SUBJECT: Applications for Approval of an Official Plan Amendment and Change in Zoning for Lands Located at 1031 Highway 52 North, Copetown (Ancaster) (PED08193) (Ward 14)

RECOMMENDATION:

That Official Plan Amendment Application OPA-07-019, Copetown Lions Development Association, Owner, to exempt the subject lands from various Policies of the Ancaster Official Plan, and Zoning Application ZAC-07-076, Copetown Lions Development Association, Owner, to change the zoning from the Agricultural “A” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone, Modified, to permit the development of the subject lands for 42 Multiple Residential units on communal services, for lands located at 1031 Highway 52 N, Copetown, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED08193, be denied on the following basis:

(a) That the principle of development has yet to be established through submission of the necessary supporting technical information. The proposal for any form of residential development is, therefore, premature based on insufficient technical and environmental studies required to justify the proposal with respect to servicing and protection of natural heritage features, as deemed necessary in the Provincial Policy Statement, Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan and Ancaster Official Plan.

(b) That the type and form of development proposed does not conform and is inconsistent with the intent of the Ancaster Official Plan.

(c) That the type and form of development proposed does not conform and is inconsistent with the intent of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan.

(d) That the type and form of development proposed is contrary to the Water and Wastewater Management Master Plan.
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(e) That the type and form of development proposed is incompatible with existing and planned uses in the immediate area.

(f) That the proposal does not represent good land use planning.

Tim McCabe
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of the application is for an Official Plan Amendment and a change in zoning to permit the development of the subject lands for 42 Multiple Residential units on communal services. The principle of development cannot be supported as the required technical and environmental studies necessary to support the application are insufficient. Furthermore, the proposal is contrary to Council Direction and Corporate Policy, which state that communal services are not permitted as a servicing form.

BACKGROUND:

Proposal

The subject lands represent a 2.3 hectare parcel of land, with frontage of approximately 86 metres on Highway 52 North in the rural settlement area of Copetown. Surrounding land uses include predominately single family residential units situated along Old Governors Road and Highway 52 North. To the east of the subject lands are the baseball diamonds and recreation area of the Copetown Lions Club; and to the south is a woodlot area which has been identified as an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) in the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

The purpose of the applications is for an Official Plan Amendment and change in zoning to permit the development of the lands located at 1031 Highway 52 North, Copetown, for 42 Multiple Residential units on communal services (Appendix “A”). The proposed form and arrangement of the townhouses (Appendix “B”), would create eight blocks, each accessed by a private road from Highway 52. A number of different unit types are presented, including both one and two-storey units, some with walkout basements. The site would be serviced by way of on site wells and a private sewage collection and disposal system that will be maintained as a private system.

The proposal is intended to represent an opportunity for seniors to purchase units in the rural area on a life lease system. It is suggested that the form and tenure of the units would be affordable and suit the needs of the aging population currently residing within the rural area.
The proposed development would be assessed against the Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone standards of the Ancaster Zoning By-law. The concept plan illustrates that the proposal would conform to the general built form requirements of the proposed zoning; including the lot frontage, density and height, as required by the regulations of the By-law. The proposed zoning may require some modifications to the Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone in order to implement the proposed concept; however, insufficient information was contained in the concept plan to permit an in-depth review.

Owner/Applicant: Copetown Lions Development Association

Agent: Fothergill Planning and Development Inc.

Location: 1031 Highway 52 North, Copetown (Ancaster)

Description:
- Frontage: 86 metres
- Depth: 156 metres
- Area: 2.3 Ha

Details of Submitted Application

EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Lands</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings and Retail</td>
<td>Residential “R4” Zone, Hamlet Commercial “HC” Zone and Residential Hamlet “RH” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings and Woodlot</td>
<td>Residential Hamlet “RH” Zone and Agricultural “A” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Open Space/Baseball Diamond/Community Club</td>
<td>Public Open Space “O2” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings and Trailer Park</td>
<td>Residential Hamlet “RH” Zone and Public Open Space “O1” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

1. The proposal cannot be supported for the following reasons:

   i) The principle of development, through insufficient technical information, fails to demonstrate conformity with the Provincial Policy Statement, the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, and the Ancaster Official Plan.

   ii) The type and form of development proposed does not conform, and is inconsistent with the intent of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan.

   iii) The type and form of development proposed is contrary to the Water and Waste Water Management Master Plan.

   iv) The type and form of development proposed is incompatible with existing and planned uses in the immediate area.

   v) The proposal does not represent good land use planning.

2. The purpose of the application is for a change in zoning to permit the development of the lands located at 1031 Highway 52 North, Copetown, for 42 Multiple Residential units on communal services (Appendix “A”). The proposed form and arrangement of the townhouses (Appendix “B”), would create eight blocks, each accessed by a private road from Highway 52.

   A number of different unit types are presented, including both one and two-storey units, some with walkout basements. A number of modifications to the proposed Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone may be required in order to implement the proposed concept; however, insufficient information was contained in the concept plan to permit an in-depth review. The site is surrounded by predominately single detached residential dwellings situated on large lots, in addition to a small number of commercial and recreational uses. With respect to the scale, density and character of the proposal, this will be discussed in detail in the Density and Streetscape Character section of the report (Page 11).

3. Site Servicing

   The site would be serviced by way of on site wells and a private sewage collection and disposal system that will be maintained as a private system (i.e. a communal system). The applicant submitted a Hydrogeological Study undertaken by Terraprobe in support of the water supply availability. In addition, a preliminary servicing report for water and waste distribution and treatment by Stevenson Engineering has been submitted.

   With regard to applicable policies, it should be noted that the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) Policy 1.6.4.2 states that municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas.
This presumption is further reiterated in the policy direction of the Growth Plan for
the Greater Golden Horseshoe. While focused on urban areas, the Plan does
contain reference to the Rural Area and, in particular, Rural Settlement Areas,
with Policy 2.2.2 (j), which seeks to limit growth in settlement areas that are not
served by municipal water and wastewater systems.

Notwithstanding this, the PPS does make provision for private communal
services under Policy 1.6.4.3, provided they conform with Policy 1.6.4.1., which
identifies the general parameters for communal systems, which includes:

\( b) \text{ Ensure that these systems are provided in a manner that:} \)

1. \textit{Can be sustained by the water resources upon which services rely.}

2. \textit{Is financially viable and complies with all regulatory requirements.}

3. \textit{Protects human health and the natural environment.}

4. \textit{Promotes water conservation and water use efficiency.}

5. \textit{Integrates servicing and land use considerations at all stages of the planning process.}

In order for the municipality to assess the servicing proposal against these
policies and those within the Ancaster Official Plan, staff has requested that the
hydrogeological study be peer reviewed, and that the costs of the review be
borne by the applicant. To date, the applicant has yet to provide the City with the
necessary fees to proceed with this review and, as such, conclusions drawn from
the report cannot be substantiated, nor conformity with the PPS be established.

The report has, however, been reviewed through the consultation process by the
Ministry of Environment. The Ministry concludes that the report is preliminary,
and that further work needs to be completed in order to determine if the site is
capable of meeting the water supply needs for this development. Under these
circumstances, staff maintains concerns over the ability of the site to provide
adequate water and services to accommodate the proposal, and deem the
principle of development premature until this issue can be resolved.

Notwithstanding the lack of substantiated technical information, it must be noted
that it is Council Direction and Corporate Policy that communal servicing not be
permitted as a form of servicing in the rural area. While the PPS maintains the
opportunity for Municipalities to entertain the possibility of using Communal
Services, it is clear that municipal services are the preferred option and that the
decision to use communal services, where they are demonstrated to be in
conformity with the aforementioned policies, are at the discretion of the
Municipality, as per Policy 1.6.4.3 of the PPS, which states:
1.6.4.3 Municipalities may choose to use private communal sewage services and private communal water services…

Policies contained within both the existing Ancaster Official Plan and the new Hamilton Rural Plan clearly indicate that the City, over environmental and health concerns, have opted against adopting communal services as a viable and sustainable form of servicing in the rural area. Policy 3.3.8. states:

3.3.8 All development in the Rural Area shall have adequate and efficient systems of water, sanitary sewage disposal and storm drainage, and must be on the basis of private individual systems to avoid environmental problems that could result from development in these areas.

In particular, reference to the settlement of Copetown, the Copetown Secondary Plan details that:

6.3.13 (a) There is no intention on the part of the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth to extend municipal services to Copetown. Services shall consist of individual septic sewage systems and wells.

The continued commitment made by the municipality to choose against communal services is reflected in the new City of Hamilton Rural Official Plan, passed and enacted by Council on September 27, 2006, and currently awaiting Ministerial approval. Section C 5.2, Communal Water and Wastewater Systems, details, in particular, that such servicing forms should be restricted over concerns for public health, stating that:

C.5.2 The Province requires municipalities to prohibit lake-based municipal services to all rural areas except in response to public health emergencies…. Many existing communal systems operate in conjunction with privately maintained sewage disposal systems resulting in partly serviced rural development. Partly serviced rural development is subject to a higher risk of failure and the potential for future health emergencies. Therefore, it is the objective of this Plan to restrict both the creation and expansion of communally serviced or partially serviced rural development.

Consequently, Section C 5.2.1 of the City's Rural Official Plan states:

C.5.2.1 The creation of new communal water or wastewater treatment systems is prohibited.

These Council endorsed policy directions are also reflected in the City of Hamilton Water and Wastewater Master Plan Policy Paper and Master Plan, adopted by the Public Works Department and City Council in April 2005 and
August 2006, respectively, and updated in February 2007. The Plan identified general policies pertaining to both water and wastewater servicing, which included:

- Harmonizing planning and servicing policies such that planning decisions are made recognizing the infrastructure impacts.
- Growth areas with full municipal servicing given priority.
- Partial servicing no longer permitted.
- Maximize the use of existing capacity.

The above policies and corporate directions, endorsed by the City, clearly illustrate the intention of the City of Hamilton to resist communal systems based on the need to ensure the protection of water sources, the environment, public health and sustainable development. In addition to this, it should also be noted that there are significant potential liability issues created through approving communal services.

The issue of liability is significant because the Ministry of Environment (MOE), prior to approving any application for Provincial Certificates of Approval for such communal systems, now requires the municipality under Sections 52 and 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act, to enter into a default agreement. The City would consequently be responsible for assuming control of the private communal system should it at any point in history default and/or fail. Not only would taking control of the system place unnecessary strain on the City’s resources, but given MOE standards for municipal systems being higher than those for private systems, the City would be required to ‘upgrade’ the system to the new requirements, placing a considerable logistical and financial burden upon the City.

It should be noted to this effect, that the City owns and operates four communal water systems, three of which have been assumed through development operator default. Currently, allocation of responsibility by the Province for a fifth system is being contested by the City. Under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), once the transition to municipal operation is made, there is a higher level of regulatory accountancy leading to requirements for substantial investments in infrastructure and operation, which are often not easily recoverable through standard rate structures.

In acknowledging the significant risk of this new liability, the new Rural Official Plan subsequently states the following:

5.2.3 The City will not consider nor accept to becoming a party to a ‘default responsibility agreement’ for any private communal water supply or sewage treatment system as may be required pursuant to Ministry of the
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Environment guidelines whether or not the existing proposed development is permitted by this plan or the Zoning By-law...

Given the risk involved, both from a public health and liability standpoint, staff from the City’s Planning Department and Water and Wastewater Division of the Public Works Department do not support the provision of communal services as a viable servicing form.

4. **Environmental Impacts**

The subject lands are traversed by Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) #37 (Copetown Ballpark Woodlot). In addition, portions within the site may contain wetland features and, as a result, provide an important hydrological and ecological function in its own right.

