



MONTGOMERY PLACE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK SUMMARY

Engineering & Planning Section



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

1.0 INTRODUCTION 5

2.0 FLOODING AND DAMAGE 5

3.0 SUPPORT FOR DRAINAGE RESTORATION 8

4.0 TREE PROTECTION THROUGH STEEPER DITCHES 9

5.0 DRIVEWAY WIDTHS 11

6.0 COST SHARING FOR DRIVEWAY RECONSTRUCTION 14

7.0 RIP RAP 17

8.0 OTHER COMMENTS 18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Montgomery Place neighbourhood has a unique network of swales/ditches and culverts designed for storm water management in a rural setting. Over time, the drainage effectiveness has been compromised as new driveways, landscaping, and erosion altered the right-of-ways and contributed to flooding during spring snowmelt and intense rainfalls, and calls for drainage improvements to be made. Community engagement has taken place through the Local Area Planning process, two meetings with the Montgomery Place Community Association Board, an open house on February 13, 2020, attended by approximately 60 residents, an online survey completed by 62 residents, and direct calls and e-mails between citizens and Saskatoon Water.

Highlights from the survey include the following:

- Property damage from flooding was identified by 20 (33%) respondents, an additional 17 (28%) indicated nuisance ponding on their properties, and 24 (39%) indicated no drainage issues.
- Property damage costs included damage to basements, landscaping, gardens, personal cleanup time and effort, paving stones, and increased insurance costs. Ten respondents (16%) indicated damage expenses ranging from \$1,000 to \$20,000 (average of \$10,400 for the ten).
- Intense rains caused property damage for 15 (25%) respondents, spring melt for 11 (18%) and water main breakage for seven (11%).
- Support is high for restoring the drainage path with 40 (65%) strongly and 12 (19%) moderately supporting restoration. Only five (8%) indicated moderate or strong opposition and another five (8%) were unsure or neutral.
- Slightly less than half of respondents strongly (11, 18%) or moderately (18, 29%) supported steeper ditches for short distances to protect trees, with 14 (23%) opposing this strategy, and 19 (31%) being unsure or neutral. Several comments indicated the importance of the older trees to the neighbourhood. Comments also indicated that protection of trees should be considered on a case by case basis and more input is needed by the people who will be impacted by the maintenance. Some people noted the difficulties experienced in maintaining the steep ditches from the previous restoration work.
- Almost half of respondents (28, 46%) indicated that the maximum width for new driveways should be based on lot size, 19 (31%) said all properties should have the same maximum crossing width, and nine (15%) said there should be no maximum width. Some commented that maximum width should be based on size of culverts or size of garage.
- The majority of respondents indicated that driveways should be reconstructed up to the existing width (36, 58%), and over a third (22, 35%) said that reconstructed driveways should be the same maximum width as new driveways.
- Responses about cost sharing for noncompliant crossings varied: 12 (21%) supported property owners paying 40%, another 19 (34%) supported property owners paying for all costs exceeding \$10,000, seven (13%) supported property owners paying all reconstruction costs, four (7%) indicated property owners should be allowed to select whichever option is less, and eight (14%) stated that the City should pay 100%. Citizens opposed to cost sharing indicated that property owners who did not install the

crossing shouldn't be required to cost share if driveways were installed prior to current (2000) standards and by previous owners. Some people inquired about potential payment programs with costs added to taxes.

- Responses indicated that 29 (47%) preferred riprap on top of the culvert ends, eight (13%) did not want riprap, and 25 (40%) were unsure. Concerns were expressed about the ability to control weeds in the riprap and rocks becoming dislodged.
- Some other responses included a desire to see a schedule for construction for the rest of the neighbourhood.

During the open house, many residents expressed support for the City taking action to improve drainage. Residents also expressed some concerns about the proposed project:

- The narrow streets and lack of sidewalks in combination with ditches could create potential safety issues for children.
- Adverse impacts to landscaping and parking.
- Difficulties in maintaining and mowing steep ditches.
- A resident unknowingly purchased property with noncompliant driveways from Saskatoon Land and subsequently made significant investments in property improvements based on the existing layout.
- A resident said he worked through the City approximately ten years ago when making a significant investment in a driveway that is not compliant with current standards.

