impede sight lines, or impose dramatic alterations to the character of our established, low density, single family neighbourhood.

It has been suggested that the Rivers Edge Condominium property at 225 Sandwich St N, is considered part of our neighbourhood, however, we believe this to be incorrect. There are important differences, (50 km/h speed limit, situated near industrial site, located 1.5 km away at the immediate edge of town etc.) and therefore should not be accepted as a comparison used to justify this project. This long established area does not include multi level condominiums or apartment buildings.

We understand the "Official Plan" seeks to accommodate the population growth of Amherstburg, however, we believe that this can be accomplished with suitable alternatives that work within the current zoning parameters.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anthony & Linda Hall

[David McDowall, resident of Front Road North](#)

Dear Amherstburg Town Council,

My wife and I live at 671 Front Road North in Amherstburg and I spoke at the previous planning committee meeting in opposition to the proposed plans for 639 Front North. After thoroughly reading the 90+ page document and researching, as best I can, the provincial government's Bill 23 my opposition remains strong for a number of reasons; not the least of which include safety, environmental impact, heritage impact and traffic concerns. I will expand on all of these individual concerns in greater detail in a separate document and/or in front of council at a later date. Quite frankly there simply aren't enough hours in the day to properly research this issue and to fully counter all the inaccuracies I have so far uncovered going through the application, the supporting documents and Ontario Bills 23, 108 and 109.

For the sake of time, I wish to focus on the long list of requested variances and special

provisions put forth in the 639 application. These provisions serve no useful purpose other than maximizing the volume of structure at the expense of greenspace, neighbouring homes, safety and aesthetics.

In 2010 while still the owners of 671 Front Road North my wife and I submitted a proposal to restore and extend the existing porch on the home known to all as Island View built by Thomas Ouellette. This single variance request to maintain the existing less-than code rail height was rejected, requiring my wife and I to modify the surrounding land (including taking up 18" of driveway width along the side of the home) to bring the porch height to less than two feet. How can a developer in turn take so many building requirements that I can assume are in place for all the right reasons and ask the town to simply throw out the rule book for the sake of increasing profit.

I am not opposed to the lands being developed. Progress is inevitable; however, I am opposed to overcrowding a parcel of land so abruptly and aggressively.

Thank you,

David McDowall

Ron and Kim DuFeu, residents of Front Road N

My wife and I have lived at 674 Front Road N for the last 13 years and we are both against granting a RM2 (Residential Multiple Second Density with Special Provisions) and R2 (Residential Second Density with Special Provisions) zoning by-law amendment for the property at 639 Front Road N. The reasons for our opposition are as follows:

1. The property of 639 Front Road N is located on a 1km section of road between Texas Road to the south and Kingsbridge Drive to the north. The speed limit on this section of highway is 70 kph, but the majority of vehicles (cars, trucks, motorcycles, transport trucks, etc.) are traveling at speed significantly greater than the posted limit. We are aware of at least three separate vehicle related deaths, including my next door neighbour's (658 Front Road N) father who was killed as he attempted to walk across from his property to the property at 639 Front Road N. There has also been numerous vehicle accidents on this 1km section of road, including two separate accidents that occurred and caused damage to our property. This 1km section of road has two blind corners when approaching from the north or south. The increased traffic, increased number of vehicles entering and exiting the proposed development, and increased number of residents in the area will increase the risks to public health and safety. Sections 1.1.3.4, 1.1.1 c, 1.4.3 f of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020 states that "public health and safety need to be considered when developing land" and this development will definitely increase the risk to public health and safety. A RM2 zoning change that would permit a higher density form of housing would significantly increase the chance of fatalities due to the added housing.
2. According to the County of Essex Official Plan section 2.8.1 Roads states, "Strive to minimize conflict between local and nonlocal traffic by protecting the County Road system depicted on Schedule "D1". The County shall discourage new development that would adversely impact traffic movement along the County Road system unless road improvements can be undertaken to eliminate the adverse impact". Based on the previously mentioned arguments, we feel that this development would adversely impact

traffic movement. Even though a traffic study may say that there would be no or minimal impact, having leved on this section of road it scares both my wife and I when we try to cross the road or pull out of our driveway.

