

Nancy Davis

From: Nancy Davis
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 12:43 PM
To: Nancy Davis
Subject: FW: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

From: Adam Crozier

From: VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, WILLIAM [REDACTED] >
Sent: September 15, 2021 12:14 PM
To: Amanda Wyszynski <Amanda.Wyszynski@brant.ca>
Cc: Adam Crozier <adam.crozier@brant.ca>; john.wheat@sympatico.ca; John MacAlpine <john.macalpine@brant.ca>; Ryan Cummins <ryan.cummins@brant.ca>; Steve Howes <steve.howes@brant.ca>; Marc Laferriere <marc.laferriere@brant.ca>
Subject: FW: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Amanda,

I attended the September 7, 2021 meeting with specific interest in Rezoning Applications ZBA4-21-AW and ZBA4-21-RC. The email chain attached is related to ZBA4-21-AW. I watched the meeting on the County of Brant YouTube channel. When watching on the YouTube channel it does not appear that one is actually able to participate in the meeting. By way of copy to Adam; would you please send me instructions concerning how to participate in virtual meetings. Also, unless I missed it there are no instructions on the County of Brant website. I understand that this is meant to be temporary, but no end is in sight for the Covid virus, and we may be stuck with virtual meetings for longer than we would like.

The email distribution may seem large, but our property is on the border of Wards 1 and 2, and the two projects have potential impacts on our residence. We wish to keep everyone that is potentially involved in the loop. I have addressed the email to you Amanda, because you are the one I have been dealing with previously. We do request however that all those copied consider my comments. (Another reason for the increased circulation is that apparently my previous comments were sent out to Council members in a font size that was not readable.)

We were disappointed that a neighbour had to tell us about the meeting for 517 Paris Road. I participated in the previous physical meeting, but I guess that we are not within 120 m. Marc LaFerriere made a motion in the previous meeting that notice be given to people in a larger area in such rural situations, and there seemed to be agreement within Council however good intents did not result in actions.

Before I get started I would also like to comment on how zoning gets changed, and comments from the agent for the 517 Paris Road application. When we moved our current address the property was zoned rural. It was found out completely by accident that a few years later our zoning had been changed to Estate Residential in the zoning bylaw, without so much as a letter in the mail box. At the time I did speak with legal council and was advised that the County had probably published the change in the Expositor or something similar and that there wasn't much that could be done. We are still considered to be Estate Residential as far as I know. In the Official Plan, it is shown that the intent is for this land to be zoned Commercial eventually; again no notice. If the agent for the 517 Paris Road property is correct

we can expect to be rezoned yet again in the bylaw to non-conforming Commercial; again with no say in the matter. I was offended with the other Owners, when told we should have sold or set up a business. We are just going along for the ride while Council makes changes without discussing these with the people that are affected. Where else can you get acreage like we have, with flat, arable land, in close proximity to two urban areas with all their conveniences!

We were disappointed that your recommendation to council was to approve the rezoning for the 539 Paris Road application. The material presented had not changed substantially from the previous meeting except there was a site plan added. There were several questions that I asked prior to the first meeting that were never addressed, or if addressed the results not shared. If the zoning change had been approved, and a peer review requested of the traffic study not been requested (I believe the term was Bumped up), there would only remain details of the site plan to iron out and the project is basically approved. Although we are disappointed in the unilateral zoning changes and would prefer that there be no development across the road, if there is going to be development we want to make sure that every action is taken to make sure that we are not negatively impacted in our current location. The attached emails comprise the total of our communications, and there are very few answers. As a general comment, in my opinion the two referenced applications have many issues that should be decided together. Examples of this include water sources, sewage treatment, ground water issues and traffic. Fortunately, the rezoning application was not approved.