Consequently, as part of the application review, the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) was circulated the application and asked to comment on the proposal. The GRCA confirmed that according to information currently available, portions of a wetland feature are located on the subject site. In addition, small wetlands have also been identified within the Copetown Ball Park Woodlot, an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), which is located adjacent to the site. As a result of the wetland features, portions of the subject property are regulated under the GRCA’s Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation (Ontario Regulation 150/06), which prohibits development in or on the following areas:

   a) **Wetlands; or,**

   b) **Other areas where development could interfere with the hydrologic function of a wetland, including areas within 120 metres of all provincially significant wetlands and wetlands greater than or equal to 2.0 hectares in size, and areas within 30 metres of wetlands less than 2.0 hectares in size, but not including those where development has been approved pursuant to an application made under the Planning Act or other public planning or regulatory process;**

   And prohibits alteration to:

   c) **Straighten, change, divert or interfere in any way with the existing channel of a river, creek, stream or watercourse or change or interfere in any way with a wetland prior to receiving written consent of the Grand River Conservation Authority.**

Given the significant environmental features contained within and adjacent the subject lands, the proposal will require further study including an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prior to a permit from the Conservation Authority being issued. The GRCA, therefore, concludes that in the absence of an
Environmental Impact Study (EIS) they would request deferral of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications.

This position is supported through policies in the PPS, Regional and Local Official Plans. In particular, Policy 2.1.6 of the PPS outlines that development shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage feature identified (i.e. significant wetlands) unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated, and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. Similarly, the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan in Policy C.1.2.2 states that land use changes in or adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA’s) will only be permitted where such development:

i) Will not adversely affect, degrade or destroy any of the qualities which are the basis for the area’s designation;

ii) Will not cause any significant impacts upon water quality and quantity; and,

iii) Will not adversely affect the implementation of any resource protection policies or plans.

To date, no EIS study has been submitted and, as such, staff is unable to assess whether the proposal could be developed in accordance with the above policies.

5. Intensification

As detailed in the Planning Justification report submitted in support of the application by Fothergill Planning and Development Inc., the PPS encourages the efficient use of land and development patterns by promoting intensification in built up areas. In addition, Policy 1.1.1 of the PPS makes specific reference to:

b) Accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential….development

A policy direction further substantiated in Policy 1.4.3., which states:

Policy 1.4.3 Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market by:

a) Establishing and implementing minimum targets for the provision of housing which is affordable to low and moderate income households…

b) Permitting and facilitating:
all forms of housing to meet the social, health and well-being requirements of current and future residents, including special needs requirements…

As detailed previously, the application proposes affordable units at a type and density not currently offered within in the Copetown Settlement Area, and that these units would be marketed towards senior citizens. Subsequently, the planning justification report argues that in light of these policies, the application, achieves and conforms with the intent of the PPS.

However, it is staff’s opinion that these policies cannot be considered in isolation and do not provide justification in themselves. Careful consideration is required with respect to conformity with the Policy document as a whole, as well as other related Policy documents, including but not limited to the Growth Plan. Consequently, staff considers the potential conflict with PPS Policy 1.1.3.2, which emphasises the need for development and intensification to be appropriate and efficient with respect to the services and infrastructure presently available, as it states:

Policy 1.1.3.2 a) Densities and a mix of land uses which:

1. Efficiently use land and resources.

2. Are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion.

b) A range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment in accordance with the criteria in Policy 1.1.3.3, which states:

Policy 1.1.3.3 Planning authorities shall identify and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated, taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs.

The question of whether the settlement of Copetown has the infrastructure and public service facilities suitable for the proposed development must, therefore, be addressed. With specific reference to this application, it should also be noted that as the development is directed towards seniors, the availability of services, particularly transit and medical services, becomes increasingly more important. Copetown currently is a rural hamlet with limited commercial and institutional services within the settlement boundaries. Much of the area does not benefit from sidewalks, and currently no form of public transit services the area. The
Ancaster Official Plan in Policy 3.1.2 identified that this limitation for growth was a function of Rural Settlement Areas and, therefore, directed growth through intensification to the Urban Area, which was considered more appropriate, stating:

3.1.2 The framework for future development shall entail the establishment of two different types of growth areas: the Urban Area which shall absorb the predominant growth in the Town; and secondly, the Rural Settlement Areas, which shall experience only minor growth...

The limited provision of services and infrastructure was also a situation recognized specifically within the policies for the Copetown Secondary Plan. In addition to noting that municipal services were not to be extended to service the area (Policy 6.3.13 a)), Policy 6.3.13 e) of the Ancaster Official Plan also identified that transit likewise, was not to be offered to the residents of Copetown:

Policy 6.3.13 e) There is no intention on the part of the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth to extend the boundaries of the urban transit service area to include Copetown.

The unavailability of transit in this rural area, based on the low-density rural landuses currently in operation, and the presumption that appropriate intensification should be directed to the Urban areas, subsequently result in the proposal being in conflict with the Growth Plan with respect to those policies that manage growth; in particular Policy 2.2.2 1. c), which seeks to:

Policy 2.2.2 1. c) build compact, transit supportable communities in designated Greenfield areas.

Furthermore, the policies of the PPS indicate that land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses. However, it is important to note that the definition of settlement areas includes urban areas as well as rural settlement areas. The smaller areas, populations and limited mix of uses in the existing Rural Settlement Areas, combined with their near urban location, make them inappropriate for increased densities, particularly when coupled with the servicing issues identified above. The proposed density can be more appropriately accommodated in the Urban Area where the City provides for a mix of land uses, and densities that can be appropriately serviced by full municipal water and wastewater services.

6. **Density and Streetscape Character**

With respect to the proposed density of the residential project, and its subsequent impact upon the character of the area, staff notes that the area is predominately characterized by large single family dwellings located on large lots generally in excess of 0.4 Hectare (1 acre) (2.5 units/ha). Policy 3.1.10 of the Ancaster Official Plan requires new development in Rural Settlement Areas to be
compatible with existing development. Furthermore, the Secondary Plan in implementing this intent states:

6.3.9 (a) The lands designated ‘Hamlet Residential’ on Map 1 shall be for residential use in the form of single detached dwellings.

The character of the area with respect to density, and the provisions to maintain this as per the above policy, are a direct result of these dwellings requiring sufficient space to accommodate private individual services. Consequently, through proposing communal systems, the application would be able to accommodate a density of approximately 17.72 unit/ha, which would represent a significant change from the existing lotting fabric and character of the area not anticipated in the Secondary Plan.

Staff considers that although concerns over character remain, the application is for a comprehensive form of redevelopment and any potential negative impacts could possibly be addressed and mitigated through the amending By-law. The proposal would also be subject to site plan approval and, as such, an additional opportunity for detailed review and assessment would be available.

However, notwithstanding these provisions, the actual impact of the application with regard to character remains difficult to pre-judge given the absence of an EIS and subsequent development envelope. The application has, therefore, failed to demonstrate that the increase in density and land use mix is sustainable and appropriate; and, given the provision of the necessary services within the urban areas within close proximity to the subject lands, staff considers that any extension into the Rural Settlement Areas is unwarranted, inappropriate, and would create an unsuitable precedent.

7. With respect to archaeological potential of the subject lands, staff notes that the subject property is within 300 metres of water/prehistoric water course; is on well-drained, sandy soil within a clay/stone matrix, is within 100 metres of a historic transportation corridor, and that there is documentary evidence that associates the property with historic occupations (historical mapping shows a school within 100 metres of the subject property).

In these circumstances, where there is a potential for archaeological resources to be located on site, it is the City’s practice to place the subject lands in a ‘H’ Holding zone, thereby prohibiting the development of the subject properties until such time that the owner/applicant conducts an archaeological assessment of the subject properties and mitigates, through preservation or resource removal and documentation, adverse impacts to any significant archaeological resources found. Using this option, no demolition, grading, construction activities, landscaping, staging, stockpiling or other soil disturbances shall take place on the subject properties prior to the approval of the Director of Planning and the Ministry of Culture confirming that all archaeological resource concerns have met licensing and resource conservation requirements.
8. In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, a preliminary notice of these applications was sent to 44 property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. Two responses were received from the preliminary notice of circulation letter, and an additional 69 responses were received from residents outside of the 120m circulation area (Appendix “C”). Sixty-three letters (1 from within the 120m circulation area) were in support of the proposal, stating that the opportunity to retire in the rural area was a positive step for the current residents within the area who did not wish to move to an urban area upon retirement. Eight letters (1 from within the 120m circulation area) were received raising concerns with the proposal. The concerns raised ranged from issues with the servicing capacity and potential for contamination in the area, increased traffic, environmental impacts, lack of services and unsuitable precedent. These concerns have been addressed within the main body of the report.

9. **Traffic/Safety Issues**

   The Traffic Engineering and Operations Section has provided comments regarding this application, and raise no objections to the zoning application. It is noted that conditions related to sight lines, access permits and signage, would be requested and addressed at the site plan stage.

10. In conclusion, as established in the site servicing section, the question of capacity has yet to be verified, and furthermore, the issue of environment, public safety and liability remains of significant concern. Notwithstanding these technical issues, staff maintains concern regarding the ability of the proposal to represent efficient use of the existing services, and questions remain over the ability and capacity of the area to sustain the development in light of the availability of existing infrastructure and services. The proposal would place undue pressure on the settlement to extend services out to this rural area which have not been identified in either the existing or new Official Plan polices. Consequently, staff concludes that the proposal fails to represent good planning.

   Finally, in response to the assertion that housing for seniors represents conformity with the need to provide diverse housing opportunities for different residents, it must be noted that the abilities under the Planning Act would not extend to permitting staff to make provision in the adopted By-law limiting the units to use by seniors. Consequently, staff must view the development with the understanding that the units would be available for general residential occupation regardless of the intended use.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

If this application is denied, the applicant can use the subject property for the range of uses that are currently permitted under the existing Agricultural “A” Zone.
FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial: N/A.
Staffing: N/A.
Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider applications for an Official Plan Amendment and a change in Zoning.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

Greenbelt Plan

The subject lands are designated as “Copetown” Rural Settlement Area, within the Former Town of Ancaster Official Plan. Policy 3.4.2.1 states that Towns/Villages, as identified in municipal Official Plans and within their approved boundaries as they existed on the date this Plan came into effect, continue to be governed by municipal Official Plans and related programs or initiatives and are not subject to the policies of this Plan, save for external connection policies of Section 3.2.5. The proposal is, therefore, consistent with the policies of the Greenbelt Plan.

Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

The application has been reviewed with respect to the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Places to Grow). Staff does not consider the application to be consistent with the policies that manage growth and direct general residential intensification to the built up areas, as per the Policies contained in 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

The intent to focus growth in urban areas and to direct residential intensification to areas with a public benefit was determined in the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS). GRIDS uses the model of sustainability to draw together land use planning and infrastructure investment planning (water, wastewater, stormwater and transportation) within a framework that considers social/cultural, environmental and economic implications of growth and development decisions.

In particular, while Hamilton has yet to incorporate Intensification Areas into the Official Plan, it is clear that the subject lands, which are rural and are not serviced by transit or municipal servicing, do not represent areas appropriate for intensification.

Provincial Policy Statement

The application has been reviewed with respect to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Staff recognizes that the application is consistent with the policies that focus growth in settlement areas 1.1.3.1.
However, Policy 1.6.4.2 states that Municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas. In addition, Policy 1.6.4.3 states that municipalities may choose to use private communal sewage services and private water services, and where Policy 1.6.4.4 permits, individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services, where:

a) Municipal sewage services and municipal water services are not provided; and,

b) The municipality has established policies to ensure that that the services to be provided satisfy the criteria set out in Policy 1.6.4.1.

Staff notes that the owner/applicant has submitted a hydro-geological investigation (Terraprobe, August 2, 2006) in support of the proposed communal services. This study is required to undergo a peer review, with any associated costs to be borne by the owner/applicant. Until such time as the submitted study has been peer reviewed and accepted by the City, the proposal is premature, as the study is required for the satisfaction of the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement policies.

