

Summary of Public Comments Received

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>Support was expressed regarding the addition of commercial uses and businesses to meet the community needs.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Opposition regarding the proposed commercial development was expressed due to the impact it will have on the existing ground water resource and the compounded impact it will have on existing residential communities. In addition, there was concern regarding the impact the proposed development will have on the existing natural landscape.</p>	<p>The Greenville Rural Settlement Area is currently experiencing issues related to the quantity and quality of ground water available for daily needs. The abutting quarry is also a factor in the reduction of groundwater resources. Through a review of the submitted studies, Development Engineering staff have determined that revisions are required to ensure that the proposed plan aligns with the requirements of the Mid-Spencer/Greenville Rural Settlement Area Subwatershed Study, Aquafor Beech Limited, April 2016. Staff have included development controls through Holding 'H' Provisions that can only be lifted when concerns related to servicing and stormwater management have been addressed.</p>

Comment Received	Staff Response
<p>Opposition was expressed regarding the size of the commercial plaza, increased traffic, and truck activity as well as excessive impervious surface coverage to accommodate the proposed development.</p>	<p>The lands are designated “Settlement Commercial” as per the Greenville Rural Settlement Area Plan and the subject lands are to be utilized for convenience commercial uses. The proposal is to develop the land for commercial uses provided that all concerns related to the private water, sewage and stormwater runoff can be addressed. The proposed site configuration is oriented to have commercial vehicles enter the subject property via Moxley Road, mitigating traffic impacts along Brock Road where many residential uses are located. Staff have reviewed the stormwater management solution and require amendments to the proposal.</p> <p>A stormwater management solution is required to be approved before construction can occur on site. Staff have recommended a Holding ‘H’ Provision to ensure that the owner submits and receives approval of a stormwater management design.</p>

Dear Pasha

I personally welcome the development in the Greensville Flamborough area. The parcel of land has been sitting dormant for years and locals are forced to drive 10-15 minutes to stores and business. The community needs more affordable homes, mixed commercial and commercial businesses. Currently highway 5 is a hodge podge of commercial and agricultural land and some homes on large acreage. Some of the land isn't even being used for crops. I would like to see zoning changed to allow for growth. In order to get cars off the highways we need to create self sustainable communities. Many of these commercial and industrial parks have parking lots filled with cars owned by workers who must commute. There needs to be more homes build as well and more commercial businesses.

Thanks for allowing me to share my thoughts

Tammy Francoeur

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to you as a concerned resident regarding the proposed rezoning of 471 Moxley Rd from agricultural land to commercial use in our community.

While I understand the pressures of growth and economic development, I am deeply concerned that the current review process is not adequately addressing the cumulative environmental and infrastructure impacts of this proposal, especially given the highly sensitive location: a UNESCO World Heritage Site, within a protected water zone, and an area that relies heavily on private wells drawing from a shared aquifer.

Cumulative Impact Must Be the Primary Lens

This proposal cannot be evaluated in isolation. It must be reviewed in the context of the broader development pressures already underway. At minimum, this includes two additional estate developments currently under review in the same area.

Individually, each project may appear manageable on paper, but collectively, they represent a significant and potentially irreversible burden on our water supply, land stability, and road infrastructure.

Aquifer Risk: Water Demand Without Water Security

This commercial development would place an enormous new demand on the same groundwater system that local families depend on for drinking water. Unlike municipal water systems, private wells have no redundancy. If the aquifer is depleted or contaminated, residents have no alternative supply.

A development of this scale, particularly with loading docks and commercial operations, raises serious concerns regarding:

increased groundwater extraction,

potential contamination risks,

long-term aquifer depletion,

and the absence of clear safeguards to protect existing well users.

A rezoning decision that enables intensive commercial activity must not proceed without a comprehensive hydrogeological study that evaluates not only this project, but the combined drawdown and contamination risks of all projects currently proposed.

Runoff & Paving: No Meaningful Stormwater Plan

The proposed scale of paving is staggering. 375 parking spaces represents an enormous impervious surface area. Without a robust stormwater management plan, this introduces major risks including:

polluted runoff entering the watershed,

erosion and sediment displacement,

impacts to wetlands and surrounding conservation lands,

and contamination of the groundwater recharge system.

If stormwater is not managed with proven, enforceable infrastructure, the result will be increased flooding, degraded water quality, and damage to downstream ecosystems—including those tied to our waterfall and tourism areas.