- 1) Concerning "Growing the Greenbelt". As stated, the proposed Paris Galt moraine study area stops at the north side of Paris Road in our region, except for an excursion around our property lines at the back. The proposed boundaries also showed a small sliver to the south of this area which seems odd, and I have indicated as such to the Ontario government. You state that the matter was referred to the Environmental Planner; there has been no response to date. The period for comments has been closed for this study so I contacted the Ontario government myself to determine the status; I have yet to hear back. It makes no sense to me for the province to consider extending the greenbelt in this area, while the County is considering paving the land and putting in gas stations. In my opinion, neither of the rezoning applications should be approved until it is determined that they are also consistent with the Growing of the Greenbelt.
- 2) I raised the M2 vs M3 question, and I am pleased to see that it is being considered. As I indicated, I am concerned that in the future, the existing owner or another owner could build something with a greater impact on the region if zoned M3 with little recourse. By way of copy to Councillor Wheat can you expand on your "be careful what you wish for comment". That an existing portion is already zone M3 is a weak argument in my mind as the owner can do all the things he wants with an M2 designation as far as I can tell. A variance for set-back is already required; give them what they want if appropriate within an M2 zone. Jumping to 517 Paris Road for a second; if the diesel filling station is removed from the site plan, and the site plan gets approved, what is there to stop them from leaving room and putting in diesel tanks etc. in later.
- 3) ii There was a lot of discussion about traffic. In my opinion there were very few real answers. All the homeowners have told Council members that Paris Road is a very busy road. Canada Post has said Paris Road is a very busy road. It can easily take me 5 minutes to get out of my driveway during many times of the day; particularly in the winter. Delivery-persons coming to our address have learned to back in the driveway or turn-around or they will never get out of our driveway. The studies (that I would love to see a copy of) conclude basically that no action is required even if the two projects were to be approved. A review by a traffic expert with some spot testing of data should be done by someone who has no legal arrangement with the proponents. It didn't seem to me like any of the Councillors reviewed a traffic report. We still have not ascertained the hours of operation for the refrigeration facility, or the gas station. How can you approve a zoning change when you don't know the answers to these questions? If I look at the plot plan for the industrial mall, there are 160 parking spots shown! It is also my expectation that the unused property south of the existing industrial units will likely be filled with additional units in the future, so maybe double that number. I haven't done any studies, but I can guarantee there will be traffic issues if these projects are approved without any further action being taken. We shouldn't forget the cyclist either as there are what appear to be riding clubs coming by the house fairly often.

- 4) I indicated that ground water/run-off is an issue in our area. Currently whenever there is a heavy rain, run-off runs down Paris Road and runs down our driveway where it collects between our property and the neighbours. I don't have a detailed topographical map, but it is clear that where the industrial units are to be built is a local high spot. The elevation, based on a top map that I found, is about 8 m (26.3 ft.) above that of our property. There are no culverts/gutters/storm sewers. We can imagine a scenario where some of this new run-off water ends up on our property. The Works department is familiar with these issues. We had a flood a couple of years back. I did some simple calculations assuming that lots 1 and 3 are covered with buildings or paved. (Note I didn't include 517 Paris Road.) Using a 60 minute 25 year return rainfall rate for our area (50 mm). Enough water to fill 105 16ftx32ft swimming pools, or enough to cover a Canadian football field with 4.2 feet of water would have to be gotten rid of if it can't sink into the soil as it mostly does now. (517 Paris Road is at an even lower elevation than our house.) Any studies, which I believe should be done, before, rather than after approval of zoning changes, should include both properties. Even with grading, this water will still have to be directed somewhere, unless permeable surfaces are used to avoid such run-off. Whatever material is considered, fugitive emissions must also be considered; we cannot have dust, debris blowing unto the adjacent properties.
- 5) We have seen no response from Operations and Development engineering concerning potential impact on the wells in the area. These issues need to be addressed prior to approving the rezoning. We can accept no change in quality or quantity of our well water. It was mentioned in the meeting that new developments were obliged to use municipal water, however, I recall a proposal for an ethanol plant that was proposed for around the corner, and they going to use well water. Apparently test wells had a negative impact on the wells of nearby residences. This was a case of test wells being approved by the province because there were no concerns voiced; no one knew the proposal had even been submitted, so no surprise. Until we know where potable water is going to come from for these projects, and in what quantities, it make no sense to proceed. Similarly, there are currently no sanitary sewers in this area; what is going to happen with all the gray water and waste from these sites. Recall that these projects are also near a geological feature that the province of Ontario wishes to protect and rightfully so.
- 6) It's a bit late by the time that bylaw enforcement can do anything about noise; these should be addressed to the extent possible prior to approval of the rezoning application and definitely before approval of the site plan. I proposed 85 dbA as a maximum sound pressure level at the property boundaries, but what value does the County consider acceptable.
- 7) This was a simple question; what is a SWM pond? During the meeting I think I heard someone say that this was a Storm Water Management pond. The question remains; Is this just a hole in the ground that fills up when it rains? Is it stagnant water that may smell and provide a breeding spot for mosquitos? Is it secure? Is the pond lined? The pond is not there currently, and there has been no discussion concerning the feature.