However, it should be noted that it is Council Direction and Corporate Policy that Communal Services are not permitted as a servicing form. As such, the Municipality has chosen not to use Communal Services, as per Policy 1.6.4.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement.

Furthermore, Policy 2.1.6 outlines that development shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage feature identified (i.e. significant wetlands) unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated, and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. The subject lands are traversed by ESA #37 (Copetown Ballpark Woodlot) and, as a result, staff requires that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared and reviewed/endorsed by ESAIG, to address this concern.

Lastly, Policy 1.7.1(e) outlines that long term economic prosperity will be supported by planning so that major facilities (such as airports, transportation corridors, sewage treatment facilities, waste management systems, industries and aggregate activities) and sensitive land uses are appropriately designed, buffered and separated from each other to prevent adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, and minimize risk to public health and safety. Due to the proximity of the subject lands to Highway 52 North; Governors Road and the Canadian National Railway Corridor, staff requests a noise assessment be conducted to demonstrate that any adverse impacts that would be created following the location of the residential development adjacent to these landuses, would be adequately mitigated.

Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan:

The subject property is designated as a “Rural Settlement Area - Copetown” within the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. Policy 3.2.1.6 states that residential development within Rural Settlement Areas may occur by means of Plans of Subdivision, land lease
or plans of condominium. Limited development by severance may be permitted if in conformity with the secondary plan, and if located in a manner that will not interfere with future development.

As mentioned above, the use of Communal Services has been removed, as per Council Direction and Corporate Policy, as set out within the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, City of Hamilton Water and Wastewater Master Plan, and City of Hamilton Water and Wastewater Master Plan Policy Paper.

Therefore, the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Re-zoning application are contradictory to the policies of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. In addition, Policy C-1.2.2 of the Plan states that lands use changes, in or adjacent to Environmentally Significant Areas, will only be permitted where such development:

i) Will not adversely affect, degrade or destroy any of the qualities which are the basis for the area’s designation;

ii) Will not cause any significant impacts upon water quality and quantity; and,

iii) Will not adversely affect the implementation of any resource protection policies or plans.

Rural Hamilton Official Plan

The subject property is designated Agricultural on Schedule “A” Land Use - Rural Area of the Ancaster Official Plan, and is designated as Hamlet Residential in the Copetown Rural Settlement Area.

The adopted Rural Hamilton Official Plan (Ministerial approval pending) designates the subject property “Rural Settlement Area”. Section 5.2.1, Chapter C of this Plan, prohibits the creation of any new communal water or wastewater treatment systems. Further, Section 5.2.3 states that the City will not become party to a Default Responsibility Agreement or any private communal water supply or sewage treatment system, and further residential development in the Rural Settlement Area is limited to single detached dwellings. Staff, therefore, does not support this application as there can be no consideration of communal systems or multiple forms of residential development in the Rural Area according to the policies of the new Rural Official Plan.

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) permits municipalities to consider the use of communal services, however, through the development of the Water/Waste Water Master Plan (February 2007), and implemented through the development of the Rural Official Plan, the City has determined that this form of servicing is not sustainable or appropriate. Therefore, these systems are not permitted.

In addition, the Rural Hamilton Official Plan identifies in Policy 2.4.2 that new development adjacent (within 120 metres) to a key natural heritage feature requires an Environmental Impact Statement, which demonstrates conformity with the
environmental protection policies identified in Chapter C. To date, the proponent has not submitted any technical information or EIS in support of the proposal.

**Town of Ancaster Official Plan**

The subject lands are designated “Rural Settlement Area” in the City of Ancaster Official Plan Schedule “A” and “Hamlet Residential” in the Copetown Rural Settlement Area Secondary Plan; the following policies are applicable to the proposed redevelopment of the subject lands.

3.1.2 *The framework for future development shall entail the establishment of two different types of growth areas: the Urban Area, which shall absorb the predominant growth in the Town; and secondly, the Rural Settlement Areas, which shall experience only minor growth...*

3.3.8 *All development in the Rural Area shall have adequate and efficient systems of water, sanitary sewage disposal and storm drainage and must be on the basis of private individual systems to avoid environmental problems that could result from development in these areas.*

3.1.10 *New development in the Rural Settlement Area shall be of a nature compatible with the existing development.*

5.8.1 *The Rural Settlement Areas shown on Schedule A are those areas where a variety of land uses and development have clustered together on a small scale outside the designated Urban Area, and where it is considered appropriate that further development, predominately residential, on a limited basis can be accommodated in the time span of this Plan. In this regard, Secondary Plans shall be prepared to establish the type of development, its geographical limits, the total amount of growth, as well as the size and location of lots to be created...Future development in these areas shall conform to the Secondary Plan.*

5.8.2 *Within these Rural Settlement Areas, new development shall be compatible with the existing built environment...*

5.8.4 *The predominant use of land in the Rural Settlement Areas shall be for single-family detached residential development...*

As detailed within the Analysis/Rationale section of this report, the application fails to maintain the intent and planned vision for development within the area, as prescribed in the above policies.

**Copetown Rural Settlement Area Secondary Plan**

6.3.9 (a) *The lands designated ‘Hamlet Residential’ on Map 1 shall be for residential use in the form of single detached dwellings.*
6.3.13 (a) There is no intention on the part of the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth to extend municipal services to Copetown. Services shall consist of individual septic sewage systems and wells.

(e) There is no intention on the part of the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth to extend the boundaries of the urban transit service area to include Copetown.

The form, type and intensity of development proposed does not comply with the specific policies identified in the Secondary Plan for the “Copetown Rural Settlement Area”, as detailed above.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

Agencies/Departments Having No Comment or Objections

- Traffic Engineering and Operations Section, Public Works Department.
- Community Services Department, Recreation Division.
- Hamilton Municipal Parking System.
- Open Space Development and Park Planning Section, Capital Planning and Implementation Division.
- Bell Canada.
- Niagara Escarpment Commission.

Water and Wastewater Division, Public Works Department has reviewed this proposal and states the following:

With respect to the establishment and provision of servicing to support the development, the City of Hamilton Rural Official Plan, passed and enacted by Council on September 27, 2006, Section C5.2, Communal Water and Wastewater Systems, applies. In particular, Section C5.2.1 of the City’s Rural Official Plan applies. Also refer to Section 5.2.3 of the City’s Rural Official Plan.

In view of the above Official Plan policies, and in consideration that any application for Provincial Certificates of Approval for such communal systems under Sections 52 and 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act would require Application of Municipal Responsibility (Procedure D-5-2), the Water and Wastewater Division of Public Works could not support this proposal for development of new communal services in its current form.

Grand River Conservation Authority has reviewed this proposal and states the following:

Information currently available at this office indicates that portions of a wetland feature are located on the subject site. Small wetlands have also been identified within the Copetown Ball Park Woodlot, an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), which is located adjacent to the site. As a result of the wetland features, portions of the subject
property are regulated under the GRCA’s Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation (Ontario Regulation 150/06).

The Grand River Conservation Authority’s Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation, prohibits development in or on the following areas:

a) Wetlands; or,

b) Other areas where development could interfere with the hydrologic function of a wetland, including areas within 120 metres of all provincially significant wetlands and wetlands greater than or equal to 2.0 hectares in size, and areas within 30 metres of wetlands less than 2.0 hectares in size, but not including those where development has been approved pursuant to an application made under the Planning Act or other public planning or regulatory process;

And prohibits alteration to:

c) Straighten, change, divert or interfere in any way with the existing channel of a river, creek, stream or watercourse, or change or interfere in any way with a wetland prior to receiving written consent of the Grand River Conservation Authority.

Therefore, development on the subject property will require a permit from the Conservation Authority.

In the absence of an Environmental Impact Study (EIS), the GRCA requests deferral of Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications. The GRCA recommends the future submission clearly demonstrate the portion of the property proposed for Residential Multiple (RM3) and the portion of the property that will be maintained as Open Space (OS). Setbacks are required from the wetland and ESA features, which should be identified in the EIS and demonstrated on the proposed site plan.

The GRCA did review the studies submitted and requests the following be addressed in future submissions:

• Groundwater flow direction/discharge/recharge areas need to be addressed in the hydrogeological investigation.

• The high water table elevations need to be identified.

• The GRCA would like confirmation that the basement elevations are located above the highwater table and pond elevations.

• The GRCA recommends the City obtain confirmation that the proposed stormwater outlet constitutes legal outlet.
Public Health Services, Health Protection Division, has reviewed the proposal and states:

- Sewage Disposal system servicing the 42 Multiple Residential Units must be approved by the Ministry of Environment (MOE), as it will generate greater than 10,000 L/D.

- The City of Hamilton must make a decision to either accept or decline the responsibility of the communal sewage system in the event that the operator of the system fails to meet the operational requirements.

- The residential development will have greater than 6 residential units; therefore; the proposed communal water supply must comply with the Safe Water Act (SWA) and regulations thereunder.

- The City of Hamilton must make a decision to either accept or decline the responsibility of the communal water supply in the event that the operator of the supply fails to meet the operational requirements.

Forestry Section, Operations and Maintenance Division, Public Works Department, has reviewed this proposal and has the following comments:

An assessment of the submission, which would permit the construction of 42 Bungalow Townhouses for Seniors to be known as Copetown Lions Parkview Estates, shows that there are no Urban Forestry conflicts.

There are no trees located on the Road Allowance of this proposed development and the Forestry and Horticulture Section does not oppose these requests.

Numerous Private trees are located along the Southern edge of the site and may have to be managed as this application moves forward. This will be addressed at the Site Plan Stage.

Ministry of the Environment has reviewed this proposal and has the following comments:

After reviewing the above document, it was evident that this was a preliminary hydrogeological investigation, and further work needs to be completed in order to determine if this site is capable of meeting the water supply needs for this development. As indicated by the consultant, test well(s) will need to be drilled and a pumping test(s) will need to be completed. In addition to this, depending on the estimated water supply needs for the development, an assessment of the amount of sewage generated will need to be undertaken. If the sewage generated from the proposed development is estimated to be greater than the 3,000 LPD maximum flow indicated in the report, a more detailed subsurface investigation will need to be undertaken at this site, and the use of a tertiary treatment system would also likely need to be incorporated into the
system. Finally, if the sewage flows that need to be treated are estimated to be greater than 10,000 LPD, a Certificate of Approval from the Ministry will be required.

Public Consultation

In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, a preliminary notice of these applications was sent to 44 property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands, and one Public Notice sign was posted on site.

Two responses were received from the preliminary notice of circulation letter and an additional 69 responses were received from residents outside of the 120m circulation area (Appendix “C”). 63 letters (1 from within the 120m circulation area) were in support of the proposal, stating that the opportunity to retire in the rural area was a positive step for the current residents within the area who did not wish to move to an urban area upon retirement. 8 letters (1 from within the 120m circulation area) were received raising concerns with the proposal. The concerns raised ranged from issues with the servicing capacity and potential for contamination in the area, increased traffic, environmental impacts, lack of services and unsuitable precedent. These concerns have been addressed within the Analysis/Rationale section of the report. Notice of the Public Meeting will be given in accordance with the regulations of the Planning Act.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

Community Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
The public are involved in the definition and development of local solutions.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Human health and safety are protected through the decision to prohibit communal servicing.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Infrastructure and compact, mixed use development minimize land consumption and servicing costs through encouraging development to the urban areas.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?
☐ Yes ☑ No
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Location Map

Subject Property

1031 Highway No. 52 North
Change in Zoning from the Agricultural "A" Zone to the Residential Multiple "RM3" Zone and Amendment to Official Plan designation "Hamlet Residential".

Lands to Remain Under Existing Designation.