The engagement results show that Montgomery Place residents take great pride in their properties and many have made substantial efforts to beautify and maintain their yards, including adjacent right-of-ways. The results also show that some residents are unaware of the flooding impacts that neighbours have experienced. The engagement results have defined the various competing interests, and have been incorporated in developing a balanced plan for drainage improvement.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Montgomery Place neighbourhood has a unique network of swales/ditches and culverts designed for storm water management in a rural setting. Over time, the drainage effectiveness has been compromised as new driveways, landscaping, and erosion altered the right-of-ways and contributed to flooding during spring snowmelt and intense rainfalls, and calls for drainage improvements to be made. The formal engagement process associated with the Montgomery Place Local Area Plan in 2018 highlighted drainage concerns. In June 2019 and February 2020, Saskatoon Water met with the Montgomery Place Community Association Board to present the results of the driveway, culvert and ditch assessment and to seek feedback for the proposed approach to improve drainage including cost sharing options. The Community Association's feedback indicated support for improving drainage and indicated that community reaction to proposed changes and cost-sharing would be mixed with some opposition expected.

In late January 2020, door-to-door flyers summarized proposed drainage improvements, encouraged people to attend a neighbourhood open house on February 13, 2020, and to go online for more information and to complete a survey. The Community Association also promoted the open house and survey on their Facebook site and through e-mail. Over 60 people attended the open house and 62 people completed the on-line survey. The following summarizes the feedback.

2.0 FLOODING AND DAMAGE

Which of the following drainage issues have you experienced at your current residence?




Figure 1: Current Drainage Issues in Montgomery

The drainage concerns and property damage responses are shown in Figure 1.

Drainage Issues

- 24 out of 61 (39%) responses indicated they do not experience ponding at their property and no property damaged has been experienced to date.
- 17 out of 61 (28%) responses indicated they experience ponding at their property due to drainage issues but have not experienced property damage.
- 20 out of 61 (33%) responses indicated they had experienced some level of property damage.

The responses regarding property damage causes are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Property Damage Results.

Property Damage Causes

Of the 20 responses that indicated property damage was experienced, 33 causes were provided (one property could have up to three flooding causes):

- 15 out of 61 (25%) responses indicated rain.
- 11 out of 61 (18%) responses indicated spring melt.
- Seven out of 61 (11%) responses indicated water main failure.

Please indicate the approximate flood damage costs incurred and provide comments to further describe drainage issues you have experienced.

Comments regarding drainage issues and property damage are provided as follows:

Property Damage and Repair Costs (Ten)

- \$1,000
- \$2,000
- \$5,000
- Severe rain storm approximately 12 years ago. Approximately \$5,000 damage to basement.
- \$6,000
- Greater than \$10,000
- \$10,000 to \$20,000
- \$20,000 (3)

Landscaping

- I don't know the cost but the water main break wrecked our front grass. We spent the summer trying to restore our grass which took time, water, fertilizer etc.
- Damage was to vegetation (trees, grass, and garden) and some basement water damage. We did cleanup ourselves. Flooding in front has not happened since City fixed waterline and dug out ditch in front. Backyard flooding still would be problem.
- The city has resurfaced the road and created a barrier at the end of my driveway. Now water pools and slowly erodes my driveway bricks and slips the retaining wall on my ditch. (This will cost \$10,000-\$20,000 to fix.)
- The one and only water main break (\$6,000 in damage) was not along the ditch. It swept away all the sand from under our interlocking block sidewalk along the side of the house. The City never found the break which resulted in two more breaks later in the spring. We have never had any issues with heavy rain or run off, nor do we having standing water in spring. Drainage has been good. The water made its way halfway up the property when the water main break happened. Unfortunately the pipes have never been replaced on our street and seems like there is no plan for it either.
- No property losses, major landscaping issues in spring.

Other Costs (Two)

- The cost was in time for clean-up. A lot of the damage is a result of poor drainage or lack of ditches and culverts on neighbouring properties.
- Basement flooded twice. Insurance costs went through the roof.

Water Ponding (Three)

- A quick melt in spring causes the most problems for water extensively ponding on our property.
- No damage to house, once the City unfroze the culverts everything drained as it should. Before the City came around there was water over the street in various places along our crescent and our drainage ditch was full to the brim in front of the house.

- Water pools in front ditch, side of house and backyard during spring melt and heavy rains.

No Damage (Six)

- Zero, N/A, Nil (Five)
- None, I think the City of Saskatoon does its best to open the drainage in the spring and after that it all in Mother Nature’s hands.