In my opinion, these two rezoning approvals should not be approved until there is a much better understanding of the projects and how they will impact local residents; and only then if there is no significant impact on residents who will become neighbours of these proposed projects. Perhaps the work (due diligence) has been done, but I suspect that it has not.

I hope that each of you will review my comments and make sure that we have the necessary answers, prior to even considering approval of these projects.

Regards,

Bill

From: VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, WILLIAM

Sent: April 8, 2021 9:06 AM

To: Joan Gatward <joan.gatward@brant.ca>
Subject: Re: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

Joan,

Yes of course! There are no concerns on my part with sharing.

Regards,

Bill

From: Joan Gatward <joan.gatward@brant.ca>

Sent: April 7, 2021 4:13 PM

To: VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, WILLIAM [REDACTED] >

Subject: Re: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

Thanks Bill for sending the email chain and answers. Do I have your permission to share the answers with other Councillors?

Regards,
Joan Gatward
Councillor Ward 5
County of Brant
Email joan.gatward@brant.ca
Phone 519 446 0060

> On Apr 7, 2021, at 10:29 AM, VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, WILLIAM [REDACTED] > wrote:
>

> CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

>
>
> Joan,
>

> I was disappointed to hear that you could not read the contents of my letters. Please find attached a copy of the email chain related to the referenced zoning application.

>
> Regards,
>
> Bill
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, WILLIAM [REDACTED] >

> Sent: April 6, 2021 11:17 AM

> To: Adam Crozier <adam.crozier@brant.ca>; Amanda Wyszynski <Amanda.Wyszynski@brant.ca>; W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen [REDACTED]

> Cc: Heather Boyd <heather.boyd@brant.ca>; john.wheat@sympatico.ca; John MacAlpine <john.macalpine@brant.ca>; Alyssa Seitz <alyssa.seitz@brant.ca>; [REDACTED]

> Subject: RE: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

>
> Adam,

>

> As this meeting is described as an informational meeting, with the majority of my concerns still requiring additional investigation by the County, I am satisfied with only watching today's proceedings, with the understanding that not presenting today will not affect whether I can make presentations at future meetings should I wish to do so, concerning the various applications that must be approved prior to work being started.

>

> Thank you for responding,

>

> Regards,

>

> Bill

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Adam Crozier <adam.crozier@brant.ca>

> Sent: April 6, 2021 10:55 AM

> To: Amanda Wyszynski <Amanda.Wyszynski@brant.ca>; W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen [REDACTED] >

> Cc: Heather Boyd <heather.boyd@brant.ca>; john.wheat@sympatico.ca; John MacAlpine <john.macalpine@brant.ca>; Alyssa Seitz <alyssa.seitz@brant.ca>; william.vannieuwenhuizen@brant.ca [REDACTED]

> Subject: RE: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

>

> Good morning Bill,

>

> If you wish to address Committee with your comments during the public meeting portion of the application, you can join the meeting via Zoom videoconference or via telephone dial-in. If you wish to simply view the proceedings they will be available at the link provided by Amanda. Please advise if you wish to speak to the application.

>

> Thank you.

>

> Adam Crozier

> Deputy Clerk

>

> Office of the Chief Administrative Officer Council Services Division County of Brant

> 31 Mechanic Street

> Suite 207

> Paris, Ontario; N3L 1K1

>

> T 519-449-2451 x (2214) | F 519-449-2454 |

[REDACTED]

>

>

>

> The County of Brant is here for you.

> Stay connected. Follow us on social media @BrantCommunity, subscribe to our news brant.ca/Subscribe and visit our COVID-19 website for the latest updates brant.ca/COVID-19

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Amanda Wyszynski <Amanda.Wyszynski@brant.ca>