Traffic & Safety: Already Over Capacity

This area already has a serious traffic problem. A commercial operation with this number of parking spaces and loading docks will dramatically increase:

heavy truck traffic,

congestion,

road degradation,

and public safety concerns for residents, cyclists, and pedestrians.

This is not simply an inconvenience, it is a fundamental infrastructure issue. Increased truck traffic also raises noise and air pollution concerns that directly affect residents and the natural character of this protected area.

Contradiction With Tourism and Conservation Commitments

The City has invested heavily in a long-term waterfall tourism initiative, promoting this region as a natural destination. Yet development decisions appear to be moving forward without the conservation planning required to protect:

the waterfalls,

the surrounding land,

the watershed,

and the source of water that makes these attractions viable in the first place.

Tourism depends on conservation. If the aquifer is compromised, if the landscape becomes industrialized, or if runoff damages the watershed, the long-term tourism strategy will be undermined. This is a direct contradiction in planning priorities.

UNESCO & Protected Water Zone: Higher Standard Required

This is not a typical parcel of land. It is located in a globally significant and environmentally sensitive area. Rezoning agricultural land to enable large-scale commercial development in a protected water zone sets a precedent that may encourage further similar proposals, permanently changing the character and sustainability of this region.

Request to Council

I respectfully urge the committee to require the following before considering approval:

A full cumulative impact assessment incorporating all current and pending developments in the area

Independent hydrogeological review addressing aquifer drawdown and contamination risks

A detailed stormwater management and runoff mitigation plan with enforceable requirements

A traffic impact study that includes heavy truck volumes and long-term road capacity

Confirmation that the proposal aligns with the City's obligations and commitments related to:

UNESCO designation,

protected water zone requirements,

conservation planning,

and long-term tourism sustainability

Closing

This decision is not only about a single development, it is about whether we are prepared to compromise the very water system and natural landscape that residents rely on, and that the City itself is promoting as a tourism and heritage asset.

Once an aquifer is damaged or depleted, it is not easily restored. Once agricultural and conservation lands are paved over, the loss is permanent. Council has a responsibility to ensure that growth does not come at the cost of irreversible harm.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration. I strongly encourage the committee to delay or deny this rezoning until the full cumulative impacts are properly studied and publicly

Erica Smith.

I am writing to you as a concerned resident regarding the proposed rezoning of 471 Moxley Rd from agricultural land to commercial use in our community.

While I understand the pressures of growth and economic development, I am deeply concerned that the current review process is not adequately addressing the cumulative environmental and infrastructure impacts of this proposal, especially given the highly sensitive location: a UNESCO World Heritage Site, within a protected water zone, and an area that relies heavily on private wells drawing from a shared aquifer.

Cumulative Impact Must Be the Primary Lens

This proposal cannot be evaluated in isolation. It must be reviewed in the context of the broader development pressures already underway. At minimum, this includes two additional estate developments currently under review in the same area.

Individually, each project may appear manageable on paper, but collectively, they represent a significant and potentially irreversible burden on our water supply, land stability, and road infrastructure.

Aquifer Risk: Water Demand Without Water Security

This commercial development would place an enormous new demand on the same groundwater system that local families depend on for drinking water. Unlike municipal water systems, private wells have no redundancy. If the aquifer is depleted or contaminated, residents have no alternative supply.

A development of this scale, particularly with loading docks and commercial operations, raises serious concerns regarding:

increased groundwater extraction,

potential contamination risks,

long-term aquifer depletion,

and the absence of clear safeguards to protect existing well users.

A rezoning decision that enables intensive commercial activity must not proceed without a comprehensive hydrogeological study that evaluates not only this project, but the combined drawdown and contamination risks of all projects currently proposed.

Runoff & Paving: No Meaningful Stormwater Plan

The proposed scale of paving is staggering. 375 parking spaces represents an enormous impervious surface area. Without a robust stormwater management plan, this introduces major risks including:

polluted runoff entering the watershed,

erosion and sediment displacement,

impacts to wetlands and surrounding conservation lands,

and contamination of the groundwater recharge system.

If stormwater is not managed with proven, enforceable infrastructure, the result will be increased flooding, degraded water quality, and damage to downstream ecosystems—including those tied to our waterfall and tourism areas.

Traffic & Safety: Already Over Capacity

This area already has a serious traffic problem. A commercial operation with this number of parking spaces and loading docks will dramatically increase:

heavy truck traffic,

congestion,

road degradation,
and public safety concerns for residents, cyclists, and pedestrians.