Ward 14 Key Map

File Name/Number: ZAC-07-078 / OPA-07-019
Date: November 30, 2007
Appendix "A"
Scale: N.T.S.
Planner/Technician: EJ/MB
Mr. Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section

Dear Mr. John,

I write you this letter to relay my concern for the proposed development of the Copetown Lions Club lot on Hwy 52 in Copetown. The Lions Club has sent us all a letter asking for support for a proposed sub-division for seniors to be built on some land that they own in Copetown.

I cannot lend my support to this project & am in fact extremely distressed at the possibility of such development being considered for our tiny community.

First let me address my concerns as to how this project would affect the current residents of Copetown. We are currently operating on a well & septic tank. Would this new development's above ground sewage system, not cause possible pollution to our ground water? Also, is it not possible that this extra drain on our natural resources could cause our wells to dry up? The intersection at Hwy 52 & Governor's Road (Hwy 99) is already very busy & quite congested. There have been many accidents at this intersection due to the volume of traffic. I fear that increasing the traffic will only make this intersection more dangerous.

Finally, I am gravely concerned that should the Lion's Club receive permission for this project, that it would open the way for other developers to change the zoning in our area. Should this happen our quality of life would dramatically decrease.

In addition to my concerns for the current community, I must also address the fact that this is not a practical location for a retirement community. As previously mentioned the site is very near the intersection at Hwy 52 & Governor's Road. This is a very dangerous intersection & therefore is not at all suitable for seniors. Very few able bodied pedestrians choose to walk there since there actually was such a fatal accident. I can only imagine the fatalities & serious injuries that would result from wandering seniors deciding to walk to the "corner store". There are no hospitals anywhere near Copetown. Seniors frequently require emergency services & it is not to their benefit to reside in an area where such services are not readily available.

I am outraged that a club that is supposed to enhance the community would propose a project that can only destroy its ecological, social & practical balance.

Most Sincerely,

Christina Zancola
John, Edward

From: Christopher McLeod
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2007 11:51 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown

Attention Mr. E. John,

It has been brought to my attention that the Copetown Community Centre is applying for a zoning change to allow for the construction of new homes. I would like to express my, and my families objection to such a zoning change. If approved we would be damaging an area that is of a Natural Importance as it works hand in hand with the Dundas Conservation area.

Water is an issue in this area, as would be light pollution. I would ask that I and my family be informed of any meetings regarding this zoning application. Again we oppose this requested zoning change and look forward to being in dialogue with you and your office in regards to this issue.

best wishes over the holiday's,

Christopher McLeod

950 Slote Rd R.R. # 3,
Dundas, Ont.

1/2/2008
John, Edward

From: Christopher McLeod
Sent: Sunday, December 23, 2007 12:24 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: copetown

Mr. John,

I sent an email earlier in the week regarding the Copetown Lions Development Assoc. request for a zoning change for 1031 Hwy 52 file number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076. I have grave concerns and objections to such a zoning change from Agricultural to a multi-res as the impact to this environmentally sensitive area would be disastrous.

Does this address not fall within the protected areas of the Niagara escarpment commission? Is this address not protected as part of Ontario's Greenbelt?

Copetown does not have the water or sewage to handle any multi-res developments. We at our home at 950 Slole Rd have ran out of water the last two summers because of a dry well. We work hard and respect our source of water, as well as reducing our waste as much as possible.

There are many seniors residence in Dundas already that have city water and sewage. A new one is just being completed as this letter is being written on Hait St. near the Dundas library. Are these units all full?

Changing the zoning for the Lion's open's the door to all developers making a request. Please don't destroy my neighbourhood.

Christopher McLeod & Hall Tsui

1/2/2008
John, Edward

From: Christopher McLeod
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 10:48 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: copetown

Mr. Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St., N., Suite 400, Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3


RE: Copetown OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. E. John,

Please accept this formal letter in regards to my families concern over the zoning change request file number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076. The request is for a 42 unit multi-dwelling which, with all it's good intentions, can not be supported in the Copetown Community.

We do not have the public works in place to support these homes. Water and a safe and proper sewage system are not feasible. We work hard to conserve and respect our source of water, yet we continue to have issues with available supply for our home.

Access to highway SZ would also be a safety concern for all drivers and pedestrians. The history of that stretch of road can speak for itself.

Also, as the dwellings are labelled as retirement homes, they would have no access to public transportation, no hospitals or medical clinics in this area, or any of the facilities that are deemed important to the retirement community.

I would like the opportunity to be a part of the discussion and ask that I be on the mailing list for any immediate or upcoming meetings on this issue.

Sincerely,

Christopher McLeod
950 Stote Rd., R.R. #3
Dundas, Ont. L8H 5F3

1/8/2008
From: murray schoeman [ 
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2008 10:56 AM 
To: John, Edward 
Subject: copetown lions development association 

File #OPA-07-019ZAC-07-076

We have lived in Lynden for the past 50 years. 
We have always live in the country and love it. 
We also would love to retire in a country setting. 
This would be a great place to call home.

Yours Murray and Dina Schoeman 

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter for private users. 
It has removed 285 spam emails to date. 
Paying users do not have this message in their emails. 
Try SPAMfighter for free now!

1/16/2008
January 2, 2008

Mr. Edward John, City Planner,
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St. N. Suite 400, Hamilton ON
Fax 905 546 4202

Re file # OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Sir:

As the Executive Director of Flamborough Information and Community Services, I would like to express my support for the application of Copetown Lions Club to change the present zoning from Agriculture “A” to Residential Multi-Dwellings “RM3”.

In providing community information to the residents of Flamborough for 30 years, we are very aware of the needs of this community. Services for seniors is one of the biggest gaps in Flamborough. The construction of 42 residential town house units specifically for seniors would greatly improve senior services in our rural area. There are many seniors who have lived in this rural community all their lives and I know for a fact that moving to an urban setting greatly reduces their quality of life.

One of the goals of the City of Hamilton’s Strategic Plan and Vision 20/20 is to put People First and to Improve Quality of Life. This initiative is consistent with the goals and strategies outlined by the plan, so I encourage you to support the work of this worthwhile service group. A large part of the services, parks and recreation of Flamborough has been initiated in the past by such service clubs and should be support by the City of Hamilton.

Sincerely,

Shelley Scott
Executive Director,
Flamborough Information and Community Services
January 02, 2008

Mr, Edward John, City Planner,
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St. N. Suite 400, Hamilton ON
Fax 905 546 4202

Re file # OFA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Sir:

This letter is to support the application of Copetown Lions Club for a change in the zoning from Agriculture “A” to Residential Multi Dwellings,”RM3”. The property at 1031 Hwy 52 North is nicely situated next to the Copetown Park and has good highway access.

The project by the Copetown Lions Club would be beneficial to the community in general and seniors specifically.

'Baby boomers' like myself who have lived in the country most of their lives, would prefer to reside in seniors accommodation in this rural area. I believe these townhouse units would fill a need now and in the distant future, therefore I support this project fully.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Elkin
428 Lynden Rd
RR1 Troy ON LOR 2B0
John, Edward

From: Devereux garage [ ]
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 4:57 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: copetown project OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Mr. Edward John, City Planner

I am sending this to you on behalf of the Lions Club who are proposing a senior's development in our community. We have lived in this area for 31 years and in Copetown for 24 years. When we retire we would love to stay here, near our friends & neighbours. Moving to another area, especially a city would be very difficult. Please support our Lions & the citizens of Copetown & area.

Carmen & Dennis Devereux
143 Hwy 52., RR#1
Lyden, ON
L0R 1TO

1/2/2008
December 28, 2007

Mr. Edward John
City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division
West Section

Fax 905-546-4202

Re: File # OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Subject: Zoning Change in Village of Copetown

I am writing in support of the Copetown Lions Development Association in their application for zoning change from Agriculture ‘A’ to Residential Multi-Dwellings ‘RM3’.

I hope that you realize what a great task they are undertaking!

Retiring and living in our own surroundings! How great is that! We are ‘rural’ taxpayers and want to stay ‘rural’ taxpayers! And currently there are limited facilities for this type of living, especially in this area.

I am in strong support of this project and hope that you realize the needs of this type of housing.

I ask for your support on this zoning change.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Lois James
13 Plastow Street
Rockton, Ontario
L0R 1X0
Mr. Edward John, City Planner,
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James Street N., Suite 400 Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

File number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

On behalf of The Copstow Lions Club application regarding change
of zoning from Agriculture "A" to Residential Multi-Dwellings "RM3"
"We go on record in support of this application."

Yours truly,
Helen & Roy Billiard

[Signature]
December 27, 2007

Mr. Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton Planning Division, West Section
77 James Street North Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Re: File Number: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Sir:

We would like to make you aware of our support of the Copetown Lions Club seniors residential project. As long time residents of the Flamborough area, should we require senior housing it would be our preference to live in Copetown rather than having to move from our area.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]
William P. Campbell

[Signature]
Carol E. Campbell
Mr. Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St. N., Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K8

Re: File #
OPA-07-019/RAE-07-076.

Dear Sirs,

We are writing in support of the Colborne Lions Development Association application at 1031 Hwy 52 North to change the present designation Agriculture "A" to Residential Multi-Dwelling "Rm3".

As seniors, we would like to have opportunity to live in the nearby Colborne rather than moving into the city proper.

I trust you will give this application your careful attention.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

[Signature]
Dear Mr. John,

This letter is to advise you that we strongly support the zoning change application by the Copperwood Forest Club, File # ORA-07-019/2 AC-07-076.

We agree that seniors need to be able to purchase affordable townhouse units in a nearby locale rather than being forced to move to Dundas, Ancaster or into the city proper. Having lived in the same community all our lives, we feel it is vitally important to remain close to family, church and community centers. The proposed type of housing would be ideal for those of "boomers" just entering our senior years.

Our desire is that you will give the Club's application to change the present designation, Agricultural A to Residential Multi-dwelling "RMS" very serious thought and consideration.

Thank you for taking the time to read of our concerns; we truly appreciate your interest.

Sincerely,

Doug & Ruth Lee.
Mr Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, Administration
77 James St. N, Suite 400
Hamilton, Ontario L8K 2K3.

Dear Sir:

File No: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

We, the undersigned, would like to express our views regarding the Capetown House application for a Zoning Change at 1031 New 52 North.

We think this is a wonderful idea to have affordable housing (townhouse units) to be constructed in the Capetown area.

When seniors can no longer look after their own property, which is in the rural area, is usually quite large, they have to move to pledges, assisted, or Bradford away from family, friends and the community, which they have been apart of for 50, 60, 60 years.

We seniors have to downsize and have been postponing this because we do not want to leave our close knit community.

Please approve this zoning and construction which is strongly supported and needed in the Community.

Yours in Community spirit
Donald & Marilyn Bean
Mr. Edward John, City Planner,
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section,
77 James St. N., Suite 400,
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3,


Dear Mr. John;

I would like to state my support for the Copetown Lions Seniors Townhouse Project proposed for the Village of Copetown.

My wife and I have recently purchased a Condominium Apartment in the Town of Dundas. We would have much preferred a Unit in the proposed Lions Club Project which would have allowed us to stay in the Rural area.

We know first hand that there is a need for a Development such as they are planning and urge you to assist them in getting the necessary Zoning changes and Permits to allow them to proceed.

Rollo C. Snyder

8 Main St. Unit 306,
Dundas, Ont.
L9H 2P6
Mr. Edward John, City Planner  
Planning Division West Section, City of Hamilton,  
Suite 400 - 77 James Street North  
Hamilton ON L8R 2K3

Dear Mr. John:

Re: Copetown Lions Development  
file # OPA-07-019/ZNAC-07-076

In the matter of the Application by the Copetown Lions for a seniors housing project, please accept this letter of support.

The Lions Club have already proven their ability to manage such a project and have proven themselves to be significant volunteer community supporters for the village. Their community centre, ball field and playground is a key community-building asset and in many ways is the centre of community life.