3. Currently Front Road N is zoned R1A from Texas Road to beyond Middle Side Road (Highway 10) with the exception of a dual zoned area R1A/CN at 639 Front Road N. There are no high density apartment or condominium developments on Front Road N or any other area within Amherstburg north of Texas Road. The closest high density apartment development is about 2km away south of Texas Road which will contain 230 units. This section where two apartments are currently being built on Front Road N is not considered a highway and has a speed limit of 50 kph.

4. According to Schedule A, Map 19 in the Town of Amherstburg Zoning By-law #1999-52 the subject land is zoned R1A/CN, but on lots with more than one zone, the lot is to be considered a single lot according to the Zoning By-law. In such cases, the Zoning By-law states that the highest or most restrictive zone requirement pertaining to the permitted uses in all relevant zones, will apply throughout the said lot. My interpretation is that the entire lot should be considered R1A, which allows for single family home development, which we would accept.

4. Per Page 56 ([Agenda Package - Special Council Meeting_Mar13_2023.pdf](#)) Section 2.2 the developers consultant states that "Specifically, the Subject Lands are surrounded by low density residential development to the north, south and southwest of the property. Why would we want to set a precedence of allowing high density apartments and condominium developments in residential areas throughout Amherstburg that are designated R1A? Is this what we want our town to become? Do we want to be like Tecumseh? Under the Town of Amherstburg Official Plan it states, under section 4.2.3.4 "a suitable mix of housing types should be provided while ensuring that the overall density restrictions are not exceeded and that conflicts do not occur between housing types." With the plan to build a high density apartment building in an area of single family homes, this requirement is clearly not met, since there are no apartments or condominiums in the area.

5. Increased high density apartment and condominium developments will change the small town feel that Amherstburg currently has. Amherstburg will risk that it will no longer be a primary destination for visitors. We already have two large obnoxious apartment buildings being constructed on Front Road N and we should not allow any additional apartments or condominiums to be built north of Texas Road. Resident, potential residents, and visitors have no choice but to see these buildings as they travel to the downtown area. Given the history of accidents and fatalities on this stretch of road, the increased potential for accidents and fatalities due to increase density in the area, the potential flooding concerns due to the drainage that runs through the subject lands, the increased Drinking Water Threat, we feel that there are too many negative factors and risks to allow this zoning by-law amendment as it stands to be approved.

We are not opposed to the builder developing the 639 Front Road N property with single family homes or duplexes, which would fit in with the existing neighbourhood (allow R2

zoning change but no zone relief requests). A zoning change that would allow R2 with zone relief requests would not fit in with the current neighbourhood. We are opposed to changing the current zoning to RM2 or allowing a zoning change to RM2 with zone relief requests. There are no benefits to the neighbourhood of allowing this zoning by-law amendment as it currently stands, which would allow the construction of (RM2-11 zoned with zone relief requests) high density apartment buildings with zone relief requests or higher density development (R2-8 with zone relief requests).

The proposed by law amendment does not meet the Mission Statement of the Corporation of the Town of Amherstburg, since the increased density due to the proposed RM2-11 & R2-8 Zone Relief Requests and building of an apartment or higher density duplexes, will not enhance the quality of life for the homeowners in the neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Ron and Kim Du Feu

674 Front Road N, Amherstburg,

[Jennifer and Jeff Robertson, residents of Front Road N](#)

To All,

After reviewing the minutes of the special council meeting and reviewing the plans for the proposed development at 639 Front Rd N. - I have concerns regarding the amendment to the use of the property and the effects that it will have on our community.

The current residential community surrounding the proposed development is single family dwellings and the area at 639 Front Road should not be rezoned to allow for an apartment building/condo's. The zoning should remain the same, as it does not fit within the current character of the neighbourhood to build an apartment building/condo. The existing zoning allows for single unit residences, which is in keeping with the current use of the surrounding community.

