SENES Consultants Limited

MEMORANDUM

121 Granton Drive, Unit 12
Richmond Hill, Ontario
Canada L4B 3N4
Tel: (905) 764-9380
Fax: (905) 764-9386
E-mail: senes@senes.ca
Web Site: http://www.senes.ca

TO: Mr. Murray Thompson, URS Canada   33900-94

FROM: Gwen Brice   March 12, 2009

SUBJ: SIA response to City of Windsor submission, February 27, 2009

From the submission there are two comments that specifically reference the social discipline, both are summarized in Part 1 and Part 3 of the submission as;

e) *"unnecessary social and economic impacts using properties that now contain people's homes and businesses to buffer the W-E Parkway, when better results could be obtained through the use of targeted tunnelling, which would have much lower property displacement impacts."*

g) *"Ignored the social impacts of forced expropriation for unnecessary buffer lands for the W-E Parkway and not required if targeted tunnelling were implemented`*

The two points referenced above are based on the concept that targeted tunnelling would have "… much lower property displacement impacts." If by "targeted tunnelling" the submission is referring to the GreenLink proposal, this does not reflect the results of our comparison.

Using the GreenLink concept provided (July 2008), we overlaid it onto the Parkway concept using GIS; our comparison showed that the footprint was similar for both. A review of displaced households was conducted by neighbourhood and minor variations where identified at the Spring Garden/Bethlehem neighbourhoods where the difference in the number of displacements was less than 10 households.

Discussions with residents and input from focus groups conducted as part of the practical stage project consultation program resulted in a refinement in the W-E Parkway design. When the W-E Parkway refinement was presented to the public, additional residents came forward requesting to be purchased rather than left living beside the new corridor. In most cases these residents were located on one side of a street, where the opposite side was identified as being displaced by the W-E Parkway, such as was the case with both Kendleton Court and Sansotta Court.

The discussion and assessment of the impacts associated with the displacement of residents is reported by neighbourhood in Chapter 4 of the *Social Impact Assessment Technically and*

Environmentally Preferred Alternative (TEPA) report dated December 2008. The assessment also discusses the effect of household displacements on community character and cohesion, and this is also provided by neighbourhood. Mitigation identified includes the implementation of the "willing-seller, will-buyer" process by the MTO. It is important to note that given the option of remaining and becoming the "new" boundary of the transportation corridor, or being displaced, many of these residents chose to be displaced, and consequently, approached the MTO with a property purchase request. This does not mean that they were "willing" to sell if circumstances were different.

The disruption of residents living adjacent to the transportation corridor as a result of nuisance effects is also discussed in the *Social Impact Assessment Practical Alternative Working Paper* and the TEPA report and relies on technical information provided by noise and air disciplines. Nuisance effects are typically experienced within 50 m of the road edge and decrease with distance from the roadway. It is my understanding that both the noise and air disciplines have provided responses to concerns raised in the City of Windsor submission concerning the effects on adjacent neighbourhoods and residents, and, consequently, no further discussion is offered on nuisance effects in the context of the W-E Parkway buffer expansion.

When comparing the revised W-E Parkway alignment (October 2008) to the previous design, a notable design change was made in the realignment through the Spring Garden area. This resulted in approximately the same number of displaced households; and slightly fewer households left within 50m of the road edge.