The seniors housing project planned for 1031 Highway 52 North is a wonderful idea and the only proposal of which we are aware for allowing the people of Copetown and surrounding areas to remain in the rural community setting which we/they have chosen for their lifestyle during those earlier years when we/they have been able to maintain their own farms and rural village homes.

Our young grandchildren, who live in the heart of Copetown, thoroughly enjoy the Lions playground. What a wonderful location it would be for us, when our advancing years will no longer allow us to maintain our farm property, to be able to live within a few hundred yards of the home and family support of our daughter. We could live independently yet near to our family for their help and support. Obviously, that would reduce our need to draw on The City's social services, thereby reducing future costs.

We urge the Planning Committee and City Council to move forward with the necessary zoning changes.

Sincerely

Merle Caldwell

Gary Caldwell  
Past Chair, the Rotary Club of Dundas,  
Hamilton VIP Award 2006

cc Bill Shewfelt, Chair,  
Copetown Lions Development Association  
P.O. Box 96,  
Copetown ON L8R 1J0
13 Beverly Glen Dr.
R.R.1, Lynden, ON
L0R 1T0

Mr. Edward John
City Planner
City of Hamilton
Planning Division, West Section
77 James St. N., Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

Dear Mr. John

Application For Zoning Change
1031 Hwy. 52 North
File No. OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

I am writing you today to voice my strong support of the Copetown Lions Club and their application for the above-noted Zoning Change.

My Wife, Karen and I have lived at the above address in the hamlet of Orkney for over 7 years. We moved here from Oakville/Burlington when we married in 1999. We are both Senior Citizens and absolutely love our life in this area which is perfect for our needs. We are virtually 15/20 minutes away from Ancaster, Dundas and Hamilton which provide nearby shopping facilities, many fine restaurants, entertainment, sports attractions and our passion golf which we play at Knollwood Golf Club just outside of Ancaster.

Our present property which encompasses one-half acre has become too labour intensive for us. I will be 73 years of age this month and can no longer carry out the snow shovelling, lawn cutting, garden maintenance etc. required to maintain our residence and property. We must therefore downsize in the very near future and we want to do this without leaving this area which we love for its beauty, tranquility and quality of life. We have looked at townhouses and condominiums in Ancaster and Dundas but they are generally much too expensive and the areas “too busy”.

...2
2.

When we attended the Copetown Lions Club Open House held at the Copetown Community Centre on Wednesday, January 31, 2007 at which the proposal for a 42-unit residential development geared to seniors on the above property, we listened to a number of speakers, including experts on communal well and septic tank systems, examined the proposed development plan for Parkview Estates and architectural plans for the housing units. Our immediate reaction was, and still is, this is exactly what we want. The location is perfect, the types of housing and floor plans are exactly what we want and most importantly, the pricing will be affordable for us. Mr. John this is exactly what we want!

I am a retiree of The Toronto-Dominion Bank having worked for that institution for over 40 years. My Wife, still works on a part-time basis for TD/Canada Trust in Waterdown. We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss our views and needs at your Office at any time.

We believe this proposal will have the overwhelming support of other Seniors in this area with needs similar to ours. We do not want to move to the larger and more expensive centres which I have mentioned. This is where we want to be.

We ask that you support this proposal and we thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

L. Gordon & Karen Ferguson,
e-mail: tel:

p.s. our current City of Hamilton Taxation Roll # is

c.c. Mr. Bill Shewfelt
Copetown Lions Development Association
Jan 2008

Mr. Edward John, City Planner

Fax:

We have a farm and would like to preserve a lot for retirement. City of Hamilton has a freeze on annexing anything. Fair is Fair if they can do it, so should farmers. If that changes, please advise us of the change.

Signed:

Lynda
December 28, 2007
Via Fax 905-546-4202

Mr. Edward John
City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St. N., Suite 400
Hamilton, On L8R 2K3

Dear Sir:

Re: OPS 07-019/ZAC-07-076

With this letter, I would like to extend my support for the senior housing project in Copetown, ON.

I feel there is a need for this kind of project which would enable the local residents to stay in the community in which they have lived for several years.

Thank you,

Karen Robillard
47 Hwy 52
R.R. #1
Lynden, ON L0R 1T0
December 28, 2007

Via Fax 905-546-4202

Mr. Edward John
City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St. N., Suite 400
Hamilton, On L8R 2K3

Dear Sir:

Re: OPS 07-019/ZAC-07-076

With this letter, I would like to extend my support for the senior housing project in Copetown, ON.

I feel there is a need for this kind of project which would enable the local residents to stay in the community in which they have lived for several years.

Thank you,

Wayne Peters
47 Hwy 52
R.R. #1
Lynden, ON L0R 1T0
December 31, 2007

Mr. Edward John, City Planner  
City of Hamilton  
Planning Division, West Section  
77 James Street N., Ste 400  
Hamilton, ON  
L8R 2K3

RE: File No. OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Hello Mr. John,

This letter is in support of the zoning change that has been requested by The Copetown Lions Club to change the present designation from Agriculture A to Residential Multi-Dwellings RM3 on their property located at 1031 Highway 52 North.

Our family currently resides in the Orkney Estates survey, and we wish to let you know that we would prefer not to move to other areas such as Dundas, Ancaster or the city proper when and if we require senior housing.

We fully support this townhouse development, which would allow our seniors to remain here in the Copetown community.

Thank you.

Karen Bevington  
Miko & Karen Bevington  
12 Kyle Court  
Orkney, ON  
L0R 1Y0
John, Edward

From: Lynne Crickmore
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:46 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown Lions Project OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

This letter is to show our family's support for the Copetown Lions project to bring retirement living to Copetown, file OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076.

My children are the 10th generation of family to live in Copetown, a residency spanning over 200 years. In fact, it was our direct ancestors, the Copes, who initially settled and named Copetown. It is a tragedy that senior members of our family have had to leave such long roots, to find senior housing in Brantford and other locations.

Copetown needs a place for its seniors. Copetown and the surrounding area are located in some of the most expensive real estate in Hamilton. Seniors needing to downsize, because of monetary or space needs, have no place to go except to the city. At a crucial time in their lives, the unavailability of local housing separates fragile seniors from their families, and lonely widows and widowers from the community support systems that will benefit their retirement lives. Seniors live best when they can live in supported living situations, ideally in a neighbourhood that will support them.

There is no community more supportive than Copetown's, and the Copetown Lions are at the hub of that support system. They are a dedicated, enduring group, whose only goal is in their motto, "We Serve".

In conclusion, it is our family's wish that you allow the zoning change so that Copetown Lions Club can continue to do their good work.

Sincerely,
Lynne and Maurice Crickmore
Heather Inksetter
Stephen, Jodi, and Amy Crickmore

Discover a magical Christmas destination. Visit asksanta.ca today!
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John, Edward

From: Gord Sanderson
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2007 11:58 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: File #OPA-c7-019/ZAC-07-076

Good Day Mr. Edward

We received a letter from the Copetown Lions on Dec. 19th regarding the proposal for a development of a townhouse complex at Hwy 52. As a long time resident of Lynden I would certainly support the construction of a ‘Seniors Residence Complex’ so people that have farmed and/or lived in the area for most or all of their lives would have the option to stay in the area if they wish to at retirement. For some it would mean being able to continue being near their family and friends, and for some the opportunity to continue living in a more rural setting. Our urban centres are growing rapidly and it makes sense to me to build a complex of this nature when the cost of the land is still reasonable.

There was talk a number of years ago to renovate and adapt the old Lynden Public School into a seniors residence and Community Centre. That never happened! Perhaps this new proposal would be the answer we've been waiting for. I am one person who would be in favour of changing the zoning to allow a project of this kind to be a success. I understand there was a similar zoning change made that allowed Crossroads Equipment to locate at their new facility.

When I look at the development that is happening in Ancaster, Orkney, and along Jerseyville Rd I think we would be making a wise move to allow this plan to go ahead before we are in a crisis situation. We are all getting older and there certainly is not options like this proposal available at this time. Please give careful consideration to this zoning change that would allow a positive development to move ahead.

Sincerely Gord Sanderson

Your chance to win great prizes with TELUS and Windows Live Messenger for Mobile. Click here for more information!
John, Edward

From: Nancy Ruth  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 8:03 PM  
To: John, Edward; nanajam@hotmail.com  
Subject: Copetown Lions zoning change request: File no. OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076 - Concerns  
Importance: High

Mr. Edward John, City Planner  
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section

Dear Mr. John,

The Copetown Lions Development Association has requested a zoning change from Agricultural 'A' to Residential Multi-Dwellings 'RM3' for property they wish to develop as 42 residential senior townhouse units. In my opinion, this proposal raises the following areas of concern:

1. The development is inconsistent with the existing town plan for this area, which at present allows for single family dwellings on lots fronting Hwy 52. A change in zoning may result in subsequent multi-dwelling development which is contrary to the character of the community.

2. The population density of the proposed development may negatively impact the environment with respect to water consumption and waste disposal. City water supply and sewers do not extend to Copetown. Many individual homes and farms are challenged for sufficient potable well water in this area.

3. There are no facilities to support or enhance a senior citizens complex in Copetown. No public transit serves the area. Residents of this community must have a car and be able to drive to access all necessary commercial and support services.

4. Traffic on Highway 52 is presently high volume between Highway 403 and Highway 8. There is considerable truck and commuter traffic as well as farm equipment and school buses. Canada Post cites safety as the rationale to discontinue rural route delivery. Many safety concerns have been identified on this section of Highway 52. 'Drive Safe on 52' raised much awareness beyond local inhabitants of Copetown. Impatient drivers who pass on the shoulder are commonplace in spite of signage and lining of the road. The additional volume of traffic accessing the proposed development may increase hazards. Current traffic levels make turning into and out of existing driveways difficult; turns crossing lanes of opposing traffic are extremely dangerous. This is well noted by residents turning either left or right to access their own homes and farms. It is often difficult to enter traffic heading north or south within 1-2 miles either side of the intersection at Governor's Road. Adding vehicles for 42 units close to this corner will increase hazards.

I do not feel that such a development is in the best interests of either Copetown or senior citizens.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this issue.

Respectfully,

Nancy Ruth  
913 Hwy 52 S  
RR#2 Lynden ON LOR 1T0
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John, Edward

From: Frank Davis [j]
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2007 2:05 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: file number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Mr. John,
I am writing regarding the application of the Copetown Lions Development Association to rezone the property at 1031 Highway 52 North from Agriculture "A" to Residential Multi-Dwelling "RM3".

As a longtime resident (55 + years) of the Copetown area, I am excited by the possibility of being able to retire in a senior community, located in a rural setting.

I have spent most of my life in a rural area and would be disappointed in having to move into a Town or City when I give up my rural residence.

I respectfully request that you grant the rezoning designation to allow this much needed and worthwhile project to go ahead.

Yours truly,

Frank Davis
R.R. #1, Jerseyville ON
L0R 1R0
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John, Edward

From:  Linda Dearsley
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2007 6:55 PM
To:  John, Edward
Subject: file # 0PA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

This is in regards to the Copetown Lions development. I am one of many baby boomers. I have lived in the country all my life, and having seniors townhouse units in Copetown would be a wonderful idea.

Respectfully, Linda
John, Edward

From: Thursday, December 20, 2007 9:52 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: REGARDS TO ZONING CHANGE IN COPETOWN(File # OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076)

Dear Mr. Edward John:

I am writing in regards to the request for a zoning change in the village of Copetown with the file number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076.

We would very much wish for a townhouse with units for seniors to be built there. We have lived in the Copetown area for 45 years as farmers. As we are seniors we would like to stay in this area rather than go to Dundas, Ancaster or Brantford because now our children live here on the home farm. This way we would still be close by without all the upkeep and still stay in the area.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Kroesbergen
3180 Governor's Road
R.R. #2 Lynden, Ontario
LOR 1T0
EMAIL
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John, Edward

From: Harry Droogendyk
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2007 2:58 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Re: Copetown Lions application - OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Sorry, I guess you need my address etc. to legitimize this.