This is not simply an inconvenience, it is a fundamental infrastructure issue. Increased truck traffic also raises noise and air pollution concerns that directly affect residents and the natural character of this protected area.

Contradiction With Tourism and Conservation Commitments

The City has invested heavily in a long-term waterfall tourism initiative, promoting this region as a natural destination. Yet development decisions appear to be moving forward without the conservation planning required to protect:

the waterfalls,

the surrounding land,

the watershed,

and the source of water that makes these attractions viable in the first place.

Tourism depends on conservation. If the aquifer is compromised, if the landscape becomes industrialized, or if runoff damages the watershed, the long-term tourism strategy will be undermined. This is a direct contradiction in planning priorities.

UNESCO & Protected Water Zone: Higher Standard Required

This is not a typical parcel of land. It is located in a globally significant and environmentally sensitive area. Rezoning agricultural land to enable large-scale commercial development in a protected water zone sets a precedent that may encourage further similar proposals, permanently changing the character and sustainability of this region.

Request to Council

I respectfully urge the committee to require the following before considering approval:

A full cumulative impact assessment incorporating all current and pending developments in the area

Independent hydrogeological review addressing aquifer drawdown and contamination risks

A detailed stormwater management and runoff mitigation plan with enforceable requirements

A traffic impact study that includes heavy truck volumes and long-term road capacity

Confirmation that the proposal aligns with the City's obligations and commitments related to:

UNESCO designation,

protected water zone requirements,

conservation planning,

and long-term tourism sustainability

Closing

This decision is not only about a single development, it is about whether we are prepared to compromise the very water system and natural landscape that residents rely on, and that the City itself is promoting as a tourism and heritage asset.

Once an aquifer is damaged or depleted, it is not easily restored. Once agricultural and conservation lands are paved over, the loss is permanent. Council has a responsibility to ensure that growth does not come at the cost of irreversible harm.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration. I strongly encourage the committee to delay or deny this rezoning until the full cumulative impacts are properly studied and publicly addressed.

Respectfully,

M Smith

A very concerned Greenville Resident

To Whom It May Concern,

I am submitting this letter as a formal statement of concern and objection regarding the following development applications within the Greenville community:

- 36 Taylor Crescent — File ZAC-25-037 and 25T-202508
- 190 Highway 8 at Crooks Hollow Road and Highway 8 — File B-25:094
- 471 Moxley Road — Files RHOPA-26-001, ZAC-25-001 and ZAC-26-004

My family has lived in Greenville for more than sixty years. The concerns outlined below are not new; they are consistent with issues raised in my letter of June 2006 and in correspondence submitted by my father in 1995 voicing water concerns. Over several decades, residents have repeatedly expressed concern regarding the environmental limits of development within this groundwater-dependent rural community.

Primary Concerns

1. **Groundwater Quantity and Quality**
The cumulative increase in water demand associated with proposed residential and commercial growth raises serious concern regarding groundwater recharge capacity and long-term water security. Existing residents rely primarily on private wells and have already experienced declining water availability.
2. **Stormwater Management and Flooding**
Increased hard surfaces and altered drainage patterns contribute to greater stormwater runoff, surface flooding, erosion, and the transport of contaminants into sensitive natural systems. Residents have observed measurable changes in flooding patterns over time.
3. **Risk of Groundwater Contamination**
Proposed or existing landfill and dump activities, including those associated with the north site gravel pit, present a potential long-term threat to groundwater quality and the safety of residential drinking water supplies.
4. **Environmental Accountability and Monitoring**
Hydrologic and environmental studies are frequently prepared by consultants retained by developers. Without standardized, long-term baseline data and independent monitoring, these studies do not adequately reflect real-world conditions experienced by residents. Numerous households have incurred significant costs after wells ran dry, requiring cistern installation or the trucking of potable water.

Community Need and Planning Justification

The commercial uses proposed for the Moxley Road development do not appear to respond to demonstrated community need. Residents have not requested additional large-scale commercial services, particularly where such development may place essential water resources at risk. The potential loss of reliable drinking water cannot reasonably be balanced against convenience-based commercial expansion already available nearby.

Similarly, anticipated large residential construction along Highway 8 and Taylor Crescent will likely increase water consumption significantly, compounding existing pressures on the groundwater system.