3.0 SUPPORT FOR DRAINAGE RESTORATION

Do you believe the City should restore the drainage path (ditches and culverts) for storm water and snow melt run-off to reduce flood risk?




Figure 3: Drainage Path Restoration Results.

The responses regarding drainage restoration are shown in Figure 3.

- 52 out of 62 (84%) responses strongly agree (40, 65%) or moderately agree (12, 19%) that the drainage path needs to be restored to mitigate the impacts of storm water and spring melt run-off.
- 5 out of 62 (8%) responses either strongly disagreed (three) or moderately disagreed (two) with restoring the drainage path in Montgomery Place.

4.0 TREE PROTECTION THROUGH STEEPER DITCHES

Would steeper ditches in short areas around trees be acceptable in order to protect the trees in the City Right of Ways while improving drainage? These steeper sections would require additional effort by residents for maintenance.




Figure 4: Ditch Steepness for Tree Preservation Results.

The responses regarding tree preservation are shown above in Figure 4.

- 29 out of 62 (47%) responses strongly agreed (11, 18%) or moderately agreed (18, 29%) with constructing steeper short distances of ditch around trees to preserve the trees during construction. These steep sections require additional effort to maintain (i.e. grass cutting).
- 14 out of 62 (23%) responses strongly disagreed (five, 8%) or moderately disagreed (nine, 15%) with constructing steeper ditches in short distances to preserve the trees in the proposed ditch alignment.
- 19 out of 62 (31%) responses were neutral or unsure at the time the survey was completed.

The comments regarding tree preservation are provided below:

Positive Tree Preservation Responses (Five)

- I would like to see trees protected as much as practical.

- Trees are a big part of what makes Montgomery beautiful. Protection of trees should be a high priority.
- Huge applause for so much consideration for the trees that are a huge part of this community's uniqueness.
- Trees are a distinctive feature of the Montgomery neighbourhood, so every effort should be made to preserve existing trees. As well, tree root systems stabilize soil structure and tree water demand assists surface water issues.
- I believe that whenever possible measures should be taken to protect trees. However, many of the trees in the neighbourhood are very old and are slowly dying or have poor health. I do not think efforts should be made to save these trees. The long term success of the project is the important issue.

Ditch Steepness Concerns (Six)

- The most recent drainage ditches in the area are terrible, they are way too steep, and if they are not able to be mowed then it brings down the quality of the neighbourhood.
- I am concerned that the steepness of ditches are dangerous for small children.
- Some trees should be protected but others should be removed. Steeper ditches make it very difficult to maintain the ditches. In the winter persons that are not familiar with the ditches end up driving into them when parking or backing out of driveways.
- I agree trees need to be protected as Montgomery is an older area with mature trees. But maintaining steep ditches such as mowing lawns is very hard especially for the elderly.
- Trees need protection so I am ok with it but on the other hand our dug out ditch on 11th is hard to mow safely with my mower.
- The trees do very well on my property, I am very against the overkill ditches the City has been doing recently in the area, and maybe a more moderate version might be acceptable.

Other (Two)

- Possibly some of the trees shouldn't be protected.
- In our case, one of our trees on the City easement is to be removed, which is on the high side of the existing drainage path. Our current drainage path should not affect the tree's condition even after the path has been upgraded in my opinion.

5.0 DRIVEWAY WIDTHS

Which of the following options would you most support for width standards of NEW driveways?



Figure 5: Driveway Width Results for New Crossings.

The responses regarding standards for new driveway crossing widths are shown above in Figure 5.

- 28 out of 61 (46%) responses indicated new driveways maximum width should be based on lot size.
- 19 out of 61 (31%) responses indicated new driveways should have the same maximum width regardless of lot size.
- Nine out of 61 (15%) of responses do not want a maximum driveway crossing width for future driveways (no restrictions).

Which of the following options would you most support for reconstructing EXISTING driveways when restoring drainage paths?




Figure 6: Driveway Width Results for Existing Crossings.

The responses regarding standards for existing driveway crossing widths are shown above in Figure 6.

- 22 out of 62 (35%) responses indicated the maximum crossing width for new crossings should be the same as the width allowed for existing crossings.
- 36 out of 62 (58%) of responses indicated that existing crossing should be restored to their current width during construction.