Harry Droogendyk
3928 Governors Rd
PO Box 145
Lynden, ON

On Dec 21, 2007 2:56 PM, Harry Droogendyk <m> wrote:

Mr. Edward John:

Please record the fact that I support the Copetown Lions efforts to have the property at 1031 Hwy 52 rezoned from A to RM3.

Regards,
Harry Droogendyk

Regards,
Harry Droogendyk
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Hi Edward:

George Kellner
P.O. Box 62
Copetown ON L0R 1J0

Mr. Kellner called on December 21, 2007 to let you know he is in support of the Copetown Lions Club’s plans to construct 42 Townhouse Units on 1031 Highway 52 North, Copetown.

Cathy

Cathy Brittan  905.546.2424, Ext. 1355
Planning and Development Department
Development Planning – East Section
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 400, Hamilton ON L8P 4YS
Fax: 905.540.6142  E-mail: cbrittan@hamilton.ca
From: Ross Datar
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2007 7:24 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copeland rezoning

Mr. John
I am in favor of a change in zoning at 1031 Highway 52 North to Residential Multi-dwellings RM3.

I am a senior living on Powerline Rd near Lynden and will have to move from the farm sometime in the future. A senior townhouse unit would be very attractive place for me to move and I hope the units can be developed.

Ross Datar
3365 Powerline Rd
John; Edward

From: Heather Henry
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2007 11:22 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown Lions Development Association  File # OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. John,

My husband and I would like to support the Copetown Lions' Club request for re-zoning of their property to Residential Multi Dwellings for Seniors. We would prefer not to move from this area when the time comes for us to move to a seniors facility. We love at 230 Orkney Rd. RR#1, Lynden, LOR 170. Phone: Thank you for your assistance and support of this project.

Heather and Peter Henry

Read what Santa's been up to! For all the latest, visit asksantaclaus.spaces.live.com! http://asksantaclaus.spaces.live.com/
John, Edward

From: Edward Laman
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2007 11:40 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown Lions Seniors Townhouses

I am a Copetown resident (2309 Governors), and I support the above project. File OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Thanks,
Edward Laman
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John, Edward

From: Classic Mobile Installations
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2007 3:41 PM
To: John, Edward
Cc: Morrison, Alison
Subject: Lions Club Subdivision Proposal in Copetown
Importance: High

Hello, I am writing today to express my concern regarding the proposed Lions club development on Hwy # 52 in Copetown. With the proposal of constructing this many homes, I feel it would be a detriment to this area.

I attended the Lions Club presentation of this proposal to local residents last year. Some locals did attend, but it was mostly potential buyers from other areas. Most of the residents I have spoken to, have the attitude that this won't get passed and it will just go away. Unfortunately, this is quite often what happens. Then all of a sudden, a development is built and everyone complains.

You must consider that these people I describe, are here and enjoy the life they have. If not, I am sure they would be in convenient subdivisions with amenities at the ready. Others are here as the agricultural zoning allows them to conduct their business.

These zoning laws were enacted by the local governments to preserve the current status, and are what has protected this area from being paved over.

If zoning is approved for the Lions Club, what stops it from being approved for the next developer who buys a farmers field? I say, stop it in it's tracks before it's to late. Once it's gone, we will never get it back.

Over the past summer, I read countless articles in the local new regarding water issues. I spent the summer conserving water while my lawn dried up. Construction projects of this magnitude can divert underground water flows and local wells could dry up. I have spent $24,000.00 on my well and treatment system and am greatly concerned that my well could be compromised by a construction project of this size.

When I attended the presentation meeting at the lions club, I stood up and asked about contamination and possibility of wells drying up. They did agree that it was a possibility. When I asked if they could guarantee that it would not occur, they were unable to give a definitive answer. They said "there are many reasons for a well to dry up". They implied to me that if it was to occur, that I could get a lawyer. Why should I get a lawyer????

You would think that they would remedy a situation they caused.

Sewage from the proposed developments "above ground sewage system" could pollute the ground water if there was a spill. At the presentation, they described a sewage treatment system that would be contained in the back of a tractor trailer, parked close to Hwy # 52. I wonder what would protect this unit from being compromised. If there were a tornado this unit
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could be blown over and a spill would occur. There are a different scenarios that could compromise such a treatment system. Considering the Walkerton disaster and, all the other issues in the past regarding water contamination, this really is a contentious issue. There should be a proven, failsafe method to treat sewage. If the possibility of water contamination exists, there is a possibility of it to materialize. In this case, the proposal should absolutely not be approved.

If you consider the size of what is proposed to what exists here now, this development is enormous. This amount of homes being proposed will have a profound affect on the amount of water being consumed. No one can determine what effect it will have on the water table. In fact the developers can not even guarantee that there will be enough water for the proposed development, let alone existing residents.

Considering the proposed above ground sewage treatment system, which has no track record in this area. Considering the density of homes on such a small parcel. Considering the effect on the water table. Considering light pollution. Considering the effect on traffic, the natural habitat and destruction of the ecosystem, this proposal takes away far more than what it can give.

A proposal of this magnitude has a lot of hurdles to jump. I guess that's why most residents fell that it will "just go away"

I asked about the disruption to the traffic on busy Hwy #52 and the answer was, "we will cross that bridge later".

These are not satisfactory answers for me. I asked for guarantees and they could not provide them. They averted questions regarding the well being of the current residents and focused on the possibilities of the subdivision development

On my way back to Copetown, late in the evening. I get a sense of relief when I leave Dundas and all of a sudden the streetlights are behind me. The darkness overshadows the remainder of the drive to Copetown. I value this and fear that the light pollution from the proposed subdivision and possible further development concerns, will make our piece of heaven, just a memory.

Sincerely, Edmond Rose

1909 Old Governors Road
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From: Jackie Brinkman
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2007 7:56 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: COPETOWN LIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSN.

File #: OPA-07-019/ZAC- 07-076

I am writing to support the application by the Copetown Lions for a zoning change in Copetown to allow them to build townhouse units for seniors. I live in the area and may need such housing in the future. It would be nice to be able to stay in the area that we have lived in for the past 36 years.

Jackie Brinkman

1/2/2008
John, Edward

From: Peter Black [x]
Sent: Sunday, December 23, 2007 12:06 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: OPA 07 019 / ZAC 07 076

Dear Sir,
I live at 1230 Second Concession, about 1.5k from the designated lands of this application. I have lived in Cootes Town about 20 years. I support the building of senior residences and thus this application. I feel that the future for producing taxpayers of today should provide for, if desired, over seen living once infirmity or loss of independence raises its ugly head. To compensate, we should have the option of living in our old neighborhood. I hope you support this application.

1/2/2008
John, Edward

From: Droegendyk
Sent: Monday, December 24, 2007 8:36 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: File No OFA-07-019/ZAC-07-076, Copetown Lions

Mr. Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James Street N, Suite 400,
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

We would like to indicate our support of the Copetown Lions Club application for a zoning change at 1031 Highway 52 North from Agriculture A to Residential Multi-Dwellings "RM3".

As Orkney residents for more than 14 years, we are very encouraged to see a proposal for a seniors' townhouse development in the Copetown area. As the years go by, the snow seems to get heavier and the grass seems to grow faster on our half-acre lot making us realize that the day is coming when we will not want the upkeep involved in maintaining our property. At the same time, we really would prefer not to relocate to Dundas or Brantford so the project proposed by the Copetown Lions is very appealing to us.

Please support this request for a zoning change - we need affordable, attractive housing that offers seniors an alternative to city apartments.

Herb and Michelle Droegendyk
14 Beverly Glen Drive
Lynden, ON L0R 1T0
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John, Edward

From: rbeaul | 
Sent: Tuesday, December 25, 2007 2:00 PM 
To: John, Edward 
Subject: File OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Mr. Edward John, City Planner,
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St N, Suite 400 Hamilton Ontario
L8R 2K3

I wish to express the great need for senior housing in Copetown where we lived for 28 years, and brought up our family in a country setting.
When it comes to senior housing time for my wife Shirley and I it most certainly will be back at Copetown.

The Lions are a great asset to the Copetown community and, I am sure they will build great units that we will be proud to move into.
I do not wish to move back into city like atmosphere but prefer the country setting of Copetown, NOT Dundas, Ancaster or Hamilton

Thanking you in advance to take this matter seriously

Bob and Shirley Beaul
5070 Pinedale Ave
Burlington Ont
L7L 5V6
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John, Edward

From: siegrid
Sent: Tuesday, December 25, 2007 1:26 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. John,

This letter supports the Copetown Lions Club application for a zoning change in the Village of Copetown, specifically 1031 Highway 52 North. The application is for a zoning change from Agriculture "A" to Residential Multi-Dwelling "RM3".

The need for a Seniors townhouse unit in this area is very important to the rural community. Rural seniors would benefit tremendously if they were allowed to stay in a rural setting that is familiar for them. We would prefer not to move to other areas such as Dundas, Ancaster or the city proper when we require senior housing.

Please vote in favour of the zoning change.

Thank you.

John and Siegrid Edworthy
2621 Powerline Road West
R.R.2 Lynden, On
L0R1T0
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John, Edward

From: 
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2007 3:53 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown Senior Units

To: Mr. Edward John, City Planner
Re: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. John,

I am writing in support of the zoning change from Agricultural "A" to Residential Multi-Dwellings "RMS" to accommodate the 42 residential senior townhouse units, planned for Copetown.

I am one of the 150 people in the Copetown, Lynden, Rooton, Orkney and Westover area who have already signed up with the Lion's Club for possible purchase of one of the new senior townhouses. This complex will be located close to the already existing Copetown Community Centre.

There is a great need in this area for such accommodation. Most of us are retired farmers/wives who have spent most of our lives in these areas. We have worked hard and long on our farms and do not wish to move to a city environment as we are used to rural living and would like to remain in the area.

Copetown Lions have worked hard to get this plan off the ground. They already have in place the hall which would become a hub for the senior's in the proposed complex. They have done their research, planned with experts and know how important this complex would be for the seniors in this area.

I hope you will allow this change in zoning. This complex is needed in our area.

Frances Marie Allardyc
1563 2nd. Conc. W
R.R. #1 Lynden, Ont. L0R 1T0
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John, Edward

From: Joni Moffatt
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 3:00 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: File No. OPA-07-019-ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. John:

This is to inform you that we both support the project that the Copetown Lions Club is applying for with respect to the seniors townhouse units. We will be retiring soon and we don’t want to move to other areas, especially in town. These townhouses would be a perfect solution for us, and I ask that you approve the application to change the designation from "A" to "RM3".

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Paul and Joni Moffatt
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John, Edward

From: marie [n]
Sent: Tuesday, December 25, 2001/ 8:51 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. John,

Please accept the application by Copetown Lions Club to change the present designation, Agriculture "A" to Residential Multi-Dwellings "RM3." This will enable them to build 42 residential senior townhouse units.

Thank you.

Marie Baehrle
218 Sunnyridge Road,
Jerseyville, On. L0R 1R0
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John, Edward

From: virginia toth
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2007 2:09 PM
To: John, Edward
Cc: v_toth@hotmail.com
Subject: re: file no. OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076
Importance: High

Attention: Mr. Edward John,

I am using my email to send on behalf of my 82 year old grandmother, Mrs. Elizabeth Nowell, who currently resides in her own home. (502 Sager Rd., RR1, Troy On, L0R 2B0)

She is very interested in a residential senior townhouse unit, if the Copetown Lion's Club members can have a zoning change on highway 52 north at 1031 on their property.

This would be nearby country living which she prefers over moving to an apartment in Dundas/Ancaster, or another city.