Planning Considerations

Meaningful planning decisions require reliable data capable of evaluating cumulative and long-term impacts. At present, there remains insufficient evidence to assure residents that groundwater supply, water quality, and flooding conditions will not worsen as a result of these projects.

Conclusion

I respectfully submit that approval of these developments should only be considered where enforceable guarantees, supported by independent and ongoing monitoring, demonstrate that there will be no detrimental impacts to groundwater quantity, groundwater quality, or flooding conditions affecting existing residents.

As a long-time Greenville resident, I have personally witnessed environmental changes over many years. These lived experiences must be weighed alongside technical studies when evaluating the appropriateness of further development in this area.

Thank you for your careful consideration of these concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty-Jean Price

Good morning Abdullah,

I am a resident of Greenville and I am very concerned about the commercial development proposed at 471 Moxley Rd. Our main concern is that this is a sizable development with no dedicated water source, meaning that all units draw from the same aquifer that supplies local wells.

Greenville sits on a designated protected water source area. Our aquifer is sensitive to overuse, vulnerable to contamination and shared by hundreds of homes. The oversight/lack of planning for this commercial development to have a separate water source poses a real risk to our water quality, quantity and safety.

I opposed this development and I am writing to you asking you to oppose commercial rezoning at 471 Moxley Rd.

Please provide follow up and let me know how you are working to protect Greenville's water aquifer.

Thank you
Peppy E.Tew

Good morning Abdullah,

I am a resident of Greenville and I am very concerned about the commercial development proposed at 471 Moxley Rd. Our main concern is that this is a sizable development with no dedicated water source, meaning that all units draw from the same aquifer that supplies local wells.

Greenville sits on a designated protected water source area. Our aquifer is sensitive to overuse, vulnerable to contamination and shared by hundreds of homes. The oversight/lack of planning for this commercial development to have a separate water source poses a real risk to our water quality, quantity and safety.

I opposed this development and I am writing to you asking you to oppose commercial rezoning at 471 Moxley Rd.

Please provide follow up and let me know how you are working to protect Greenville's water aquifer.

Thank you
Shannon Tew

I live on [REDACTED]. I am gravely concerned that any major commercial unit there will adversely affect my well. There is a history of unstable water flow issues in the area and I strongly believe that a new development will only continue to create instability with our access to water. I vehemently object to the project and will do so at the public meeting. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Darren Smith

Hi Abdullah,

As a resident of Dundas, I am writing to formally express my objection to the proposed commercial rezoning and development at 471 Moxley Road.

Greenville sits on a designated protected water source area, and the aquifer that supplies our community is both sensitive and shared by hundreds of homes. The proposed development raises serious concerns, particularly given that it does not include a dedicated water source and would draw from the same aquifer that supplies local wells. Introducing a large-scale commercial project of this nature significantly increases the risk of overuse and contamination of a water system that is already vulnerable.

In addition to water security concerns, the development would bring increased runoff from large paved and roofed areas, contributing to drainage and erosion issues. Increased truck traffic, noise, and daily deliveries would also negatively impact road safety, accessibility, and the quiet residential character of our community. These changes risk diminishing both quality of life and nearby property values.

This land is currently zoned agricultural for good reason. Rezoning it for commercial use sets a troubling precedent that prioritizes short-term development over long-term environmental stewardship and community well-being.

I urge you to reject the proposed commercial rezoning at 471 Moxley Road, protect Greenville's designated water source, and put residents' water security and safety first.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

--

Thank you,

Tara-Rose Bourgeois

471 Moxley - RHOPA-26-001 ZAC-26-004 – February 18, 2026

I would like to have my comments included in this application.