The comments regarding driveway widths are provided below:

Grandfather Existing Crossing (Five)

- The existing driveway should be grandfathered.
- The driveways in the area have been in place for years long before current standards. The residents should not be penalized because of the change of standards. The neighbourhood has narrow streets. When vehicles park on the street it can restrict the flow of traffic and sight lines. Most houses in the neighbourhood have driveways that are used by the residents because they are large enough to meet the needs of the resident.
- Imposing the new driveway width requirement on older properties where garage design and entryways were not constructed to meet the new standard would likely create considerable inconvenience and/or difficulty in accessing garages as well as changing the visual appearance of the property in a negative way.

- Just fix the driveways you damage. Ongoing issue when the City “fixes” the drainage they damage yards AND driveways and they’re never repaired without a fight.
- Makes no sense to not replace what was removed. The date of the driveway should determine the bylaw on its width.

Develop a new crossing standard of some kind (Five)

- To ensure the best drainage, driveways should not be more than maximum, if a property is very wide, two separate driveways at maximum may work
- Driveways should be just driveways, just for vehicle access to property. No need for massive paving.
- As property configurations change over time, so must construction parameters. Some properties are designed with larger frontage access, which should be supported but only to a specified maximum.
- My neighbour has a driveway that is the entire width of his lot. This means that there is nowhere for water to collect on his lot, causing flooding on the lot next to his which eventually backs all the way up to our lot. Thankfully, we have a very steep ditch, but it is ludicrous that the water backs up to the point of flooding for his other neighbour.
- All driveway changes in the future should have to meet proper drainage, no filling in ditches or adding to the driveway without fixing the problem.

Develop new crossing standard based on lot size (Three)

- You need to consider that Montgomery is special in that the lot sizes are not the norm, and this why some people choose to live in the area. Therefore width should be based on lot size or reconstruct to existing width.
- The maximum width should depend on the lot size (e.g., wider driveways allowed for larger lots up to a specified maximum with tolerance discretion to accommodate existing driveway widths. I have a driveway with a 12" corrugated steel culvert installed in about 1985 to meet the City requirements at that time. It has never presented any problems such as freezing up in the spring or water flow over top of the driveway during heavy downpours and has always provided for adequate storm sewer water drainage.
- I strongly agree with the driveway width being determined by lot size, a proportionally sized driveway seems like a small thing to ask.

No Maximum Crossing Width Required (Five)

- Do not restrict driveway width, thinking it will be the solution to drainage.
- Driveway widths should have a very high limit for this unique neighbourhood. However, culvert size must be a ratio of the width of driveway, which may create a practical limit on the driveway width, depending on ditch depth and width. I strongly believe driveways should have no theoretical limit.
- Because of the larger yards restricting the width might be difficult for some properties.
- If there is a problem with flooding I might have changed my answer to reconstructing to maximum 20 feet. If there's no problem, why make the homeowner redesign their yard?
- Personally, if it is not broke don't fix it. We don't have any issues so I'm concerned that a change will be forced on us to fix a problem that doesn't exist.

6.0 COST SHARING FOR DRIVEWAY RECONSTRUCTION

Which of the following options do you support for paying for driveway reconstruction when the City restores drainage paths?




Figure 7: Cost Sharing Options for Driveway Reconstruction

The responses regarding cost sharing options are shown in Figure 7.

- 19 out of 56 (34%) responses agreed that property owners with non-compliant crossings should pay for all costs exceeding \$10,000 to reconstruct crossings.
- 12 out of 56 (21%) responses agreed that property owners with non-compliant crossings should pay 40% of costs to reconstruct crossings.
- Four out of 56 (7%) responses agreed that property owners with non-compliant crossings should have the option to select 40% of the cost or cost exceeding \$10,000 (whichever is less).
- Seven out of 56 (13%) responses agreed that property owners with non-compliant crossings should pay for all costs to reconstruct crossings.
- Eight out of 56 (14%) responses agree that all crossing reconstruction should be paid by the City.

The following are comments regarding cost sharing options for crossing reconstruction.