The current traffic levels on County Rd 20/Front Rd are already extremely heavy during peak times and this additional high density building will only exacerbate the traffic issues currently faced by residents. There have been a number of fatalities and serious accidents in the general vicinity of where the proposed high density apartment building/condo is being considered.

It is suggested that the new subdivision and the apartment/condo building would in some way assist with meeting the goals of affordable housing in our area, Although it would provide a range of housing prices, I would be interested in understanding what is considered affordable housing within the provincial guidelines.

"There is opportunity for the proposed development to help the province meet projected market-based and affordable housing needs of residents by providing a range of housing options, which will be set at various price points (PPS, 1.4.3 a)."

It is suggested that "The proposed development can be considered an infill project, please take into account that "many forms of infill development can be more intensive than previous uses and have higher levels of imperviousness (e.g., more pavement), runoff rates, and contaminant loading per unit of area. In many cases, areas surrounding

the new infill development were built before the need for stormwater controls was recognized and are already experiencing stormwater management problems. Although the development of single, individual infill sites may not have significant impacts, the development of many individual sites can have cumulative effects and exacerbate or create problems at the subwatershed and watershed level including flooding, erosion, or water quality degradation." as could be the case with the building of an apartment/condo on this site.

Allowing the change to the use of this property and allowing an apartment/condo building to be built across the front of the property (west side) would change the landscape of our current community significantly in many ways. Amherstburg has been voted one of the prettiest towns in Canada, there are heritage properties right next door to this location. We are not opposed to change, but believe that this would not be doing the town of Amherstburg and its residents justice by changing the use of this property allowing an apartment/condo building to be built at that location.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jennifer and Jeff Robertson

Margo Purdie, resident of Front Road N

Good Evening:

I have lived at 609 Front Road North for over 60 years. The subject property is located two doors to the north of my home.

The proposed amendment for a high density residential unit will adversely affect the neighbourhood. With the highway in our front yards our only enjoyment is in our rear yards. We will no longer have any privacy with residents in the mid rise peering into our yards. Homes on the east side of County Road 20 are larger in size (approx. an acre) and cramming a high density unit, combined with semi duplexes and single dwelling units is not consistent with the existing homes. A compromise would be to remove the high density designation ie. mid rise condominiums from the proposal.

Even Pointe West and Kingsbridge subdivisions between Texas Road and County Road 10 are void of high density buildings. This type of building should be concentrated in the downtown core where amenities are within walking distance. Not some two miles away where if you walk the sidewalks you feel like you're going to be sucked into traffic or hit by a distracted motorist. Bike into town, forget that idea!

Mr. Bolger's indicated a traffic impact study has been completed showing no real impact with the addition of this development. I must respectfully disagree. The flow of traffic in and out of the town has greatly increased over the years and with the Town's eagerness to increase the residential tax base without any regard to alternate routes I can hardly get out of my driveway or cross the road to maintain my property. Even for me and my guests, we find it challenging and risky to exit or enter my driveway. I have to signal much earlier than normal and watch for the traffic behind me to make sure they don't hit my vehicle from behind. It's not uncommon to drive past my driveway only to turn around and try to turn into my driveway safely going through the preventative motions again.

Why are variances being sought when they could very well reconfigure their design to meet the setbacks established by the Town. Do rules only apply to the small landowner? It's very disheartening to see Mr. Bolger advertising the sale of the condominiums in a local magazine prior to Council's decision on this proposal. I truly hope Council's decision isn't based on monetary benefit only but the impact it will have on our great neighbourhood.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Regards,

Margo Purdie

[Joy Hamilton, resident of Front Road N](#)

Dear Amherstburg Clerk:

On Friday, March 24, 2023, I received from Corporation of the Town of Amherstburg, Notice of General Meeting, Monday March 27, 2023, to Consider A Zoning By-Law Amendment. The notice states "any person who wishes to attend and address Council by electronic means, must register with the Clerks Office no later than 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 23, 2023." I assume this was an oversight and simply a case of "cut and paste".