1. Myself and the community at large here in Greensville object to this proposal for several reasons. I have lived here for over 35 years and I am quite familiar with the terrain.
2. This property is zoned agricultural and should remain as such. We are losing too much farm land to these developments. This property has been farmed most recently with corn and other crops and is sustainable as such. It grows our food and supports wildlife and biodiversity. It cleans our water and provides resilience to flooding and helps combat climate change.
3. Greensville as you know depends on the aquifer for drinking water. The quarries and other businesses in the area have already affected the water table by de-watering operations and reducing the amount of groundwater available to residents. These operations have required the quarries to drill new wells for residents or to buy out their properties. (Ask Lafarge for these records)
4. Drilling a bore hole in the winter does not provide enough information as the water table would be at its best. Droughts and climate change have affected the water tables with many residents already experiencing draw down in their wells to the point that Taylor Crescent residents adjacent to the proposal don't have enough water for laundry. During my 35 years here and speaking with residents it gets worse year after year. My own well here at 663 Harvest has declined in water levels over the years. To allow more water extraction just worsens the situation.
5. The community is very well educated on the hydro-geology in this area because of many years with EA hearings in the 1980's over a landfill proposal in the Lafarge South Quarry with consultants from Golder and Associates, Conestoga Rovers etc., all at odds over the potential effects on our water table in the area during a 7 year long EA hearing.
6. The applicant has said publicly on July 10, 2024 that he has not done a project like this before, which does not instill any confidence for the residents. There is no benefit to Greensville residents only cost.
7. This parcel of land is one of the last active recharge zones for this area and to pave this over with commercial units, 300+ parking spaces, loading docks is quite frankly unacceptable. We need rain to percolate down to the aquifer to continue to supply wells and the watershed.
8. Residents will have to endure water issues, noise, tractor trailers, lighting issues from this development right next door to where they live. Along with tractor trailer traffic next to the school. Not a good mix. Add to that all the existing quarry traffic plus a huge project to rehab the North Quarry under a recent application from Amrize (formerly Lafarge) with trucks hauling soil along Highway 5. The highway is already at capacity and is very dangerous with speeding quarry trucks and lots of accidents and near misses. Continuing accidents on Highway 5 forces all truck traffic through Greensville along Harvest Road, past the elementary school on a road not designed for heavy traffic.
9. Greensville has been designated by the City as a "Water Protection Zone" The city also has a communal well on Harvest and the rest on private wells. This area can no longer accept further water extraction. The Greensville School and Library are also reliant on the aquifer. The risk of low levels and possible contamination must be avoided.

10. There are other development proposals within 1 Km in the application process for the Greensville area. The city insists that development needs to happen within the urban boundary but accepts residential and commercial developments on a one by one basis knowing that these areas have no city services? In my view the city needs to start looking at the cumulative effects of these proposals that can and will affect the rural residents and their quality of life which is sustained by water, quantity and quality. Our community has taken pride in protecting our land, water and natural surroundings and this proposal as others in this area puts that at risk.

11. There are no guarantees the landlord will make sure that water is only used for sinks and toilets as he stated. This contradicts his proposed use of our water. How would this be enforced? It Can't. A landlord will rent space to anyone who pays and is less concerned then about water use.

12. In terms of water use the proponent lists several uses that in fact would use a substantial amount of water. i.e. car dealership, car rentals and washing of cars, garden center all of these require extensive water extraction.

13. We also see no comments from the public from the meeting on July 10, 2024 where objections were relayed to Angrish. There has been no attempt since then for further discussion.

14. The documents suggest that heavy equipment will be needed to deal with the bedrock beneath the site for the construction of the piers, what effect will that have on the water table, noise, dust and the impact to the residents adjacent to the site? The proponent has mentioned that groundwater may provide serious design constraints and that the proximity of the ground water table will be problematic to disturbance at some of the locations. Also that de-watering may also be considered, These again are risks to our groundwater in the area.

15. The Greensville community has been actively involved in the City Waterfall Master Plan and MT Planners hired by the City agree the aquifer and watershed is critical is maintaining the sustainability and attractiveness of Websters and Tews Falls.

16. We are concerned that the city will take at face value the application as I am not sure the city has any hydro-geology expertise in house or any studies relating to the aquifer in this area. In dealing with consultants for a proponent over the many years they will always provide the positive side for their clients.

17. Does the city take into account the amount of money a developer may have spent before approval?

18. Any approval of any one of these proposed developments could be the one that pushes a slow recharge system past sustainability. We all know that ground water is finite and is not replaceable.

19. The community respectfully urge you to reject the proposed commercial rezoning at 471 Moxley and to prioritize the protection of our water resources, environment and rural community. Planning should place residents long-term well being ahead of short-term commercial interests.