Regards,
Virginia

Your chance to win great prizes with TELUS and Windows Live Messenger for Mobile. Click here for more information.
From: nealparker
Sent: Sunday, December 30, 2007 3:52 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: re. file number OPA-07-018ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. John,

My wife and I are residents of Copetown. We live at 1045 hyw. 52n. We are nearing the time at which we would like to move into some type of seniors housing. The type of project the Copetown Lions are proposing is exactly what we are looking for. We really like the community we live in, and this would give us the opportunity to stay in this area. Please take into consideration want and need.

Thankyou

Neal & Nancy Parker
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John, Edward

From: Wendy and Gerald VanDasselaar
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2007 8:39 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Senior townhouses in Copetown

Dear Mr. John Edwards,

I would just like to let you know that I would like to see townhouse units available in Copetown for seniors. In the area of Copetown, Lynden, Rocton, Orkney and Westover there are not senior housing. We see all our seniors move into larger cities, but their hearts are really in the small town listed above. If there were senior housing available in Copetown, seniors would be closer to people who they are familiar with, and the chance for visiting would be much greater. Therefore I would like to let you know I support OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076.

Sincerely,
Wendy VanDasselaar
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John, Edward

From: Jack Butter
Sent: Sunday, December 30, 2007 6:04 PM
To: John, Edward
Cc: lferguson@hamilton.ca
Subject: File #OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Mr. Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section,
77 James St.N. Suite 400, Hamilton, Ont. L8R 2K3.

My wife and I have lived all our lives in this rural area and are well into our 70’s. Looking into the future, we would hate to have to leave this area when we down size. We highly recommend the request be granted to the Copetown Lions Development Association to change the zoning so this project can proceed and allow us to have this retirement residence in our own area.

The Copetown Lions have a highly proven track record and do a remarkable job in this community and is run by outstanding people with their commitment to the community.

Regards,
Jack & Wilma Butter,
Alberton, Ontario.
LOR 1A0
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From: Bob Pearson  
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2007 5:40 AM  
To: John, Edward  
Subject: Copetown Lions Your file# OPA-07-019/ZA07-076  

Mr. John:

I understand you are in charge of the file dealing with the Copetown Lions application for a zoning change to accommodate a Seniors Residential Complex in Copetown.

I would like to register my full support of the project.

We need these type of facilities in the rural areas.

Sincerely,

Robert Pearson  
1677 Highway 5 W.,  
Troy ON  
L0R2B0  
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John, Edward

From: Robert G. Tiede
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2007 12:03 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Application for Zoning Change: File Number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Mr. Edwards,

I am a resident of Orkney (29 Beverly Glen Drive). It has come to my attention that the Copetown Lions Club, which owns 1031 Highway 52 North, has applied for a zoning change from its present designation of Agricultural "A" to Residential Multi-Dwellings "RM3". This would permit construction of 42 residential senior townhouse units.

The purpose of this e-mail is to communicate my support for the application. My wife and I have resided in Orkney for over 17 years and, when the time comes, would love to be able to retire to a seniors unit in nearby Copetown rather than needing to move to other areas such as Dundas, Ancaster or the city proper.

Thank you.

Best Regards,
Bob Tiede, FCIA, FSA, MAAA

This e-mail and any attachments thereto may be privileged and/or confidential and are intended solely for the named recipient(s). Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this email and any attachments from any computer or other electronic device and notify the sender immediately.
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From: Sue Carson
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2001 2:06 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown Lions Development.

Dear Mr. John,

I would like to give my support to the application to change the agriculture A designation asked for by the Copetown Lions Development to Residential Multi-Dwellings.

I live in the area close to Copetown and enjoy the country setting. My husband and I use the shops in the area and when the time comes would be happy knowing that there is a seniors townhouse close by that might suit our needs.

I hope you will consider this application and help to keep seniors in the area where they are familiar.

Thank you. Sue and Dave Carson.

1184 Mineral Springs Road, RR3, Dundas, L9H 5E3.
John, Edward

From: 
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2000 2:10 PM  
To: John, Edward 
Subject: File # OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076 - Actual email sent

Dear Mr. John:

I am sending you this email to express my support for the zoning change of 1031 Highway 52 North. As you are aware, this property is owned by the Copetown Lions Club and is adjacent to the beautiful facilities at the Copetown and District Community Centre.

My family and I moved to this area from downtown Hamilton around 1990 and for the last 17 years have raised our family in this area. Our children and I were present at the ground-breaking ceremony for the community centre and have grown to love this area and its residents. After spending time in this community, I can assure you that there is a drastic need for the type of senior's housing that the Lions are proposing. Many of the residents here have developed a sense of community and belonging that have a focal point in the community centre and the ball diamonds. Given a choice like the one proposed by the Lions, I am certain many residents would choose to remain here. I know I would.

Please consider carefully the positive impact that such a facility would have on our community and elect to change the zoning so that the plans will continue. I fully support the vision of the Lions for the betterment of our community and hope to see the completion of this project.

Yours respectfully,
Norma Bingham
61 Beverly Glen Dr.
R.R. #1
Lynden (Orkney), Ontario LOR 1T0
John, Edward

From: Kathy and Christopher Roung
Sent: Tuesday, January 01, 2008 2:46 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown - zoning change

Mr. John,
I am writing to you as a resident of Rockton (municipality of Hamilton) regarding an application for a zoning change in the town of Copetown (file number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076). I am in support of changing the current designation to allow residential multi-dwellings for senior townhouse units. In addition to myself, all of my family members would also prefer to stay in the Flamborough area in future, should we require senior housing and construction of these units in Copetown would allow us to do so. We would not want to have to leave the area we call home, and few in this community would. There is a need for this type of housing in Copetown and the Copetown Lions Club are trying to meet the needs of the community. Please support the zoning change to allow residential multi-dwellings for senior townhouse units. Thank you for your time and consideration. Kathy Roung
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John, Edward

From: Marie Ripley
Sent: Tuesday, January 01, 2008 3:12 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Mr. Edward John, city planner

I am writing in support of the Copetown Lions Club application for zoning change in order to permit the construction of 42 residential senior townhouse units. In the last year or so, we have known six couples who have found that looking after a large rural property was no longer feasible and either moved to much smaller homes or into senior residences in Brantford, St. George, Paris and New Hamburg. Obviously, small town or village options were preferable to those in densely populated urban areas. When age forces people to move, it is not only the homes of many, many years that are lost but friends and neighbours, churches, and social and volunteer groups...essentially entire lives. Hopefully, my husband and I will be able to remain in our home for a good few years, but it certainly would be a comfort to know that we could move just a few miles down the road.

Yours truly, Marie Ripley

__________________________________________________________

All new Yahoo! Mail -

Get a sneak peak at messages with a handy reading pane.

1/2/2008
John, Edward

From: James
Sent: Tuesday, January 01, 2008 3:20 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown Lions Project

Re: File # OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Sir:

I would like to express my support for the Copetown Lions Project.

I am a former resident of Lynden who needed to downsize. (69 years old living by myself). In looking for a suitable place I visited many communities including attending the Copetown Lion's openhouse earlier this (2007) year. As you are no doubt aware Lynden has nothing suitable. Older people there, who need to downsize go to apartments in Brantford; usually after waiting to long to leave their community. In the end I chose to move to a Twenty Place condo bungalo, which I find very acceptable. However if there had been something similar in the Lynden/Copetown area (my daughter and her family live in the Copetown area) it would probably have rated high on my list of choices.

Thank you for asking for comments.

Jim MacKenzie

1/2/2008
John, Edward

From: John Groen
Sent: Tuesday, January 01, 2008 6:44 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Dear Edward John, City Planner:

Re: OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

Please be advised that we support the creation of townhouse units to purchase for seniors that live in Copetown and the surrounding area & in doing so support the application to change the zoning on lands owned by the Copetown Lions.

Yours sincerely:

Andy & Irene Groen 3447 Governor's Rd

John Groen & family 150 Orkney Rd

1/2/2008
John, Edward

From: Marilyn Sharpe
Sent: Tuesday, January 01, 2008 8:59 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Adult living in Copetown

I am writing in regards to the possible adult living in Copetown.
I would prefer not to move to another area for adult living such as Ancaster or Dundas. To be able to stay in this area would be so grand.

Thank you,
Marilyn Sharpe

HO HO HO, if you've been nice this year, email Santa! Visit asksanta.ca to learn more!

1/2/2008
Larry Paul and Gail Stewart  
62 Inksetter Road (Copetown) 
RR 1 Lynden Ontario 
L0R 1T0  

Mr. Edward John, City Planner  
City of Hamilton Planning Division, West section  
77 James Street North, suite 400 
Hamilton, Ontario  
L8R 2K3  

Re:  Proposed subdivision on Highway 52 in Copetown  

Dear Mr. John:  

We are writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed development of a parcel of land located on Highway 52 just south of Governor's Road in Copetown. The intention of the developers is to build a 42-unit residential complex that would house a large number of occupants.  

As long-term residents of Copetown, we are concerned that a construction project of this scope would have a negative impact on the health and well-being of those in the immediate neighbourhood and in the broader community.  

We feel that quality of life would be impacted by the following influences.  

First, the water table would be affected due to the density of the proposed development. Water is often in short supply during the late summer months, and this problem would be exacerbated by so many users drawing on the same supply.  

Second, the quality of Copetown's well water would be jeopardized. A development of this scope would generate a great deal of sewage waste, which would need to be disposed of by means of a septic system large enough to sustain the continuous volume. Any resident of Copetown who has applied to add even one additional bathroom to a private home understands the stringent regulations that prevail with regard to sewage disposal in a rural community.  

Third, the flow of traffic on Highway 52 would be complicated by a busy development located so close to Copetown Corners. It would be very difficult for residents and visitors to turn in and out of the subdivision safely and efficiently.
Perhaps the most significant consideration of all is the potential impact of a change in zoning on Copetown's future as a farming community. At present, the land in question is zoned "A" (Agricultural). It is our understanding that this zoning has been established and maintained in order to ensure that any development proposed for the Copetown area remains consistent with the needs and values of the existing rural community. In the rare cases where zoning changes have been permitted on Highway 52, the scope has always been limited to certain types of business operations and to single-family dwellings, each requiring at least a half acre of land. A change in zoning to "RM3" (Residential Multiple) would introduce a precedent that is not in keeping with Copetown's agricultural disposition.

You may recall the dissention among Flamborough constituents when amalgamation brought us into the City of Hamilton. Much of our initial reluctance was based on concerns that urban sprawl would swallow up our neighbourhoods and our way of life. The main activity in Copetown is farming. It is a way of life that sustains the community and makes a significant contribution to society at large. It also preserves the beauty and integrity of the rolling countryside for Copetown residents and for any Hamiltonian who should wish to enjoy a leisurely drive to the outskirts of the city.

We are already witnessing the encroachment on much of Hamilton's valuable agricultural land by various forms of high-density development. We think it would be unfortunate if a change in zoning were to pave the way for future development projects that could threaten Copetown's distinctive rural environment.

Thank you very much for your thoughtful consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

Larry Paul and Gail Stewart
John, Edward

From: ken ofield
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2007 3:44 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Copetown Residential Senior Townhouse Project

File Number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076
Dear Mr. John,

I am writing in support of the 42 proposed residential senior townhouse units in Copetown. I am a lifelong resident of Copetown and have also been a strong supporter of the Copetown Lions Club and their involvement in the community. I would hate to imagine what Copetown would look like today, if it were not for the foresight, planning and construction of the Copetown Community Centre, the Copetown baseball diamonds, the children’s play centre and the outdoor pavilion. These facilities are not only used by the residents of Copetown, but also widely used by numerous groups from the outlying areas. The Lions and the facilities that they have provided, at no expense to the City of Hamilton, are the key elements that have enabled Copetown to maintain its sense of community and have provided our youth with a place to play baseball and engage in other outdoor activities.

