5.11

Added Correspondence respecting Proposed Amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan (relates to Item 14 of Economic Development and Planning Committee Report 09-006) from the following:

(a) Linda and Vince Robinson
(b) Don Charlong
(c) Julia Kollek
(d) Cheryl Tigchelaar
(e) Patricia Arnett
(f) Dianne Wojcik
(g) Kris Robinson
(h) Sean Ernst
(i) John and Jean McCloy
(j) Mary Anne Peters
(k) Greg Russell
(l) Caroline Thomson
(m) Dawn Ludbrook
(n) Ildiko Racho
(o) David and Mary Schmidt
(p) Peter Hurrell
(q) Ann Brandt
(r) Rashne Baetz
(s) Peter Hurrell
(t) Philip Mansfield
(u) Kevin and Allison Jowett
(v) Phil Roberts
(w) Rick and Jo-Anne Crawford
(x) Rick and Yoanne Speers
(y) Margaret Tigchelaar
(z) Fred and Gail Beddoe
(aa) Marcia Cooper
(bb) Gabe and Marta Smiarowski
(cc) Jane Neysmith
(dd) Les and Lyn Kendall
(ee) Sherri Turksstra-Blok
(ff) Robin Jun
(gg) Janet Nacekivell
(hh) Derek and Elizabeth Shrubsole
(ii) Tom Blok
(jj) Ann Parker
FYI
-----Original Message-----
From: Linda Robinson [mailto:fly@execulink.com]
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 5:40 AM
To: McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred; John, Edward; Mallard, Paul
Subject: Pleasant View lands and Niagara Escarpment Comm. Planning Area

We are writing this email as long time residents of Hamilton urging you in the strongest possible terms NOT to defer comments on the proposed amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP).

We fully support the April 2007 motion made by Russ Powers, Hamilton City Councillor, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area.

We NOTE that Hamilton City Council PASSED this motion!

Furthermore, we respectfully request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, specifically that the City of Hamilton

a) responds to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing request for comments by stating that the City of Hamilton OPPOSES the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan; and

b) reaffirms its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

We note with CONCERN that the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan clearly conflicts with the principles and decisions laid out in current municipal planning documents. These documents include GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan, which is based on the OMB decision of 1995 that limits development to 1 dwelling per 25 acres. In addition, the amendment directly conflicts with the proposed Rural Official Plan.

Respectfully Yours,
Linda and Vince Robinson
Message

Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: PBWP comments to the province

-----Original Message-----
From: Don Charlong [mailto:Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 8:04 PM
To: Clark, Brad; Morelli, Bernie; Collins, Chad; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Pearson, Maria; Pasuta, Robert; Duvall, Scott; Jackson, Tom; Whitehead, Terry; Merulla, Sam; Eisenberger, Fred; John, Edward; Mallard, Paul; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; McCarthy, Margaret
Subject: PBWP comments to the province

Dear Mayor and Councillors

Is Hamilton sending mixed messages? Does Hamilton want Pleasant View to be developed with 760 residential units or does the city want PV in the NEP? Confusion at a committee meeting leads to more confusion.

The first confusion regards the provinces request for comment. The MMAH wants Hamilton to comment on an amendment to the PWBW specifically proposed by developers. Hamilton does not need any study to answer this question. PV has a litany of restrictive planning decisions going back decades. The city the province and the OMB have all clearly stated their positions that PV should be lightly developed if at all. The city needs to send a do not amend comment to the province. We already know for certain that we do not want 760 residential units.

The second confusion regards the need for a "comprehensive review". Advocates for the developers are trying to convince us that the table must be swept clear, and all options are viable. This is not even close to the truth. The PWBW imposed restrictions on PV because policy makers believed PV should be protected. The OMB agreed, one house per 25 acres. GRIDS agreed, we are outside the final urban build line. Councillor Powers and city council also requested PV be included in the NEP. A consistent and strict restriction on development. Yes there needs to be a comprehensive review, but within the parameters of the above decisions. We need to work out the details of "one house per 25 acres" not start from a clean slate.

Finally, any comprehensive planning study at this time would pre-empt a move, well under way, to include PV in the NEP. Clearly the desired result according to virtually all policy makers on record. Any planning review should wait for the conclusion of the process with the NEP.

It is very important that city councillors move carefully when making decisions that will affect the city forever. Do we really want to destroy the last and best crown jewel of a vibrant thriving ecosystem within the city boundaries.

Say no to the PWBW amendment and get busy with the process of creating what will become a great source of pride for all Hamiltonians.

Sincerely

Don Charlong
President, Valley Ratepayers Association
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View Development Proposal

-----Original Message-----
From: Julia Kollek [mailto:Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 4:10 PM
To: Eisenberger, Fred
Subject: Pleasant View Development Proposal

Dear Mayor Eisenberger

As a Dundas resident, I feel very strongly that the proposal to build a community in Pleasant View is inappropriate - and urge you to reject any requests for planning amendments.

I hope you have an opportunity to visit the area. It is one of the last pieces of natural wildlife corridor and open land within a few minutes' drive from our town. For years I have taken my family hiking in the adjacent lands belonging to the Royal Botanical Gardens and we know the area is home to bald eagles and rare species of plants.

The land was called Pleasant View for good reason.

Dundas has fought for this area before - and this is not a case of Not In My Backyard. Residents from all parts of our town want to continue to see this land protected - - as it has been legally.

Please consider carefully how inappropriate it would be on so many levels to build townhouses for seniors here so far from amenities.

It is completely incompatible with our GRIDS policy, and does not meet the Triple Bottom Line requirements of social, economic or environmental benefit to Hamilton.

Yours sincerely

Julia Kollek
Dundas
jkollek@gmail.com
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View

-----Original Message-----
From: Cheryl Tigchelaar [mailto:Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2009 4:30 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Pleasant View

Mr. John:

I am writing to express my grave concern that the Planning Committee has accepted a staff recommendation to defer comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing regarding the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan. I am equally concerned that a planner for a developer has succeeded in convincing members of the Planning Committee that a comprehensive review to determine best use of Pleasant View lands is needed.