M. Osborne – DGEC - Dundas and Greensville Environmental Concern

- > I think most residents who reside in Greenville (especially
- > Taylor/Old Brock Rd) are very concerned about the water situation related to the request for zoning change at 471 Moxley Road If this developer is willing to provide its own independent water source that will not use the existing aquifer that would be one hurdle for them to overcome.
- > The residents are also concerned about what type of commercial businesses would be going into these units - rezoning from agriculture to commercial leaves it open for any type of business.
- > This is a pretty quiet neighbourhood (we don't even have street lights!) we don't want lights on 24/7, access to these businesses 24/7 and what do they need 375 parking spots for - that's 17 cars per business ! Seems a bit excessive.
- >
- > But again - the biggest concern is safe-guarding our water source - is this developer willing to pay for each of us to get a water cistern and pay to have a water truck fill them regularly - if they do affect the aquifer ?
- >
- > Regards,
- > Lisa Brooker

Dear Abdullah

I am a home owner and resident of Greenville. My family and I live at 6 Cedar Avenue. I strongly oppose the commercial development at Moxley due to concerns about the negative impact on water supply and possible environmental contamination.

Please keep me informed about possible developments in this application.

Thank you

Robin Mitchell

Dear Abdullah

I am a home owner and resident of Greenville. My family and I live at [REDACTED]. I strongly oppose the commercial development at Moxley due to concerns about the negative impact on water supply and possible environmental contamination.

Please keep me informed about possible developments in this application.

Thank you

Robin Mitchell

Dear Abdullah Pasha:

I am writing as a concerned resident to express my strong opposition to the proposed commercial development at 471 Moxley Road.

One of my greatest concerns is the impact this development will have on our shared well water system. Many residents in our community already experience periods where their wells struggle to provide enough water. Adding dozens of commercial units that rely on the same groundwater source places an unreasonable strain on an already vulnerable system. This raises serious concerns about long-term water availability, water quality, and the security of our community's most essential resource.

In addition, the increase in truck traffic, delivery vehicles, and daily commuters will significantly change the character of our quiet rural community. Greenville/Dundas has long been valued for its peaceful environment, low traffic, and safe roads. This proposed development represents urban sprawl that will disrupt daily life, increase noise and safety risks, and diminish the rural lifestyle that residents have chosen and worked hard to protect.

Many people move from large cities to rural areas in search of peace, quiet, and a closer connection to nature. Developments of this scale undermine those values. There is also concern that newcomers attracted by large commercial sites may not share the same respect for the environment that long-term residents have demonstrated. Our community has taken pride in protecting our land, water, and natural surroundings, and this proposal puts that at risk.

This development threatens not only our water supply, but also our quality of life, property values, and the unique character of Greenville/Dundas and surrounding area. Once these changes are made, they cannot be easily reversed.

I respectfully urge you to reject the proposed commercial rezoning at 471 Moxley Road and to prioritize the protection of our water resources, environment, and rural community. Sustainable planning should place residents' long-term wellbeing ahead of short-term commercial interests.

Thank you for taking the time to consider the concerns of local residents. I hope you will stand with our community and work to preserve the qualities that make these rural towns such special places to live.

Sincerely,

Ruth Castellanos

Afternoon all,

I am reaching out as a nearby resident of 471 Moxley Road and trying to appeal to your team to act in the best interests of your constituents or are long-standing tax payers of this city – specifically to oppose the rezoning.

471 Moxley Road Commercial Development File - RHOPA-26-001 and ZAC-26-004

The recent purchases of this farm land are looking to rezone the property to commercial property. It will comprise of multiple commercial units, 11 loading docks, tractor trailers, etc... right next to residential properties that will result in:

1. drain on our local aquifer that residents rely on, vital to preserve from a sustainability perspective for our community. Please remember that residents of this area are very high paying municipal tax payers (\$10-20k/year) and outside of services such as snow plows, garbage/recycling and availability of public spaces such as community parks, our services or limited (no city water or sewage). The city will have no plans to provide such amenities, so any damage/drain costs on our water availability will come at the expense of residents.

The primary and most urgent concern is water security. This proposed development would draw from the same local aquifer that supplies the private wells for hundreds of nearby homes. Greenville sits within a protected water source area, and our aquifer is already under strain. Many residents have experienced well failures, declining water levels, and costly repairs, with no guarantee that deeper drilling will resolve these issues.

Allowing a large-scale commercial development, without a dedicated or municipal water source, to draw from this aquifer poses an unacceptable risk to both water quantity and water quality. Once an aquifer is compromised, the damage is often irreversible, and the financial and personal burden falls entirely on residents.