Cost Sharing Support Depending on Circumstances (Nine)

- If the current homeowner was not responsible for the construction of the driveway I don't believe they should be on the hook for any costs. The City has allowed this construction over the years and those not responsible for the construction should not be on the hook now.
- The homeowner who built a non-compliant driveway, knowing that he was doing so, should have to pay all costs for reconstruction. A person who bought a pre-existing non-code driveway should have financial assistance to rebuild.
- Some driveways may be compliant on size but the culverts may not be adequate due to lack of education by City or changes in size and placement. These residents should not be required to pay. However if the noncompliant driveway is of expensive type such as brick, there should be some payment from resident.
- If the driveway is in the regulations and was allowed at the time of the house construction the City should cover all costs. If the driveway was changed without City approval then the home owner should cover some cost.
- Property owners should only have to pay extra if they installed the noncompliant drive themselves; if they bought a house with a noncompliant driveway, they should only have to pay the minimum available cost.
- I do not feel that a resident whose driveway and culvert was in place prior to the current standards should have to pay any cost for culvert install or restoration of the driveway. Those who installed a driveway after the current standards were implemented that are non-complaint should share some of the costs to install the culvert and restore the driveway.
- I wonder about how these driveways were installed in the first place? If they were legal at the time they were installed, then a person should not be penalized. However, if they broke the rules then they should have to pay to rectify it.
- I don't think it's very fair to make homeowners pay very much at all who bought a house not knowing that there was an issue with their driveway. If the previous owners knew there was an issue they should have disclosed it to them. If someone built their own house after 2000 and their driveway is not compliant then they should pay much more (if not all) because they chose to be noncompliant. For example, we bought our house in 2014. I don't think it has proper drainage knowing what I know now, but when I bought the house I had no idea that it didn't or that there was any driveway specifications. I don't think it would be fair to have to pay 1000's of dollars. It would be different if I had built the house and knowingly didn't comply. I would be willing to pay something, but it seems like the previous owners should have disclosed this information if they were aware because then maybe we wouldn't have bought the house!
- I believe that the City should do a set standard, but above that should be the owners' responsibility.

City Pays 100% (Six)

- My main concern is the restoration of my driveway and that it happens at no cost to me. I paid for asphalt just last year and I strongly oppose paying for it again, conforming or not, which I don't know, even after attending the open house. You're welcome to redo it, however it's not going to cost me anything.

- I feel the City should cover 90% if not all of the cost compliant or not; you will more than likely have to dig it up to properly grade the culvert.
- After going to the open house I still don't know specifically what a conforming driveway is! Therefore I can't have an opinion yet. I feel that the City has to replace what's there, regardless of conformity. Proper culvert design should not impede drainage based on its length (width of driveway). Wide driveway = fatter culvert. I would add the current issue culverts are too small anyway. They fill up with debris after one season. They all need to be a lot bigger, then the driveway issue is solved as well. Why do they need to be round? They could be elliptical in order to get more volume.
- The City shares some responsibility for not dealing with driveway issues until now. Is driveway width the only non-compliant issue? We bought this house more than 20 years ago and have made no changes to either the driveway or landscape on City property in the front. Why now would we bear any cost to fix a non-existent problem?
- You can't charge after the fact. Many driveways were built prior to the new standard. It's unfair to start expecting home owners to pay now.
- This is why we pay taxes. There would be no cost to property owners in any other neighbourhood if the drainage was not performing the way it was intended. Drainage through the alley ways should be addressed as well.
- Culverts and ditches are on the City Right of Way. I'm confused as to why property owners must maintain City Right of Way property such as ditches and culverts. Other residents do not pay for storm sewer repairs in front of their homes on an individual basis (unless I'm incorrect on this).
- Saskatoon citizens are currently assessed a Temporary Flood Protection Charge and a Storm Water Management Charge which presumably is used on a city-wide basis to mitigate surface flooding and drainage issues. It seems reasonable that these funds should contribute to the Montgomery drainage project in the same way they have been allocated to help offset costs of projects on other flood-prone areas of the city.

Citizen Pays 100% (One)

- FYI - A few years ago, my neighbour replaced his culvert and paid 100% of the cost.

Citizen Choice in Contracting (Three)

- As a homeowner I want to choose who does the reconstruction.
- Will you give them option of doing all themselves with own contractor? If so, offer should be they pay at least 75% or get own contractor.
- If it is going to cost the property owner so much maybe an option of privately hiring to have it done to City specs.

Payments over Time (Three)

- If the City decides to have the home owners share in the costs make it an option to have it prorated on their property taxes over a period of time.
- Consider amortization of payment.
- Perhaps a payment option.