The Pleasant View area has already been studied extensively.

Please remember that Council members passed Russ Powers' 2007 motion that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission’s Planning Area.

I ask that Council act immediately to amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee so that:

a) The City of Hamilton promptly responds to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s request for comments, by stating opposition to any amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan.

b) The City of Hamilton reaffirms its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Tigchelaar

64 Lillian Avenue

Dundas, Ontario.

L9H 5T6

905-526-8310
Subject: FW: Proposed amendment for Pleasant View land

-----Original Message-----
From: Patricia Arnett  
Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2009 2:21 PM  
To: Ferguson, Lloyd; Eisenberger, Fred; McCarthy, Margaret; Robert Pastuta; Powers, Russ; Mitchell, Dave; Pearson, Maria; Clark, Brad; Whitehead, Terry; Scott Duval; Jackson, Tom; Collins, Chad; Merulla, Sam; Morelli, Bernie; Bob Bratina; McHattie, Brian; Mallard, Paul; John, Edward  
Subject: Proposed amendment for Pleasant View land  

We do not want the City to defer comments on the proposed amendment.
We fully support the April 2007 motion made by our councilor, Russ Powers, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area. City Council passed this motion.
We request that council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, namely:
1. that the City responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the PBWP.
2. that the City reaffirm it's position that the PV lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.
*The amendment to the PBWP clearly goes against the current municipal planning documents, including GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan (based on the OMB decision of 1995-1 dwelling per 25 acres) and the proposed new Rural Official Plan.
Concerned resident,
Patricia Arnett
905-522-0581
46 Sovereign Ave
Dundas
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View and Planning Committee

-----Original Message-----
From: Dianne Wojcik [mailto:Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 11:13 PM
To: Eisenberger, Fred
Cc: Merulla, Sam; John, Edward; Mallard, Paul; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; McCarthy, Margaret; Powers, Russ;
Clark, Brad; Morelli, Bernie; Collins, Chad; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Pearson, Maria; Pasuta, Robert;
Duvall, Scott; Jackson, Tom; Whitehead, Terry
Subject: Pleasant View and Planning Committee

Dear Mayor Eisenberger and Councillors:

I am a long-time resident of the Pleasant View area of Dundas, and must express my surprise and
disappointment at the recent decision made by the Planning Committee to support a land use
review for Pleasant View. This motion is ludicrous - in 1995, at the OMB hearing, there were
extensive studies, reviews and many expert witnesses who provided detailed and thorough
research of this special area of Dundas. The Conservers Society and concerned citizens spent a
considerable amount of time and money to protect this area, which has been referred to as a World
Biosphere Reserve by UNESCO.

Since our forced amalgamation with Hamilton, my property taxes have doubled without any
significant improvement in the services we received as Dundas rate payers. To permit the Planning
Department to undertake another study would only entail a further waste of our tax dollars. One of
the so-called benefits of amalgamation was to avoid duplication, yet you intend to duplicate studies
that have already been carried out, the results of which can be seen in the 1995 OMB decision.
Because of the Planning Committee's decision, it would seem apparent that the staff has not even
read the OMB conclusions.

I am strongly requesting that Council overrule the decision of the Planning Committee for further
land review.

Dianne Wojcik (905) 522-0587

Communicate, update and plan on Windows Live Messenger. Get started today.
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: March 11 Council Meeting Pleasant View lands

-----Original Message-----
From: Kris & Glenn Robinson [mailto:Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2009 11:31 AM
To: "Margaret McCarthy"; Clark, Brad; Morelli, Bernie; Bratina, Bob; McHattie, Brian; Collins, Chad; Mitchell, Dave;
Ferguson, Lloyd; Pearson, Maria; Pasuta, Robert; Powers, Russ; Duvall, Scott; Jackson, Tom; Whitehead, Terry;
Merulla, Sam; Eisenberger, Fred
Subject: March 11 Council Meeting Pleasant View lands

Kris Robinson
61 Valley Road
Dundas ON L9H 5S4

March 8, 2009

To Mayor Fred Eisenberger
Members of City Council

Re: Motion to accept the staff recommendation regarding Pleasant View:

Please consider amending the motion passed by the Economic Development and Planning Committee meeting of March 3, 2009, to clarify the City’s position with regard to the Pleasant View lands in Dundas.

These lands have been the subject of numerous studies, including a long Ontario Municipal Board Hearing. Development in the Pleasant View area is contrary to both municipal and provincial planning documents, including GRIDS, the current Dundas Official Plan, the Greenbelt Plan and the Parkway Belt West Plan. In the proposed Rural Official Plan, Pleasant View is identified as Special Policy Area A. The proposed Rural Official Plan states that the area “remain subject to provisions of the Official Plan of the former Town of Dundas as set out by the Ontario Municipal Board decision”. In my view, additional studies of these lands would be both costly and unnecessary.

I therefore urge Council to reaffirm the City’s position clearly to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing by amending the Economic Development and Planning Committee motion to include:

- That the City opposes the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan
- That the City reaffirms its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area as per Councillor Russ Powers’ April 2007 motion

I have attached, for your records, a letter from Nancy Mott-Allen, Senior Strategic Advisor for the Niagara Escarpment Commission which clearly states that the NEC opposes the proposed amendment to the PBWP.

Thank you
Kris Robinson
To Hamilton City Council & Staff,

I wish to express my deep disappointment that after decades of protecting the Pleasantview area I find myself once again having to oppose another ill planned development proposal. The Pleasantview area was already fought over 14 years ago when the Conserver Society of Dundas won an Ontario Municipal Board decision in 1995 limiting new development to one house for every 25 acres. Then in 2005 I clearly remember receiving a phone call from our MPP Ted McMeekin informing me that “we had won” the Provincial Government was including Pleasantview in the provincial Greenbelt. This area is truly the last wildlife corridor between the Niagara Escarpment and wetlands that feed Hamilton Harbor. This latest proposal by Mattwood Homes to build 760 residential units and a wellness centre would if built have grave consequences to the adjacent lands already protected by RBG, the Hamilton Conservation Authority, the Cartwright sanctuary and Conservation Halton amongst others. I also see no need for Hamilton taxpayers to support and service a rural lifestyle retirement community located so far away from our major emergency medical centers when lands within the city’s core are better suited and available.

