OPEN HOUSE REPORT

OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS FOR PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

130 Sandwich Street South,

Town of Amherstburg

March 25, 2025

Prepared by:



Tracey Pillon-Abbs, RPP
Principal Planner
Chatham, ON
226-340-1232
tracey@pillonabbs.ca
www.pillonabbs.ca

Open House Report

In addition to the statutory public meeting, the *Planning Act* requires that the Applicant submit a proposed strategy for public consultation with respect to an application as part of the complete application requirements.

As part of a public consultation strategy, in addition to the statutory public meeting, an informal in-person public open house was held with area residents and property owners on March 20, 2025, from 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm at Libro Centre, 3295 Meloche Rd, Amherstburg, ON.

The open house provided members of the public with opportunities to review and comment on the proposed development.

A total of **60** owners and tenants were notified, which represents a **120 m (plus)** radius from the Site (see attached notice).

In addition to the applicant representatives and Town Staff, 81 residents attended the open house (see attached sign-in sheet).

Email (see attached emails), phone calls and comment sheets (see attached comments) were also received.

The following is a summary of the comments and questions received, along with the responses provided (see attached copy display items).

| Topic Item | Comments and Questions | Response |
|------------|---|----------|
| Timing | When will this be constructed? | TBD |
| Design | Overall, the design is great. | Noted. |
| | Looks like a good project for the Town. | |
| | Excited to see the 'flex' space as a civic theatre. Amherstburg is rich in culture and artistic talent. | |
| | Building looks nice. | |
| | It does not contribute to an 'old towne' look. | |
| | Love the design. | |
| | Parking, historical preservation, mixed use space all seem to be well considered. | |

| Topic Item | Comments and Questions | Response |
|------------|---|--|
| Heritage | How much of the original school will be kept? | The final design of the proposed building will keep as much of the |
| | Glass is nice. | original school as possible. |
| | Glass is not nice. | |
| | Do not make it look too modern. | |
| | Attempting to shroud it with a reflective, glassed-in portico will only obscure its visibility. | |
| Traffic | Laird Ave and Sandwich are currently a concern. | A TIS has been completed. |
| | Traffic is not safe now. | There are no concerns regarding traffic. |
| | Traffic will increase. | |
| | There needs to be a traffic light at Sandwich and Fort St. | |
| | Sandwich St cannot handle any more traffic. | |
| | More lanes and stoplights should be added. | |
| | Add traffic calming measures to Laird which would further encourage people to use the Sandwich Street entrance. | |
| Parking | How deep is the underground parking garage? | 1 storey is underground. |
| | | On-street parking is available. |
| | Where does overflow parking go? | Parking has been evaluated and |
| | There needs to be more parking. | more than the minimum provided, as set out in the ZBL. |
| | Reverse the ramp direction so it's easier for people to get straight | The final design of the proposed |
| | down to their parking from Sandwich than from Laird. | building will be subject to SPC review. |
| Access | Should be somewhere else on the Site. | The TIS has been completed and has evaluated sight-lines. |

| Topic Item | Comments and Questions | Response |
|---------------|--|--|
| | | |
| | Align it better. | There are no concerns regarding access. |
| | Make it a clean four way | |
| | intersection. | |
| | | |
| | Encourage residents and users of | |
| | the new facility to enter and leave | |
| Dest | via Sandwich Street, | Dest can be controlled design |
| Dust | This development will cause more dust in the area. | Dust can be controlled during |
| Noise | This development will cause more | construction. Noise can be controlled during |
| INDISE | dust in the area. | construction. |
| | dast in the area. | oonstruction. |
| | | The Town also has a noise by-law. |
| Height | This will cast shadows. | A shadow study will be provided as part of SPC review. It is |
| | Height is too tall. | anticipated that there will be the |
| | | very minor impact on the abutting |
| | There will be a loss of sunlight. | property. |
| | | |
| | Do not compromise on the height. | The final design of the proposed |
| | 5.6 storove may | building will include architectural features that will assist in the |
| | 5-6 storeys max. | transition. |
| | Inappropriate and does not | |
| | compliment the Town. | |
| Park | Want the park to stay. | The park is not part of the Site. |
| | The ball diamonds are heritage | There are no negative impacts. |
| | features. | |
| | | |
| | Will the ball diamonds be re- | |
| | located? | |
| | There is 1 large tree in the park | |
| | which is historical. | |
| | | |
| | What are the impacts? | |
| Tenure and | Will the units be rentals? | The tenure will be both rental and |
| Affordability | NACH II | individually owned. |
| | Will they be affordable? | Afford a hillity in hairs and drawn and har |
| | What if there are vacancies? | Affordability is being addressed by providing smaller 1-2 bedroom |
| | viriat ii tilele ale vacalicies! | units. |
| Į | | unito. |

| Topic Item | Comments and Questions | Response |
|--------------------|---|---|
| • | · | • |
| | | Vacancies may occur. |
| Taxes and | This will increase taxes and | Taxes and property value may go |
| Property Value | decrease property values. | up or may go down. |
| Parking | Do not want to lose the 21 parking spaces along Park Street. | The parking spaces are not part of the Site. |
| Buffering | More landscaping is required. | The final design of the Site will be reviewed as part of SPC approval. |
| | Tall fences are preferred. | There is buffering on the east side |
| | | of the Site. |
| | | There is a 6ft fence with trees |
| | | proposed and greenery as additional layering of privacy. |
| Uses and Location | Residential is needed. | The proposed development has been selected due to its location. |
| | Residential is not needed. | The Site is pedestrian friendly. |
| | Hotel is a great idea. | There is a need for more housing. |
| | Build someplace else. | There is a fleed for filere fledeling. |
| Appeals | Are there appeal rights? | The OLT is the appeal body. |
| | | Third-party appeals are not permitted. |
| Abutting Lands | Change is okay. | Noted. |
| | No concerns with the proposed development. | The tower will be 100 ft away from the closest abutting residential dwelling. |
| Parades and Events | All streets are closed during parades and events. | The property owners will work with the Town during parades and |
| Lvents | · | events. |
| | There will not be any access to the Site during this time. | |
| Environmental | There needs to be an environmental impact study. | The study is not warranted for the Site. |
| | | There are no natural heritage features. |
| Infrastructure | Ensure that the fire department can service an emergency on the top | A FSR has been completed. |
| | floors. | No concerns were raised. |

| Topic Item | Comments and Questions | Response |
|------------|--|---|
| | Ensure that the historically weak sewage and water system on Laird can handle the increased demand | The final design of the Site will be subject to SPC review. |
| | Ensure that Sandwich can handle the increased load (especially as an emergency egress passage in case of nuclear accident). | |