As a lifelong Amherstburg resident, I respectfully submit these concerns for your kind consideration regarding the proposed development at 639 Front Road North. Safety is my biggest concern. Please remember that Front Road North is THE main artery into our town.

We have the right to a safe neighbourhood. Safety from increased traffic in our neighbourhood with blind curves between Texas Road and Kingsbridge. Safety for our new neighbours returning home - hoping drivers slow down enough to enable safe access into their driveways.

I understand some neighbours have been denied changes to their properties - actually denying them safer access! Safety for new neighbours crossing this busy street. Safety in preserving our neighbourhood and confusion over the term High Density.

Presently apartments and condominiums are built within the town core. Safety in preserving our neighbourhood's heritage homes. Safety of our properties, especially from risk of flooding and sewage disposal, since the property at 639 Front Road North has remained vacant since 2005 and the fact that the White Drain collapsed in 2005. I understand the developer has entered a request for maintenance on that drain.

Safety for our environment with destruction of natural habits for our wildlife and reports of dying trees. I understand that the Ministry of Natural Resources has been contacted with no response yet.

Safety from light pollution with a five storey building in our neighbourhood.

My neighbours and I are anxious regarding the traffic engineering studies, environmental impact studies.

Of course my neighbours and I knew this property would not remain vacant and actually anticipated an addition of homes, but not a five storey building.

I find it disrespectful that Mr. Bolger was told "this is an easy one". Mr. Bolger's comments "there will be virtually no impact" and "not everyone is going to Walmart at the same time", were especially disrespectful.

I feel we MUST recognize and honour our unique town with its natural beauty, scenic river, and incredible historical significance, (referred to as a Hidden Gem" by CBC's Still Standing); and remember and pay homage to the The Anderdon (Harbour Light Tavern) that opened in 1936 and loyally served this town, surrounding communities and visitors for so many years.

Mike Kish Resident of Front Rd. N

Dear Mayor Prue, Deputy Mayor Gibb, and Councillors Allaire, Courtney, Crain, McArthur, and Pouget,

My wife Annie and I, along with two of our children and my mother-in-law, are the residents of 671 Front Road North, having moved into our home in October 2020. Further to our comments at the March 13, 2023 Planning meeting, I write to you to express, in detail, our opposition to the proposed zoning amendments to the property located at 639 Front Road North. Our reasons are as follows:

Safety: While we accepted the risks when we purchased the property, living on essentially a four-lane highway with a speed limit of 70 km/h, the additional vehicles will only increase congestion and motor vehicle accidents. In fact, there have been three vehicle related fatalities in 2005, 2008 and 2020.

The first occurred at 639 when our neighbour's father was hit by a passing car. In 2008, an impaired driver crossed the centre line of the road and was involved in a head-on crash killing the oncoming driver. Weeks after we moved into our home, a motorcyclist was killed in a single vehicle accident at the Kingsbridge intersection. In the spring of 2021, a southbound driver crashed into the front of our neighbor's home at 681. In the process, the gas regulator located at the front of the property was destroyed, causing residents in the immediate vicinity to vacate our homes due to the gas leak. There is continuous traffic on County Road 20 all hours of the day. Furthermore, three families with young children live in very close proximity to the former Anderdon lot. Please refer to the north- and south-bound pictures of our section of Front Road North provided by our neighbours Kim and Ron Du Feu as they reside directly across the street.

Adjacent Properties: The 60+ homes that lie between Kingsbridge and Texas Road are all single-family residences on historically large lots. Contrary to the contractor's presentation, there is no such building like the one being proposed that is adjacent to any of our homes. Adjacent is defined as "next to or adjoining something else". The only such property only now exists on the corner of Brunner Avenue and County Road 20, some 1.8km from 639 Front Road North. Immediately north of this complex, just before the former Allied Chemical entrance, the speed limit decreases to 50 km/h. While we would welcome additional single-family homes, the building being proposed simply does not fit into our neighbourhood.