I would hope this is our last fight to protect these lands and all members of council now fully support the April 2007 motion made by Councilor Russ Powers, that the Province consider including Pleasantview lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission’s Planning Area. The city should reaffirm this position and support a long term plan to insure these lands are protected for future generations.

Sean Ernst

Dundas
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Inclusion of Pleasant View into Niagara Escarpment Planning Area

-----Original Message-----
From: John McCloy [mailto:  Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 9:33 AM
To: McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom;
sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd;
Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred
Cc: 'Jean McCloy'
Subject: Inclusion of Pleasant View into Niagara Escarpment Planning Area

My wife and I am concerned with the proposed development of lands in Pleasant View, Dundas. There are several environmental issues at stake here, but in brief these lands serve to not only join the Niagara Escarpment to the North Shore of Cootes Paradise as a wildlife corridor but equally importantly as a watershed into Cootes Paradise. Furthermore in the latest Issue of Silver and Gold, it is stated that the RBG announced it will be closing some trails through the North Shore this year to promote the nesting of a pair of Bald Eagles who have chosen this area. You should all ponder the implications of this event in our area by this highly visible and severely endangered species (tourism as well as environmentalism). Construction in the adjoining lands would be far more disruptive.

We hope that the City of Hamilton will oppose the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan and reaffirm it's position that Pleasant View be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

Thank You,

John and Jean McCloy
19 Sovereign Ave
Dundas, Ontario
L9H 5Z8

Home Office: (905) 523-4359
Cellular: (905) 517-8309
-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Anne Peters
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 9:37 PM
To: Powers, Russ
Cc: Eisenberger, Fred
Subject: amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan

Dear Mr. Powers,
I understand that the Planning Committee has accepted the staff recommendation to defer comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing regarding the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan.

In 2007, you made a motion that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area. The motion was passed by Council. These were good steps.

Council should follow up on these good steps by making it clear that the City responds to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's request for comments by clearly opposing the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan and by supporting, once again, the idea of including Pleasant View in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

Sincerely,
Mary Anne Peters
11 Homestead Avenue
Dundas, ON  L9H 5Y6
905-777-9664
Mr Mayor, City Councillors, City Planners of Hamilton, Ontario.

The lands from the Niagara Escarpment, down through the Royal Botanical Gardens to Cootes Paradise, have long been recognized as an environmentally sensitive area, not only for the endangered flora and fauna that exist and grow there, but also the continued existence of the native wildlife that utilize these pristine valleys and brush lands as their only access to the waters of Cootes Paradise.

Previous Mayors and City Councils recognizing the importance of this unique area, moved to help protect it for future generations by increasing the permitted lot size for a single dwelling, from 1/2 acre to 2 acres, then to 10 Acres, and finally, as per the O.M.B. decision of 1995, to 25 Acres per single family dwelling.

I commend Councillor Russ Powers and fully support the motion made and passed by City Counsel, in April 2007, "that the Province consider including Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commissions' Planning Area".

Why then would the present City fathers consider reversing that motion and allow this development, which would desecrate and destroy one of the Gems of the Niagara Escarpment? Greater Hamilton has many other areas and neighbourhoods that would welcome, and benefit from this development.

Please continue to support the Status Quo, i.e. the O.M.B. decision that requires 25 Acre per single family dwelling, and stop the development of 500 to 700 units in this area.

Thank you for your consideration and would appreciate an in site to your current position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Greg Russell.
To anyone that cares

Re: Pleasant View development proposal

Hi, my name is Caroline Thomson. I live very near highway #6 on York Road. My family moved here from Burlington three years ago as we had a strong desire to be nearer to the country.

I have been a nature nut all my life. For forty years I have spent no less than 1 hour per day in the forest. I photograph in and around home, Algonquin park and fly into wilderness locations to take part in the splendour of nature.

I run a luxury doggie daycare, teach canine behaviour and help foster wildlife.

I was so pleasantly surprised when I moved in and got settled to see so many delightful wildlife friends right here in my backyard. From my deck I have seen countless deer, wild turkeys, raccoons, possums, moles, coyotes, foxes, skunks, saw-whet owls, long eared owls, red tailed hawks, sharp shinned hawks, cooper hawks, flickers, hummingbirds, flocks of cedar waxwing, woodpeckers, rabbits, my first Dekays brownsnake, countless small birds etc etc. I see more wildlife on a trip from my backyard to Cootes Paradise than anywhere else I’ve ever been. I was and still am so pleasantly surprised.

Here’s the flip side. Many, many animals have been displaced with human presence and the construction taking place on highway six. Right now in my ditch is a dead buck, raccoon and the most handsome red tail fox I have ever seen. This is here at my house, however, I see road carnage in many spots, animals that have dragged themselves a hundred feet or so before succumbing. I often hear people slam on their brakes to avoid hitting deer and last week a lady was stopped in the middle of the road, in front of my house, so that three coyotes could cross. I wish I could tell the motorcyclists that race by that they face a certain death if they run into a deer. I have rescued raccoons that have lost their mother and taken them to a sanctuary, most recently tried to rescue an owl that had fishing line wrapped around it’s feet.

I have found no fewer than two dozen deer poaching sites in the last year. Many are six or seven manned sites. A fellow naturalist told me he found two large bucks, taken down with a “quiet” high powered crossbow only for their antlers. He has called in 7 car license plate numbers to the MNR not even to get a return call. Is everyone okay with their kids playing in the woods with high powered bows being fired. There is money for another review, however, I guess there is no money for MNR presence. Actually, two of the last poaching locations I have have witnessed were easily accessible for MNR travel, one being on the East side of six and the other being just over the tracks, less than ¼ mile from the Arboretum. And what about all the ATV’s that tear up trails, ride over nests, harass wildlife and aggravate neighbours? Again, no extra money for police presence however, we can find the dough for another “comprehensive study”. Shame on us!
Both the planned development site and the river ravine between Old Guelph Road and #6 Highway are tremendously important wildlife corridors. Dozen of animals use these rightsofway to traverse from the upper escarpment to the lower everyday. Not a day goes by that there are not 4 or 5 raptors scouring the meadows that surround these wildlife corridors. It is critical that they be left untouched and as well as the border lands. Deer, fox and coyotes have been using the unopened bridge at York and Six for quite sometime now, who knows what the consequences will be when it is reopened. I am getting really disgruntled at having to call the animal control once again to have them come and pick up another dead animal!