Other (Four)

- I have no problem with paying 40% as long as the City cleans the culverts out (so many year) to help maintain them.
- If a resident has a noncompliant driveway, it should not be the City's responsibility to bring it back up to code. If the resident paid themselves to modify the driveway, they can pay to make it drain properly.
- The City of Saskatoon collects a high level of taxation on our properties. If this is to cost any homeowner, the City needs to explain to the dime where our tax money goes and what amount is maintained for such projects. Drainage has been an issue for many decades now... what planning for this project has taken place, along with financial planning over, say, 60 plus years?
- Want the least expensive option possible.

7.0 RIP RAP

Would you prefer to have rip rap (rocks) on top of your culvert ends (similar to the culverts on Haida)?




Figure 8: Rip rap Placement overtop of culverts.

The responses regarding riprap placement are shown Figure 8.

- 29 out of 62 (47%) responses indicated they would prefer to have rocks (rip rap) placed on top of culverts for aesthetic purposes.
- 25 out of 62 (40%) responses are unsure at this time.
- Eight out of 62 (13%) responses indicated they do not want rip rap installed on top of the culverts.

Additional comments (two) related to rip rap are provided below:

- If it is decided to put rock around culverts, I would like to see something different than how it was done on Lancaster Blvd previously. Some of them are terrible now with weeds growing all around them and rocks missing or rocks always coming dislodged.
- I would like to be able to retain the existing riprap (concrete test core samples) on top of my culvert ends and driveway edging. It has worked for our driveway without incident for over 35 years.

8.0 OTHER COMMENTS

Do you have any other comments about drainage in Montgomery Place or the proposed construction for 2020?

Positive Feedback (Six)

- The area that will be worked on is the area in Montgomery Place that needs to be done the most and I am glad the City is going forward with this issue. Thank You.
- Yes - I hope this work continues to the rest of the community as it is needed desperately.
- Glad it is happening. Personally would like to see Lancaster between 11th and Caen fixed, there is nowhere for water to drain there due to filled in ditches so water often covers most of the street.
- This is a much needed project. When water pools in my ditch and yard, it's not just a nuisance but also a safety concern because of my young children and other children in the neighbourhood.
- It is going to help for sure!
- Appreciate the 60/40 split to the homeowner for sanitary sewer replacement.

Ditch/ROW Maintenance Concerns (Two)

- There are many houses that have almost no ditches, which leads to problems for their neighbours who take good care to maintain their ditch. We have a neighbour with MANY large trees that drop leaves in their ditch (on Elevator Rd., they live on the corner of Normandy and Elevator). In the three years that we have lived there they have NEVER cleaned the ditch. We have asked the City to clean it and they haven't. It clogs the culverts, pushes old leaves and debris into our ditch, and looks horrendous. Also, this fall the City used their 'Right of Way' to install a power box at the top of our ditch. Despite many conversations about moving the power lines underground, the City NEVER told us that this ugly power box would be installed. We have maintained our ditch to the HIGHEST standards, and this fall it was completely torn up and that hideous box was placed on it. The lack of communication was astounding. We just came home one day and it was there. It is an incredible eyesore on the front of our house, and it feels like a slap in the face after diligently caring for our ditch to the highest standards (especially since both of our neighbours don't have adequate drainage).
- Investigate recovering traction sand from the road shoulder in spring before the rain pushes it into ditches. I recently reconstructed my ditch and it has filled noticeably in two or three years.

Long-Term Plan (Three)

- What is the estimated time to remedy drainage in all of Montgomery Place...i.e. how many years approximately?
- I would like to see a forecasted schedule that includes other streets in the future to assist in planning as I would like to restore my entire driveway at the same time.
- Drainage became a problem after subdivision was allowed. The City did not follow up on driveway construction and culvert installation when a new home was built. Where there was once a garden or lawn became an asphalt roof and concrete driveway. The new homes' elevations was to the height of the road, not to the height of the neighbouring properties. Water ran into the adjacent property and caused problems for the neighbours. I hope there is an overall plan for Montgomery Place as the piecemeal attempts that have been made haven't shown themselves to do the proper corrective measures. 4" of asphalt on our street a few years ago did nothing to solve the drainage issues.

Other (Four)

- Very concerned for home owners that don't have a back alley! Where will they park their vehicles during construction in front of their property?
- We protect and maintain City property. There needs to be ample notice so we can properly remove our underground sprinkler, watering systems that keeps this property appearing like our own. Thank you.
- Please stop hiring the lowest bidder for everything the city tenders out because it usually ends up that it is done wrong or very poorly.
- I have comments about the lead pipes. I think that that is the biggest issue.