Now the Copetown Lions Club has another vision which will greatly add to the quality of life in our community; a senior’s residence. This residence will allow our seniors an opportunity to continue to live in the area and to maintain their friends and support systems. Without this project going forward, many of our residents will be forced to leave the area and relocate elsewhere. I have travelled to various other communities, such as Burford and Port Dover, and seen similar projects which meet the needs of their community. These are wonderful success stories and have greatly improved their community lifestyle.

The Copetown Lions Club has an exemplary record of achievement and their efforts are evident in many areas of our city, such as the Morgan Firestone Arena. Each and every project that they have undertaken has been completed to the highest standard, come in under budget and have benefited the community. I would hope and expect that the City of Hamilton would have the foresight, wisdom and commitment to work hand in hand with the Lions Club to make this project happen. The need is great and the will is strong, so instead of putting up roadblocks to prevent the project from moving forward, I encourage the City of Hamilton get on board and be a part of something that will benefit our community for many years to come.

Ken Ofield
Copetown

Books, DVD’s, gadgets, music and more. Shop online with Sympatico / MSN Shopping today!

12/20/2007
John, Edward

From: Doug Paddon
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2007 12:10 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: File number OPA-07-09/ZAC-07-076

Mr. Edward John City Planner

Sir
My name is Doug Paddon and I have been a resident of Copetown for the last 37 or more years. It is now time for me to downsize and move to some thing smaller and I have been waiting for this Copetown Lions development for the last couple of years.

For the life of me I can't see how the city of Hamilton can turn down a project like this when there will be no cost to the city and could be a real benefit to the city with the taxes that it will raise. I have heard of the city's concerns of the water and sewage but it sounds like the Lions have addressed this so that there will be no repercussions to the city.

If you take a look at other Copetown Lions Projects, the ball park, the community center, all these have been looked after by this club without a cost to the city. As a small business person all my working life it sounds to me that this is win win situation for all concerned.

Respectfully
Doug Paddon

12/20/2007
Mr. Edward John  
City Planner  
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section  
77 James St. N., Suite 400  
Hamilton, Ontario  
L8R 2S3  
Fax 905.546.4202  
e-mail: epjohn@hamilton.ca  
RE: File No. OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076  
Wednesday, December 19, 2007  

Dear Mr. John,

My wife and I are senior citizens living in Copetown for more than twelve years. At this time we feel the need to search for a senior residence, but the thought of leaving our community, Copetown, is difficult because we have enjoyed living here all this time.

We ask your help as the City Planner to facilitate the request of Copetown Lion Club to build our dream senior residence.

Thank you for your understanding. We wish you a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year,

Sami & Hasmeek Jahshan

H. Jahshan
December 10, 2007

City of Hamilton, Planning and Economic Development Dept.
Planning Division – Development Planning – West Section
77 James St. North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON

Attention: Edward John, Planner

Dear Sir

SPECIAL DELIVERY MAIL

Re: File No. OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

We are in receipt of a letter from the City of Hamilton (signed Jason Thompson) dated November 23, 2007.

The letter was advised us of applications received by Hamilton’s Planning and Economic Dev. Dept. for Copetown Lions Dev. Assoc. to amend the Ancaster Official Plan and Zoning By-law, for lands at 1031 Hwy#52 North.

We are the property owners directly beside (north-west direction) the lands owned by the Copetown Lions. Our home, including approx. one and one-half acre of land joins the above property along our entire side and back lot lines. We would, therefore, perhaps more than any other area resident, be affected by any development which may occur “next door”. We have been the owners of this home and property for approx. 25 years.

We have been advised by the letter from the City to contact you in writing regarding any comments we have in regard to the request to amend the Ancaster Official Plan and the Zoning By-law.

Although we are not necessarily against the proposal being set forth by the Copetown Lions, as we have also indicated to them, we do have several concerns and comments regarding the proposal/request. As we are in such close proximity to the lands under review, I am sure that all parties concerned can appreciate that we do have a substantial interest in this matter.

Our concerns/comments, stated briefly, are as follows:

1. Possible contamination of our existing residential well. This concern would apply not only the early stages of development, but also should potential problems develop over the long term. The proposed water treatment area (which we understand is not even contained holding areas for waste water) for the planned development site would be a mere 75 (approx.) feet from our residential
well. We consider this an unacceptable distance. We would recommend a
treatment area to the far back south-easterly side of the lands where it is far
from all and any private wells. We would need some type of guarantee that our
well would be unaffected.

2. Possible loss of present water volume in our private well. Our well has always
had plenty of volume. We would need some type of guarantee that our well
would be unaffected.

3. We would insist that absolutely no two-storey units be allowed. This would not
be in keeping with the rural nature of the area, and would definitely affect the
existing privacy and personal enjoyment of our county property.

4. The number of proposed units is 42. This is far too many units for this size
property. Sustaining this large number of units would only make the water and
waste water issues in points #1 and #2 above all the more serious. (too many
residents....more water volume needed + more waste water).

5. The proposed “42 multiple residential units” should be changed (and strictly
adhered to) “retirement units”, with a maximum occupancy of 2 persons.

The above are our concerns and comments at this time.....as this project may evolve, we
may have other comments or issues which we would like to discuss.

We would like to add that the Copetown Lions have been very open to our concerns, and
have always been willing to discuss them with us.

Please would you advise us by e-mail that you are in fact in receipt of this letter.

Thanks!

Pete and Lois Feijer
1039 Hwy #52
P.O. Box 102
Copetown, ON
L0R 1J0
Dec. 27/07

City of Hamilton
Planning Division

Attention: Mr. Edward John

Dear Sir,

Regarding Liptown Lenn's application for zoning change File No. OPA-07-019/ZAC 07-076

The senior housing in Liptown would be the perfect living arrangements. I have been a resident of Orkney, Liptown, now living in Jerceyville, all my life. I was born in Orkney, married in Liptown, my husband is also a resident since birth in Liptown. My husband is also a resident since birth in Liptown. My husband is also a resident since birth in Liptown.

This senior housing in Liptown is very much needed! For all the people being raised in the country and being able to continue living in a country setting would be ideal.

Jane Davis
2190 Jerceyville
2nd West.
Dec. 29/07

Dear Mr. John,

I am writing on behalf of my husband and myself about the Town House suite the Lepthron Parks are applying for a zoning change in the Village of Lepthron. We would prefer not to move to other areas such as Dendro or Rezder or the city property that would require service licensing.

The file # is OPA-07-019 ZRC-07-086.

Thank you...

Yours truly,
Kerry Jace Bird
1402 Col. Dr.
R.R. #1, Lyndon, ON.
LOR 1170
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I, Dama Young, am very interested in a residential multi-dwelling project going ahead as I am in my late forties. I see the need for such a project in this area, as I love living in the country. I am now on Orkney Rd and think this would be a perfect retirement area.

A concerned neighbour,

Dana Young
RECEIVED

JAN 07 2003

Rockton Ont
DEC 27/01

Mr. Ed John
Hamilton Ont.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to inform you that we strongly support the Rockton Lions Club project to build a 42 senior housing in Rockton.

We are seniors and have lived in the Rockton area all our lives and are very much interested in having housing for seniors nearby.

Yours Truly

V. Marlon Breton

Wm. Breton
Dear Mrs. Shadlow,

Just a short note to say that I heard about the move to New Bedford and I hope it goes well. I haven't heard from you in a while, but I hope things are going well in New Bedford.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Date: Dec 09

09-02-2013
ZAC-07-026
Sharon about the move to New Bedford. Would be great to hear any updates.

[Floral design]
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December 20, 2007

Mr. Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division
West Endton
77 James St. N. Suite 400
Hamilton ON L8R 2K8

Dear Sir,

As one of the many community-minded taxpayers of the Apsen area, I respectfully request your consideration of the well-researched residential project put forward by the Apsen Lions Club and their engineering consultants.

I, myself, hope this project can become a reality while I am still able to take advantage of it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 48
Apsen ON L0R 1S0
Sir,

I'm in favour of a 2M3 block as the Captain's Rooms propose.

Yours truly,

Dean Hunt
2115 NE Con W
Troy Out
LOR BO

Senior 59 yrs
Born 1918

RECEIVED

Jan 0, 2003
Mr. Edward John,

I am writing in regards of a piece of property namely 1031 blue 5-2-010.4 and 6-2-0.4, both located in Lincoln County. In regards to changing present designated Agreement to Residetial Built Buildings RM 3.

I live in Lincoln for 30 years and have for about 60 yrs at and stand where my father was born. I wish to go to the home I was born in having time to make this possible for my family and for my mother. I would very much like to remain in Lincoln where my family and friends live close by. Also, I know it is a very nice place. Hope to make this possible.

Job # CPA-07-019/240-07-022

Sincerely,

Mary S. Shaw

RECEIVED

JAN 02 `66
To: Mr. Edward John

Dear sir as so many of our residents here in Flamborough are senior and senior residents are few, I would sincerely appreciate the new senior building to be built in Capetown as we have lived in this community for over fifty years and it would be great if there is a place for us within the area to go to instead of moving to the city.

Please think long and hard to change the bylaw from Agriculture to Residents as this project of the Capetown Town can be completed.

File OPA-07-019/2AC-07-075

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]
John, Edward

From: Irma J. M. Harris
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2001 9:29 AM
To: ejohn@hamilton.ca.
Subject: Copetown Lions Development Association.

Mr. Edward John, City Planner,
I received a flyer in my mailbox yesterday (Sunday) from Bill Showfelt.
Yes, I support this project--file number OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076 to change 1031 Highway 52 North from Agriculture "A" to Residential Multi-Dwellings "RM3" for construction of 42 residential senior townhouse units.

Sincerely,
Irma J. M. Harris
1691 Old Hwy, 99, R.R. #3, Dundas, ON. L9H 5E3
Dec 27/01
207 Liberty Rd.
Rt. Lynden, WA
1-08-70

Dear Sirs,

Regarding the Senior Citizens project, changing the present designation agricultural R3 to R73, I am in favor because there is a need for this type of housing in this area.

Sincerely,

Virginia Young

FILE NO:
OPR-07-019/ZAC-07-076
Edward Jones - City Planner
Re: File # 07A-07-017/7AC-07-016

Dec 27, 2007

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to give my support to a zoning change in the village of Copetown which would allow the Copetown Lions Development Area a R13 designation allowing the possible building of residential senior townhouses.

I am a senior living in the Copetown area and would consider downsizing to a townhouse in my home area. I am asking for your support in this zoning change.

Yours Truly,

Gwen Emick
2142 Powerline Rd RR 2
John, Edward

From: James Balch
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 12:01 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: Lion's res. units

Mr. John
This email concerns file OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076. I find this proposal very unacceptable. It will leave the door open for developers to say "if Lions Club can do this why can't we?" I live in the country for the large lots and open spaces. I do not want to live in an urban environment. Also, many seniors when they reach their golden years like to live close to stores, doctors, safe places to walk etc. These things are not available in Copetown.
Please give this topic careful thought as I believe it could cause many problems. A reply would be appreciated. Thank you.

James Balch
275 Orkney Road
Lynden, Ont. L0R1J0

HO HO HO, if you've been naughty this year, email Santa! Visit askSanta.ca to learn more!
January 15, 2008

Edward John, City Planner
City of Hamilton, Planning Division, West Section
77 James St. N., Suite 400, Hamilton, ON
L8R 2K3

Dear Sir:

RE: File #OPA-07-019/ZAC-07-076

It has come to our attention that the Copetown Lions Club hope to embark on a very community minded worthwhile project. The building of a 42 Residents Seniors Housing project would be very beneficial for the citizens of the area who do not wish to be relocated in their latter years, however feel they can no longer keep their own single use properties up to standards. Many neighborhoods in the immediate area will eventually benefit from this housing project. The Rockton Agricultural Society, home of the Rockton World’s Fair endorse this project wholeheartedly.

Yours truly,

Robert J. Campbell
General Manager