What we don’t need is another comprehensive land use review but rather a quick decision – once again, that the lands from Valley Road to Snake Road, remain untouched, both for flora and fauna and for generations to come. So many of us stand shaking our heads, why are we interfering with “paradise”, who’s putting the wildlife first and what a horrible black scar left on Hamilton if we let this “Paradise” be lost. Future generations should benefit from this spectacular area the same as our forefathers did. Let’s erect more wildlife crossing signs and signs educating the public about the beautiful bio diverse lands they have the privilege of hiking.

Caroline Thomson

Carolinethosmon@cogeco.ca
69 Hopkins Court,
Dundas, ON.
L9H 5M7
March 9, 2009,

Dear Mr. Whitehead,

Having been out of the country for four months, I have only just become aware of the situation with the Pleasant View lands.

I am opposed to any plan to develop these lands—they are a natural corridor for wildlife from the Escarpment down to the Cootes Paradise area.

Furthermore, the City passed a motion in April 2007 that the Province consider that these lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area.

I believe that the current Liberal Gov't's new Rural Official Plan would also include Pleasant View in the proposed Green Belt. Once a precedent is set that these lands can be developed, the whole area would be up for grabs.

We do not need any more land reviews; heaven knows there is enough other business to spend...
the taxpayer's money on. The only people who would benefit from a review would be the developers and not local residents and citizens.

Thank you for your consideration.

With respect,

Susan Hubbard
-----Original Message-----
From: Ildiko Racho
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 12:56 PM
To: John, Edward; Mallard, Paul
Cc: Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; Eisenberger, Fred; McHattie, Brian;
bmorulla@hamilton.ca; Bratina, Bob; cccollins@hamilton.ca; Jackson, Tom;
sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave;
Ferguson, Lloyd; McCarthy, Margaret
Subject: Valley

Dear Sirs

I am distressed to hear that they want to build Dundas into another high density area. It will impact the environment, the wildlife, and the people that live here in a negative way. This is a small valley the air quality will suffer due to fossil fuels being used and it has a bad habit of sitting in low lying areas. Not only will low lying ozone be a issue so will the extra effluence from the sewers due to increased demands on a system that will not be upgraded due to costs [Our friends in the lower east end will attest to that!]. I am sick and tired of developers with deep pockets and friends in high places dictating to the smaller populations. That is why the former mayor was ousted. If they vote to amend the OMB decision of 1995 they are going against the majority of Dundas residents and therefore may unleash a backlash. Why not fix the existing issues such as the downtown core and placing high density good quality housing for the areas that are already zoned for such. Just leave the escarpment and green spaces alone.

Sincerely
Ildiko Racho
Dear Terry Whitehead,
Please vote to amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee regarding Pleasant View lands by
1) clearly stating that the City of Hamilton opposes the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan 2) reaffirming the City position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area. Please clearly affirm a strong City stand to continue to protect these lands. Deferring to the MMAH is not in the best interest of a strong City view to protect urban greenspace, waterways, endangered species, wildlife corridor and natural lands for future generations. Thank you most sincerely for your thoughtful consideration in this matter.
Mary Schmidt 18 Fleming Avenue, Dundas, Ontario L9H 5Z4
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View

-----Original Message-----
From: peter hurrell [Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 12:54 PM
To: McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred; John, Edward; Mallard, Paul
Subject: Pleasant View

Dear Sirs
I am writing this email to you to reiterate my stand and that of the Rate Payers Association of Pleasant View.
In the strongest possible terms NOT to defer comments on the proposed amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP).
We fully support the April 2007 motion made by Councilor Russ Powers, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area.
Please NOTE that Hamilton City Council PASSED this motion!
Furthermore, we respectfully request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, specifically that the City of Hamilton.
   a) responds to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing request for comments by stating that the City of Hamilton OPPOSES the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan; and will conform to the findings of the province as set out in the 1995 OMB hearing conclusions
   b) reaffirms its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.
We note with CONCERN that the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan clearly conflicts with the principles and decisions laid out in current municipal planning documents. These documents include GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan, which is based on the OMB decision of 1995 that limits development to 1 dwelling per 25 acres. In addition, the amendment directly conflicts with the proposed Rural Official Plan. Hamilton has been hit by this recession and it not over yet why waste tax dollars unnecessarily?

Sincerely Peter Hurrell
I am very disheartened that at the Planning Committee meeting of March 3, 2009, the committee accepted the staff recommendation to defer comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) regarding the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP). I do not believe that the MMAH needs to do yet another comprehensive land use to determine the best use of the Pleasant View lands. **We do not need a comprehensive review!** This area has been studied. The decision was made at the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearing in 1995.

My family and I fully support the April 2007 motion made by our Councillor, Russ Powers, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission’s Planning Area. City Council passed this motion.

We request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City’s position, namely:

1) that the City responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the PBWP.
2) that the City reaffirm it’s position that the PV lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

The amendment to the PBWP clearly goes against the current municipal planning documents, including GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan (based on the OMB decision of 1995 - 1 dwelling per 25 acres) and the proposed new Rural Official Plan.

Please consider what is at stake. This area should be protected in the Niagara Escarpment Commission’s Planning Area.