> Sent: April 6, 2021 10:31 AM

> To: W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen [REDACTED] >
> Cc: Heather Boyd <heather.boyd@brant.ca>; john.wheat@sympatico.ca; John MacAlpine <john.macalpine@brant.ca>; Adam Crozier <adam.crozier@brant.ca>; Alyssa Seitz <alyssa.seitz@brant.ca>; [william.vannieuwenhuizen@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:william.vannieuwenhuizen@[REDACTED])
> Subject: RE: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW
>
> Hi Bill,
>
> Thank you for your email below.
>
> In regards to the process and timeline of the applications, the County is proceeding with the rezoning application first in order to establish the permitted uses and development standard requirements (i.e. street setbacks). The meeting tonight is an information meeting, and no recommendation from Staff will be provided. Staff will be moving forward with a recommendation meeting once all required studies have been submitted and reviewed, which includes a Traffic Impact Analysis.
>
> Once the zoning has been established, Staff will proceed with a detailed review process known as Site Plan Control. Through the Site Plan Control Process, grading, lighting, servicing, landscape and site design will be reviewed and established. Once the site plan control process has been finalized or there are only minor revisions, the applicant will then proceed with severance applications, which require notice signs and notices to be mailed.
>
> In terms of the M3 zoning on the subject lands, this zoning was what was proposed by the applicant and Staff are reviewing the merits of the request and will be preparing a recommendation report that speaks to it.
>
> You may watch the meeting on Youtube via the following link, or Clerks can provide you with the zoom meeting details should you wish.
>
> <https://eur01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.youtube.com%2Fwatch%3Fv%3DEypw8V-xUeA&data=04%7C01%7Cwilliam.vannieuwenhuizen%40siemens.com%7Cf80720f1c28941d09f4708d8fa019bda%7C38ae3bcd95794fd4addab42e1495d55a%7C1%7C1%7C637534232143722081%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoImMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVC6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=B8lrDovnGiFyUgNaKjL1FuUplnYcX5JA%2BpgxqgRCfHw%3D&reserved=0>
>
> Thanks,
> Amanda Wyszynski BATech, MES
> Planner
>
> Development Services
> County of Brant
> 66 Grand River Street North, Paris ON N3L 2M2 _____
> C 519.717.5882 | T 519.449.3300 X 3054
[REDACTED]
>
>
> The County of Brant is here for you.
> Stay connected. Follow us on social media @BrantCommunity, subscribe to our news brant.ca/Subscribe and visit our COVID-19 website for the latest updates brant.ca/COVID-19
>

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen [REDACTED]
> Sent: April 2, 2021 11:00 AM
> To: Amanda Wyszynski <Amanda.Wyszynski@brant.ca>
> Cc: Heather Boyd <heather.boyd@brant.ca>; john.wheat@sympatico.ca; John MacAlpine <john.macalpine@brant.ca>;
Adam Crozier <adam.crozier@brant.ca>; Alyssa Seitz <alyssa.seitz@brant.ca>; william.vannieuwenhuizen@brant.ca [REDACTED]
> Subject: RE: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW
>
> CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you
recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
>
>
> Thank you for your comments Amanda. I look forward to seeing the results of the several studies yet to be conducted.
>
> I would appreciate it if you could clarify the order in which things will proceed from here. Currently, before the
County, is an application for a zoning change as I understand it. Implicit seems to be a request for severance of the lot,
and at some point there will be a review of the site plans, presumably before any work can begin on the property. Over
and about these items there are the various studies that need to be completed. In what order do these events
occur? Will site plan review be required for all three proposed parcels? Perhaps if you could supply a detailed timeline,
this would be useful.
>
> I would also like to comment further on the proposed zoning designation. I'm not sure that consistent zoning is a
requirement, however, it may be a nice to have; the land still remains employment land. It seems to me that the entire
property could be zoned M2 and still allow the planned land uses. The first parcel currently designated M3 is described
as a warehouse facility which is a permitted use in an M2 zone. If the entire property was to be zoned M2, instead of
M3, it seems to me that the intended uses would be permitted, but it would also prevent the location of a chemical or
pharmaceutical plant, dry cleaning facility, food processing plant, impound yard, or propane transfer facility on one or
more of the three parcels, in the future without a zoning change. The three parcels could potentially have different
owners in the future, and if zoned M3 they could potentially change to land use to one that would have a greater impact
on neighbours and the environment.
>
> I look forward to participating in next weeks meeting. With the lock-down due to Covid I am assuming I can listen only
on-line; is this correct?
>
> Regards,
>
> Bill
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Amanda Wyszynski [<mailto:Amanda.Wyszynski@brant.ca>]
> Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2021 2:27 PM
> To: W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen
> Subject: RE: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW
>
>
> Hi Bill,
>
> I wanted to reach out regarding your questions, please see my comments below.
>