Flooding: Since we took possession in October 2020, we have experienced two floods in the cellar of our home. The first occurred in Spring 2021 following a torrential downpour and what could easily be classified as a 100-year storm. It took our sump pump running 24 hours a day as well as two submersible pumps to keep the water to

below 20 cm. Water remained in our cellar for three days. The second flood occurred earlier this year during the ice storm in February 2022. While not as severe, we experienced over 12cm of rain in our cellar. It took over 24 hours for the water to dissipate. This will become a regular occurrence given the number of dwellings and the apartment building being proposed in such proximity to our home.

Historical Significance: Our home is known as Thomas Ouellette Manor and Island View. Our neighbours at 669 own and reside in the Thomas Ouellette Carriage House. Both homes were granted heritage designation by the Province of Ontario in 2007. We have been told that we reside in one of the most important homes in Amherstburg due to its unique construction, history, appearance, and location on Lot 13 of the former Anderdon Township.

Our home was built in 1881 and is of Second French Empire, or Napoleon III, architectural design. It is featured in the book entitled Heritage Buildings of Amherstburg written by Meg Reiner. Meg is a local history expert and Collections Coordinator at the Marsh Historical Collection. There exists no other home like ours in our community and is another example of what makes Amherstburg a tourist destination. Ms. Frances Stone, previous Island View owner from 1947 to 1974, and member of the Heritage Committee, was deeply involved with several heritage projects in the Amherstburg area. It was her wishes that these homes be preserved and that subsequent owners carry on this tradition. We are incredibly proud of this and will continue this tradition created by the Ouellette's, the Stone's, and the McDowall's. This not only extends to our home but the historical significance of this area. We have been thanked by random visitors for purchasing the home and have had numerous people unexpectedly drop by to share with us a personal connection they and their families share with our home. There is simply no place for a building of this nature in our neighbourhood, and historically speaking, apartments and condominiums rest within the town core where they rightly belong. We welcome each of you to visit our neighbourhood and see, first-hand, why we have these concerns. Single family residences. Blind spots in both north and south directions. It's historical importance. The pride and pleasure we take in our homes. As we know you are being contacted by several of our neighbours with their own reasons, please ask yourself if you would want to live next to what is being proposed. Amherstburg prides itself on our history, and by allowing these amendments will set not only a dangerous precedent for similar structures but will detract from what makes our town so unique. Please do what is right and just for our families and our neighbourhood.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mike and Annie Kisch

671 Front Road North

Amherstburg, ON N9V 2V6

[Andrew Gruening Resident of Front Rd. N](#)

My wife Sherry and I live at 615 Front Road North on a large 4 acre ravine ecosystem lot that will be directly impacted by the proposed development that Amherstburg Council is discussing. The zoning changes and variances the developer, Norbert Bolger, is requesting along with the proposed high density residential proposal will have dramatic and irreparable changes to the ecosystem and natural landscape of this rare environment that is within very close proximity. An environment that needs to be protected.

Attached are pictures of the ravine along with pictures of the various snakes that call this system home and breed along the ravine. The major development being proposed will be disruptive to the habitat and the landscape. The possibility that the proposed development will drain directly into this environment creating flood issues, and runoff into a naturalized environment such as this that can never undone is frightening - I beg you to reconsider the zoning and variance changes to the site that are being requested on the environmental impact it is going have at least.

The high rise development with underground parking will destroy the wildlife during the construction phase and any that manage to adapt will have their habitat forever changed further by the additional drainage into the ravine.

The proposed development does not fit into this area of the town, where single use historical dwellings are interlaced with Essex County Carolinian forest patches. I beg you as town councilors representing the people of Amherstburg to turn down the proposed zoning changes and variants for this property. The development of Kingsbridge behind this ecosystem has already done damage to the naturalized state , do not destroy the rest by allowing this large development to happen

Andrew Gruening