Sincerely,

Ann Brandt
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: From Rashne Baetz (former Councillor- Dundas)- re PLEASANT VIEW--for March 11 COUNCIL mtg

-----Original Message-----
From: Rashne [Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2009 6:17 PM
To: Powers, Russ; Eisenberger, Fred; Bratina, Bob; Ferguson, Lloyd; Clark, Brad; McHattie, Brian; Whitehead, Terry; Pasuta, Robert; Pearson, Maria; McCarthy, Margaret; Morelli, Bernie; Mitchell, Dave; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; Duvall, Scott; Merulla, Sam
Subject: From Rashne Baetz (former Councillor- Dundas)- re PLEASANT VIEW--for March 11 COUNCIL mtg

For March 11 Council meeting --re planning issue re PLEASANT VIEW, Dundas

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I respectfully ask you re-consider staff recommendation regarding the Pleasant View issue at Council on March 11. The City has more than sufficient grounds to reply to the Province that the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan (sought by the developers) cannot be supported as it contradicts every municipal and provincial policy for this area.

City planning staff has indicated to me that the Dundas OP is still the guiding document for this until the new Rural OP is resolved. The Official Plan was amended to reflect the OMB decision of 1 lot/25acres--a virtual development freeze.

The proposed amendment to MMAH from the developers clearly contradicts the Dundas OP and new Rural OP (which is consistent with the Dundas OP policy for this area). The amendment also contradicts the City's GRIDs Final Report conclusions.

Pleasant View has significant provincial interest. It is not just any Rural area. The province put it in the restrictive Parkway Belt West Plan in the 1970s. This area is crucial to the health of Cootes Paradise & also provides a key corridor to the Escarpment--it lies between these 2 jewels.

There is no need to spend more time and money on studies for this area. There were extensive studies leading up to the 6 week OMB hearing. The hearing considered 188 exhibits and 39 witnesses from the Province, Town of Dundas, Region, developers and wildlife biologists and citizens.

The OMB decided to continue with the virtual development freeze called for by the Parkway Belt West Plan on planning, economic and environmental grounds. Many of us, including myself, who do not live in Pleasant View worked for its protection, seeing its immense significance.

In its decision the OMB noted that the trunk sewer going through this area is for servicing Flamborough & was not to be used as an excuse for development in Pleasant View--consistent with Regional policy banning connection to sewers traversing rural areas.

Since that time Pleasant View has been included in the Greenbelt and is being considered by the Province for inclusion the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

Thank you,

Rashné Baetz,
M.A.Sc. Environmental Engineering
Former Councillor, Town of Dundas
Subject: FW: Re Pleasant View

-----Original Message-----
From: peter hurrell [Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2009 1:00 PM]
To: John, Edward
Cc: Ferguson, Lloyd; McHattie, Brian; Pearson, Maria; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Bratina, Bob; Duvall, Scott; Pasuta, Robert; Mitchell, Dave; Eisenberger, Fred
Subject: Re Pleasant View

Edward John

Dear Sir

I am writing to ask you about the planning amendment File ZAC-08-404/OPA-08-010 submitted by Fotherill Planning applying to Pleasant view

On page 6 14.2 of the application “sewage disposal” Municipal Sanitary Sewer System has been checked. How is this passable? Page 17 Finding #8 of the OMB Decision (OMB File No 0930179) (Ministers File No 23-OP-DU-023) States that the sewer is a regionally owned facility and the regional plan refuses to permit connections in rural areas “except to resolve a health hazard”. This is just one example where the application contradicts the OMB decision. Yet the application has been accepted by you (Jan 6th 09) There only approximately 220 households in Pleasant View. In 1995 we got together having garage and book sales to help contribute to the $30,000 that was raised to defend our neighborhood. There is a huge body of work in the form of studies and surveys that have been done on the subject lands, is it all to be ignored until the next OMB hearing? There is no other area like Pleasant View in this part of southern Ontario. It is part of the Cootes Paradise water shed and contains within it wild life corridors that connect Coots to the Niagara escarpment. All of these considerations are taken into account by the findings in the OMB. I respectfully urge you to re read the decision.

Sincerely

Peter Hurrell 905 522 0587

Make your Messenger window look the way you want. Express Yourself!
-----Original Message-----
From: Philip Shane
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 2:51 PM
To: Eisenberger, Fred; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam;
Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson,
Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy,
Margaret
Cc: Phil Roberts
Subject: Re: Pleasant View and the Parkway Belt West Plan

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I fully support the April 2007 motion made by our Councillor, Russ Powers, (and passed by
City Council) that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara
Escarpment Commission's Planning Area.

I request that Council amend the motion passed (March 3, 2009) by the Planning Committee
to clarify the City's position, namely:
1) that the City responds to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing request for
comments by stating that the City opposes any amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan that
would allow increased development in the Pleasant View lands
2) that the City reaffirm its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the
Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

If Hamilton wants to continue its transition to a knowledge-based economic centre (health
sciences, McMaster University, etc.) it needs to present an attractive quality of life to
the companies, ventures and individuals considering relocating to Hamilton. The Pleasant
View lands are a rare parcel of beautiful rural and natural landscape just a stone's throw
from downtown. To replace them with yet another tract of anonymous generic suburban
development would be a tragic squandering of a valuable natural asset. In addition,
numerous studies have identified these lands as an important wildlife corridor from the
escarpment to Cootes Paradise.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these points,

--

Philip Mansfield
123 Mina Ave. Dundas ON L9H 5T7
905 529-6775 Home
905 536-5270 Cell
-----Original Message-----
From: allison.jowett
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 2:21 PM
To: McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred; John, Edward; Mallard, Paul
Cc: donkaren@cogeco.ca; gkrobinson@cogeco.ca; hurrellpeter@hotmail.com
Subject: Pleasant View Dundas

Good afternoon;

My husband and I are residents of Pleasant View, Dundas. It is our understanding that the Planning Committee at the meeting of March 3, 2009 accepted the staff recommendation to defer comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH), regarding the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP). This in our view is not acceptable.

We fully support the April 2007 motion made by our Councillor, Russ Powers, that the province include the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area. City council passed this motion.