- >
- > 1) The property for which this application applies abuts the Paris Galt Moraine Study area associated with the Ontario Growing the Greenbelt study. As such, would it not be prudent to complete the Greenbelt study before approving the zoning change.
- >
- > The County of Brant Environmental Planner has been circulated on the application and will be providing comments.
- >
- > 2) Why is the application for a change from Agricultural (A) to Industrial (M3) when Industrial (M2) would appear to allow the proposed development. M3 zoning would allow some activities that I would not want conducted on the proposed property.
- >
- > The eastern portion of the subject lands are zoned as Industrial (M3) and this would allow for consistent zoning on the subject lands.
- >
- > 3) We enjoy the rural lifestyle afforded us by living in our location. We have several concerns that the proposed development will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of our property.
- >
- > i) We are concerned about light pollution associated with the proposed changes. Already there are a couple of bright lights that shine in our front window. The lights may have been there for sometime, how long is not known. The new owner has
- > cut down many trees. The change may be due to new light, or the tree removal. The bottom line is that we are now affected by the bright lights. We have concern that additional development will make the situation worse.
- >
- > The County of Brant Zoning By-Law does regulate lighting and through the detailed site plan control review, this would be evaluated.
- >
- > ii) We are concerned about changes in traffic. Paris Road (Hwy 2) is a busy road; so much so that Canada Post found the traffic too dangerous to allow mail delivery to our properties. We are concerned that traffic studies have not been done to evaluate the impact on traffic that the proposed changes will have. We also have concerns that trucks from the refrigeration facility will be coming and going all hours of the day. Granted we expect most of the traffic to be between the 403 and the Oak Park Road access, some traffic in the other direction is expected; the Oak Park Road and Paris Road intersection is already a dangerous intersection. The amount of traffic entering the 2 access points from Paris Road is completely unknown at the moment.
- >
- > Development Engineering is requiring a Transportation Impact Study and will be reviewing and providing comment. The recommendation will not move forward to Council without this report.
- >
- > iii) The application refers to overnight accommodation associated with the 4.4 acre parcel of land. What does this mean? What is the purpose? Accommodation for how many?
- >
- > The applicant is seeking to use the existing dwelling as a quilting studio with overnight accommodation with 5 bedrooms to accommodate 10-12 people
- >
- > 4) We have an existing situation that the County is aware of with run-off from Paris Road, and flooding of our properties. We want assurance that paving/covering large sections of the property associated with the new uses will not aggravate the situation.
- >
- > Through the detailed site plan control, grading will be reviewed.
- >
- > 5) We obtain our water from a well, and have had no issues with the quantity or quality of our drinking water. No mention is made concerning how much water the new facilities will require; where the water is expected to come from,

and how grey water, sewage, and storm water will be dealt with. Necessary actions must be taken to ensure that our water supply is not compromised in any way.

>
> Through the application circulation, Operations and Development Engineering were circulated who will be reviewing this.

>
> 6) If applicable, any outdoor storage areas associated with the new land uses should not be visible from the road.

>
> The Zoning By-Law does regulate the location of outdoor storage, and can only be located in the rear per Section 11.4.

>
> 7) Sound levels at the property boundaries shall not exceed 85 dbA.

>
> The County of Brant By-law enforcement does regulate noise based on my understanding.

>
> 8) The severance plan currently shows a SWM Pond. This pond does not currently exist. We would like an explanation concerning what the purpose, size and design of this pond.

>
> Development Engineering would be able to provide detailed information on this. The technician on file is Julie Tot, Julie.tot@brant.ca

>
>
> Thanks,
> Amanda Wyszynski BATech, MES
> Planner

>
> Development Services
> County of Brant
> 66 Grand River Street North, Paris ON N3L 2M2
> C 519.717.5882 | T 519.449.3300 X 3054

[REDACTED]

>
>
> The County of Brant is here for you.
> Stay connected. Follow us on social media @BrantCommunity, subscribe to our news brant.ca/Subscribe and visit our COVID-19 website for the latest updates brant.ca/COVID-19