We request that Council amend the motion passed by the planning committee to clarify the city's position, namely:

1. That the city responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the city opposes the amendment to the PBWP. 2. That the city reaffirm its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

The amendment to the PBWP CLEARLY goes against the current municipal planning documents, including GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan (based on the OMB decision of 1995 - 1 dwelling per 25 acres), and the proposed new Rural Official Plan.

Kevin and Allison Jowett
110 Rosina Avenue
Dundas, ON
L9H 6A3
-----Original Message-----
From: Phil Roberts
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 2:00 PM
To: Eisenberger, Fred; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret
Subject: Pleasant View and the Parkway Belt West Plan

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I fully support the April 2007 motion made by our Councillor, Russ Powers, (and passed by City Council) that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area.

I request that Council amend the motion passed (March 3, 2009) by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, namely:
1) that the City responds to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing request for comments by stating that the City opposes any amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan that would allow increased development in the Pleasant View lands
2) that the City reaffirm its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

If Hamilton wants to continue its transition to a knowledge-based economic centre (health sciences, McMaster University, etc.) it needs to present an attractive quality of life to the companies, ventures and individuals considering relocating to Hamilton. The Pleasant View lands are a rare parcel of beautiful rural and natural landscape just a stone's throw from downtown. To replace them with yet another tract of anonymous generic suburban development would be a tragic squandering of a valuable natural asset. In addition, numerous studies have identified these lands as an important wildlife corridor from the escarpment to Cootes Paradise.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these points,

Phil Roberts
123 Mina Ave,
Dundas, ON L9H 5T7
905-529-6775
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View Motion MAr 11

-----Original Message-----
From: Rick Crawford [mailto:Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 4:19 PM
To: John, Edward; Mairland, Paul; Powers, Russ; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; twhitehead@hamilton.ca; bclarke@hamilton.ca; Pearson, Maria; dsmithell@hamilton.ca; Ferguson, Lloyd; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred
Subject: Pleasant View Motion MAr 11

We fully support the April 2007 motion made by our councilor, Russ Powers, that the Province consider including Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission’s Planning Area. After all, City Council passed this motion.
We request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City’s position that the City respond to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the PBWP.
Our view is the amendment to the PBWP clearly goes against the current planning documents and specifically against the OMB hearing in 1995.

This important land should be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.
I ask you as as representatives, please represent our wishes.

Rick & Jo-Anne Crawford  J></(y)>  
3 Ernest Street  
Dundas, Ont L9H 5M4  (905) 627-9355
-----Original Message-----
From: steveandtracey@cogeco.ca
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 4:30 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Amendment to the PBWP

We fully support the April 2007 motion made by our Councillor, Russ Powers, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area.

We request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, namely:

1. that the City responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the PBWP.

2. that the City reaffirm its position that the PV lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

Thank you very much,
Rick and Yoanne Speers
41 Atkinson Boulevard
Hamilton, Ontario
905-525-8016
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: 03/10/09

-----Original Message-----
From: Margaret Tigchelaar  Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 4:41 PM
To: John, Edward; Mallard, Paul; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; Scott Duval; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; Robert Pastuta; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred
Subject: 03/10/09

Dear all,

It is our understanding that the planning committee, at the meeting of March 3, 2009, accepted a staff recommendation to defer comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing with regard to the ministry’s request for input on a proposal to amend the Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP). That suggests that no decision be made by the ministry until a comprehensive land use review has been completed.

Our position is that the ministry must decide not to open the PBWP and the city response must be unequivocal.

The purpose of this note is to urge you, at the next City council meeting, to support amendment of the proposal and clearly state the city’s opposition to any land use review for this area based on years of study, the declaration of this area as a precious green space, and the city’s stated position that the Pleasant Valley lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning area.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Margaret Tigchelaar

136 Parkview Ave

Dundas
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: -Pleasant View Lands

-----Original Message-----
From: gail [Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 5:54 PM
To: John, Edward; Mallard, Paul; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom;
sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers,
Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob
Subject: re: Pleasant View Lands

Dear Sir or Madam,

re:- Plans for Pleasant View survey

Please take a firm position on the above, and deny any further debate, deferral, review or consideration
whatsoever with respect to their future,
except as proposed, part of the Parkway Belt West Plan, and it's inclusion in the Niagara Escarpment Plan [Very
Important]. Deny any development or discussion and state NO DEVELOPMENT.

This should protect these extremely environmentally valuable and not to exclude their priceless future economic
value as part of a larger Niagara Falls,
Niagara escarpment, RBG, Cootes Paradise, global tourist destination.

Recently we received a letter in response, from an involved Ontario Minister, it stated - "The City of Hamilton has
responsibility for land use planning in the survey lands."

Please act upon your responsibility and lets get these lands included in the Niagara Escarpment Plan --
WITHOUT IMPEDIMENTS.

Sincerely,

Concerned Residents of the Parkway Belt West Plan Area.

Fred And Gail Beddoe
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View Dundas:File No:ZAC-08-040/OPA-08-010
Importance: High

-----Original Message-----
From: Marcia Cooper  Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 8:43 PM
To: Mallard, Paul; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred; tmcmeekin.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org; info@davidsweet.ca; ottawa@davidsweet.ca; contact@davidsuzuki.org; John, Edward
Subject: Pleasant View Dundas:File No:ZAC-08-040/OPA-08-010
Importance: High

Hamilton City Councilors;

In response to the planning committee’s decision to accept the staff recommendation to defer comments to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing regarding the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan and rezoning of Pleasant View in Dundas.

In April of 2007 a motion was made by Councilor Russ Powers, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View Lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission’s Planning Area – City council passed this motion and we fully support that motion!

I request that council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City’s position, namely:

1) That the City responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the Parkway Belt West Plan.
2) That the City reaffirm its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning area.

Again, This land is within Ontario’s greenbelt for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is included in the study area of the Royal Botanical Gardens conservation and land management strategy, for protection of this natural heritage system. It will be a shame if this land is forever destroyed for the sake of ANOTHER subdivision, especially given these times of environmental and economic crisis.

Thank you once again for your consideration of this important issue,
Marcia Cooper
57 Valley Road, Pleasant View
Dundas, On
L9H 5S4
905-528-6634

Re: File No: ZAC-08-040/OPA-08-010

When will nature, wildlife conservation and environment protection be put before developer greed?
It is an atrocity that developers have submitted this application to amend the Dundas official Plan and zoning by-law to permit their massive development of Pleasant View.
Pleasant View is a rural area surrounded by Cootes Paradise, Hamilton Conservation Authority land, Royal Botanical Gardens, the Niagara Escarpment and Halton Conservation, including the Cartwright Nature Sanctuary. This area is a natural passage for wildlife to move from the escarpment to the lake and this proposed development would cut off this vital route. You will frequently catch a deer sighting in these fields as you drive by, if your eyes are keen.
It is a known fact that this land is within Ontario’s greenbelt for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is included in the study area of the Royal Botanical Gardens conservation and land management strategy, for protection of this natural heritage system.
It is also known that the Minister of Natural Resources proposed this area be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area, providing stronger limitations to development.
It is also known that this site is covered by Greenbelt legislation and a 1995 Ontario Municipal Board ruling that allows limited development in the area.
It would be more than a shame on the City of Hamilton if this proposed development of a large retirement and residential complex on the corner of York and Valley Roads, with over 700 units including multi-story apartment building, a nursing home, wellness centre and several stores and bungalows is allowed to move forward. The impact on this area would be detrimental and irreversible! This is a rural area; APARTMENT buildings and such a high density of buildings, have no business in this area known for its hiking trails, wildlife, bird watching, and waterfalls. People travel from many areas to Dundas for these natural features, vistas and nature appreciations. Not to mention the amount of additional development that would be required to support this type of development. As it stands the roads in this area cannot handle the level of traffic they see now let alone the huge increase in volume that a development such as this would incur. Valley road is narrow with twists and turns with no sidewalks or shoulders for that matter. There are no buses, no sewers, and no natural gas lines. This area is already seeing huge amounts of development in the Clappisons Corners area of hwy 5&6, and the monumental growth of Waterdown. There is no need to destroy even more land for this unneeded and unwanted development.
Please put a stop to this development now and say yes to the conservation of this unique rural area.

Marcia Cooper
Valley Road resident for 36 years.
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View Lands

-----Original Message-----
From: Marta Smiarowski  Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 10:52 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Pleasant View Lands

Please amend the motion passed by the planning council last Tuesday March 3, 2009. We do not want the City to defer comments on the proposed amendent. We request that Council amend the motion - passed by the Planning Committee- to clarify the City's position- 1- that the city responds to the Minister of Municipal Affairs & Housing for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendent to the Parkway Belt West Plan 2- that the City reaffirms its position that the Pleasant View lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

Gabe & Marta Smiarowski
55 Home St
Dundas
Greetings to all,

I have lived in Pleasant View for 30 years and am very familiar with all aspects of the area. It is most remarkable in itself and in its connections and implications. Almost two decades ago began an extraordinary effort by local citizens of great vision and amazing dedication, to preserve this notably pristine area. Now the city has a marvelous opportunity to appreciate and retain what has been kept by dint of enormous civilian effort.

All the excellent arguments for the conservation of Pleasant View lands have been presented repeatedly, in several venues and contexts. The very carefully considered judgment (1995) of the OMB Chairman is absolutely appropriate and there is no point at all in wasting ANY further taxpayer money - at any level - to revisit. If a reminder is needed: we taxpayers DO fund the province.

New - and old - members of planning staff should be advised to review the established discoveries and determinations. Why "go through the motions" and all attendant expense if it is going to be "some form of rural development, rural settlement pattern" (Tim McCabe)? This has all been done. We have had a VERY comprehensive land use review, already paid for.

I don't doubt for a moment that Ed Fothergill has been spending lots of time meeting with city planning staff (whose time is surely valuable); he is not new to this and is well aware of why the area should not be touched. The landowners he represents bought the land very cheaply approximately 21 years ago (going rate at the time was under $5000. an acre because the land could NOT be developed, only farmed - which much of it then was) but stand to make a fabulous fortune if the city caters to the pressures brought to bear. And so Ed persists.

With the new enlightenment about trying to be locally self-sustaining, this is a wonderful opportunity to return the lands to sustainable farming, if they cannot be left to naturalize. Wildlife can live in harmony with farmland. And this does mean valuing our farmers as we should.

There was a front page article on May 2, 2008, in The Spectator, with the headline "Hamilton poised for global greatness". This article covered the meeting of local leaders with Richard Florida, and one of the points he made was that local natural areas are critical to urban success and should be retained and highly valued.

If Hamilton IS to achieve a degree of "greatness" then it must rise above the dildling and fiddling that can become a pattern. Here is one perfect opportunity.

The city of Hamilton should reaffirm its excellent position: that the Pleasant View lands be included in the NEC Planning Area.

I trust that Council will amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee and oppose the amendment to the PBWP.

Onward and upward!

yours sincerely, Jane Neysmith
-----Original Message-----
From: L KENDALL
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 12:29 AM
To: John, Edward; Mallard, Paul; Eisenberger, Fred; Powers, Russ
Cc: donkaren@cogeco.ca; gkrobinson@cogeco.ca; hurrellpeter@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: MMAH amendment PBWP - Pleasant View
Importance: High

To all recipients:
We trust the attached letter sent May 21 2008 to the then Minister of Natural Resources will speak to our opposition concerning any changes regarding the Pleasant View area.

Regards

Les & Lyn Kendall
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: pleasant view amendment

-----Original Message-----
From: sherri turkstra [mailto:Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 10:27 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: pleasant view amendment

Hello,

This e-mail is to address the serious concerns I have regarding the pleasant view lands for development. There should be "NO" development here, this area has been studied already in the past, and should be not have any development other than 1 dwelling per 25 acres

*We fully support the April 2007 motion made by our Councillor, Russ Powers, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area. City Council passed this motion.