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Heather Boyd
> Sent: March 22, 2021 8:14 PM
> To: 'VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, WILLIAM [REDACTED]'; Amanda Wyszynski
> <Amanda.Wyszynski@brant.ca>; Mat Vaughan <mat.vaughan@brant.ca>
> > Cc: john.wheat@sympatico.ca; John MacAlpine <john.macalpine@brant.ca>; W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen
> [REDACTED] Adam Crozier <adam.crozier@brant.ca>; Alyssa Seitz <alyssa.seitz@brant.ca>
> Subject: RE: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

>
> Good Evening,
>

> Thank you for your comments. By copy of this e-mail, I am forwarding your questions to the County planner for this application and will include these comments as part of the record to be presented for Committee and Council's consideration.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, WILLIAM [REDACTED]

> Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 12:57 PM

> To: Heather Boyd

> Cc: john.wheat@sympatico.ca; John MacAlpine; W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen

> Subject: FW: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

>

> CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen [REDACTED]

> Sent: March 22, 2021 10:22 AM

> To: william.vannieuwenhuizen@brant.ca [REDACTED]

> Subject: FW: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: W.F. van Nieuwenhuizen [REDACTED]

> Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2021 12:29 PM

> To: 'heather.boyd@brant.ca'

> Cc: 'john.wheat@sympatico.ca'; 'john.macalpine@brant.ca'

> Subject: Zoning Amendment Application ZBA4-21-AW

>

> We request that the County Clerk of the County of Brant document receipt and forward the following comments/concerns to the appropriate County personnel for consideration.

>

> We live at 534 Paris Road, which is on the other side of Paris Road from the property for which zoning changes are being requested.

> We have reviewed the application for rezoning file number ZBA4-21-AW and we have the following comments concerns.

>

> 1) The property for which this application applies abuts the Paris Galt

> Moraine Study area associated with

> the Ontario Growing the Greenbelt study. As such, would it not be prudent to complete the Greenbelt study before approving the zoning change.

>

> 2) Why is the application for a change from Agricultural (A) to Industrial

> (M3) when Industrial (M2) would appear to allow the

> proposed development. M3 zoning would allow some activities that I would not want conducted on the proposed property.

>

> 3) We enjoy the rural lifestyle afforded us by living in our location. We

> have several concerns that the proposed development

> will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of our property.

>

> i) We are concerned about light pollution associated with
> the proposed changes. Already there are a couple of bright lights
> that shine in our front window. The lights may have been there for sometime, how long is not known. The new owner has
> cut down many trees. The change may be due to new light, or the tree removal. The bottom line is that we are now affected
> by the bright lights. We have concern that additional development will make the situation worse.
>
> ii) We are concerned about changes in traffic. Paris Road
> (Hwy 2) is a busy road; so much so that Canada Post found the
> traffic too dangerous to allow mail delivery to our properties. We are concerned that traffic studies have not been done
> to evaluate the impact on traffic that the proposed changes will have. We also have concerns that trucks from the refrigeration
> facility will be coming and going all hours of the day.
> Granted we expect most of the traffic to be between the 403 and the
> Oak Park Road access, some traffic in the other direction is expected; the Oak Park Road and Paris Road intersection is
> already a dangerous intersection. The amount of traffic entering the 2 access points from Paris Road is completely unknown
> at the moment.
>
> iii) The application refers to overnight accommodation
> associated with the 4.4 acre parcel of land. What does this mean? What is the purpose?
> Accommodation for how many?
>
> 4) We have an existing situation that the County is aware of with run-off
> from Paris Road, and flooding of our properties. We want assurance
> that paving/covering large sections of the property associated with the new uses will not aggravate the situation.
>
> 5) We obtain our water from a well, and have had no issues with the
> quantity or quality of our drinking water. No mention is made concerning how much
> water the new facilities will require; where the water is expected to come from, and how grey water, sewage, and storm water will be dealt with.
> Necessary actions must be taken to ensure that our water supply is not compromised in any way.
>
> 6) If applicable, any outdoor storage areas associated with the new land
> uses should not be visible from the road.
>
> 7) Sound levels at the property boundaries shall not exceed 85 dbA.
>
> 8) The severance plan currently shows a SWM Pond. This pond does not
> currently exist. We would like an explanation concerning what the purpose,
> size and design of this pond.
>
> Please provide feedback on our comments/concerns, and ensure that we are advised of all meetings and decisions associated with this zoning amendment application.
>
> Bill Van Nieuwenhuizen
> March 21, 2021
> [REDACTED]

> Paris On N3L 3E1

>

>

>

>

>

>

> --

> This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

>



>