*We request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, namely:

1) that the City responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the PBWP.
2) that the City reaffirm it's position that the PV lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

*The amendment to the PBWP clearly goes against the current municipal planning documents, including GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan (based on the OMB decision of 1995 - 1 dwelling per 25 acres) and the proposed new Rural Official Plan.

Thanks very much,

Sherri

Sherri Turkstra-Blok
Campus Retail Canada
56 Hopkins Crt.
Dundas, Ont. L9H 5M5

No virus found in this outgoing message.
Checked by AVG.
Version: 7.5.557 / Virus Database: 270.11.10/1995 - Release Date: 11/03/2009 8:28 AM
Dear Mayor Eisenberger,

I'm writing you regards to the development of the last green space in Dundas, PleasantView. I'm urging you to please vote against the amendent set forth by the City's Planning Department to defer for further study on the land use in this area, in the upcoming city council meeting.

In these harsh economic times when many of the citizen of Hamilton are faced with personal deficits and cut backs it is best if the city focuses it's resources on vital services instead of planning studies on an area that has already been extensively studied and deemed unsuitable for large scale development.

Thank you for your attention and support in this matter.

Sincerely,

Robin Jun
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: PLEASANTEI GV AREA DUNDAS !!!

-----Original Message-----
From: Janet Nancekivell [Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 4:58 PM
To: Mallard, Paul; McHattie, Brian; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; Powers, Russ; Eisenberger, Fred; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret
Subject: PLEASANTEI GV AREA DUNDAS !!!

To whom it may concern. My family has been in the Pleasantview area of Dundas for 23 years. It seems that there is never a year goes by that some developer doesn’t try to take a chunk out of this neighbourhood. Despite multiple layers of government protection & assurances and residents many battles against unwanted development a new threat to the beauty of these lands has emerged yet again. Residents fully support counsellor Russ Powers proposal to include Pleasantview in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area. The current development proposal (of 760 units) flies in the face of the Dundas official plan, the parkway belt west plan, the G.R.I.D.S. document and the 1995 OMB hearing decision as well as the cootes to Escarpment Conservation and Land management Strategy committees recommendations and the long standing desires of the vast majority of residents. These fast disappearing open spaces must be protected and preserved, NOT PAVED OVER!!! Once gone they are gone forever. Please do not let the financial interests of a few individuals ROB the city of Hamilton of this BEAUTIFUL and ecologically sensitive significant area. Don’t it always seem to go you don’t know what you’ve got till it’s gone

Bill, Janet, Katie and Terry Nancekivell

Tell the whole story with photos, right from your Messenger window. Learn how!
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: Pleasant View

From: Elizabeth Shrubsole [mailto:] Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 11:29 PM
To: Mallard, Paul; brmchattie@hamilton.ca; Bratina, Bob; Morelli, Bernie; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; sduval@hamilton.ca; Whitehead, Terry; Clark, Brad; Pearson, Maria; Mitchell, Dave; Ferguson, Lloyd; rpoers@hamilton.ca; rpastuta@hamilton.ca; McCarthy, Margaret; Eisenberger, Fred

Subject: Pleasant View

Ladies & Gentleman

Have you ever walked in the area that you want to see developed? Are we to have no green spaces left. People come here from Toronto to walk the trails in Pleasant View. Building in this area is like tightening a choker collar - keep pulling on it and the land which is at present inhabited by all kinds of flora and fauna will die

Do we need to waste more money, time and resources on another comprehensive land use review of this area?
We have already paid for a comprehensive review - this area has been studied. The decision was made at the OMB hearing in 1995. Why are we rehashing this?
Hamilton is a depressed city - money could be better spent.

We concur with our neighbours in Pleasant View that:

We do not want the City to defer comments on the proposed amendment

Russ Powers made the motion in 2007 that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the NEC's Planning Area and City Council passed this motion. We fully supported this.

We request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, namely:

1) that the City responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the PBWP.
2) that the City reaffirm it's position that the PV lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

*The amendment to the PBWP clearly goes against the current municipal planning documents, including GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan (based on the OMB decision of 1995 - 1 dwelling per 25 acres) and the proposed new Rural Official Plan.

Sincerely
Derek & Elizabeth Shrubsole

*Even a brief email will be helpful !!!!!
I have attached the staff recommendation (Russ's motion is on the last page).
I have attached the contact information for the City Councillors.
I have the transcript of Fothergill's presentation if you would like it.
You can call me if you would like.

Thanks
Don Charlong, President of the Pleasant View Ratepayers Association
Peter Hurrell 905

Kris Robinson, 905

PLEASE FORWARD THIS EMAIL TO EVERYONE YOU KNOW IN HAMILTON AND ASK FOR THEIR SUPPORT BY WAY OF SENDING AN E-MAIL.
Rawlings, Alexandra

Subject: FW: pleasant view development

-----Original Message-----
From: sherri turkstra [mailto:Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 10:32 AM
To: Mallard, Paul
Cc: Powers, Russ
Subject: pleasant view development

Good Morning,

This e-mail is to address the serious concerns I have regarding the pleasant view lands for development. There should be "NO" development here, this area has been studied already in the past, and should be not have any development other than 1 dwelling per 25 acres

*We fully support the April 2007 motion made by our Councillor, Russ Powers, that the Province consider including the Pleasant View lands in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's Planning Area. City Council passed this motion.

*We request that Council amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee to clarify the City's position, namely:

1) that the City responds to the MMAH request for comments by stating that the City opposes the amendment to the PBWP.
2) that the City reaffirm it's position that the PV lands be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

*The amendment to the PBWP clearly goes against the current municipal planning documents, including GRIDS, the Town of Dundas Official Plan (based on the OMB decision of 1995 - 1 dwelling per 25 acres) and the proposed new Rural Official Plan.

Thanks very much,

Tom Blok

Tom Blok
56 Hopkins Crt.
Dundas, Ont. L9H 5M5
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-----Original Message-----
From: Ann Wilf Parker
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 10:46 AM
To: Eisenberger, Fred
Subject: Amend

Please Amend the motion passed by the Planning Committee on Friday. Surely an OMB ruling should stand. Thanking you, Ann Parker, 1 Helen St. Dundas.