2. increased traffic – this area currently does not have sidewalks, raise safety concerns for folks that walk/bike in the area in addition to congestion, noise, road wear and tear. These rural roads are non designed for high-volume commercial use.
3. location selection -> HWY 5/6 is already in full expansion for commercial projects, not sure why it is appropriate to rezone agricultural land to commercial when there are much more appropriate locations 5 mins drive closer to Waterdown. **The permanent loss of additional agricultural land through commercial rezoning, setting a precedent that further erodes the rural and agricultural character of Greenville.**
4. Negative financial impact to residents – this will ultimately negatively impact the most vital asset of our residents – the value of our homes.
5. The city has partnered well with Greenville in the past – we recognize the importance it plays in the environment as home to more than 1 conservation area – we urge you not to take action that would be contradictory to such.

I would comment, I know there are a couple other residential projects within this area – some may be reluctant about – I take no issue with these residential based projects as long as developments are meeting requirements/safety/permit/environmental etc... requirements. But with additional residential development set to take place, only more reason to limit how much development should be taking place in this residential area and what kind – i.e. all the more reason to pause if commercial development is really appropriate.

We trust again that you will act in the best interest of your residents, who you are meant to serve in your current capacity. We must act in the best interest of the community vs. the commercial interest of 1.

I urge the committee to reject the proposed commercial rezoning at 471 Moxley Road and to prioritize the protection of Greenville's aquifer, agricultural land, and the health and safety of the community.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the voices of the residents most directly impacted by this decision.

Sincerely,

Christina Wood

Dear Mr. Pasha,

I am writing to express my concern over the application to rezone and develop the land at 471 Moxley Rd in Greenville. This area is a protected water area with concerns over diminishing ground water sources. We have received letters from the city and conservation authority indicating that the water level is low and that we should be conserving water. Wells in the area continue to fail with many homes requiring delivered water to cisterns. On my street, the water truck is now seen every week as each home requires periodic delivery. When I first moved to the area 18 years ago, all wells were performing adequately and water delivery was rare and usually related only to backyard pools. As the quarry in the area expanded and the dam was removed from Crooks Hollow, the ground water was impacted and wells began to fail. Even the commercial plaza at Kirby and Highway 8 had to have a new well drilled. Further development in the Greenville area will surely have an impact on water supply. I am opposed to this development for this reason and also the loss of green space to the area, and potential for increased traffic.

Sincerely,

Natalya Kosubovich

This project has possible drastic impact on local residential areas with limited water sources, infrastructure and vehicular . In addition, the waste created by this increase in density could cause irreparable damage to the ecosystem in the area. While these changes would be very damaging, the increase in truck and vehicular traffic would cause extreme danger in the already overloaded access roads to Waterdown and surrounding residential areas!

Bryan LeGallais

Dear Mr. Pasha,

I am writing to express my concern over the application to rezone and develop the land at 471 Moxley Rd in Greenville. This area is a protected water area with concerns over diminishing ground water sources. We have received letters from the city and conservation authority indicating that the water level is low and that we should be conserving water. Wells in the area continue to fail with many homes requiring delivered water to cisterns. On my street, the water truck is now seen every week as each home requires periodic delivery. When I first moved to the area 18 years ago, all wells were performing adequately and water delivery was rare and usually related only to backyard pools. As the quarry in the area expanded and the dam was removed from Crooks Hollow, the ground water was impacted and wells began to fail. Even the commercial plaza at Kirby and Highway 8 had to have a new well drilled. Further development in the Greenville area will surely have an impact on water supply. I am opposed to this development for this reason and also the loss of greenspace to the area.

Sincerely,

Amber Kosubovich

Dear members of the Planning Committee,

I am writing to submit this letter as formal public comment regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for **471 Moxley Road**.

After reviewing the applicant's submitted planning and technical materials, I am strongly opposed to this rezoning. In my view, the proposal represents an inappropriate intensification of land use in a rural, groundwater-dependent area and introduces unacceptable risks to public safety, environmental protection, water resources, traffic operations, and long-term community planning objectives.

The following concerns are based on the applicant's own documentation, including the Planning Justification Report, Stormwater Management Brief, Traffic Impact Study correspondence, and Geotechnical Assessment.

1. Inappropriate Land Use Intensification in a Rural Area

The proposed rezoning would permit a major commercial/industrial-style development in an area that is currently agricultural/rural in character. This is not a minor change or small-scale neighbourhood service use. The development is of a scale and intensity that would permanently alter the character of the Greensville Rural Settlement Area.

The size of the site design, the need for extensive parking and loading infrastructure, and the range of intended commercial uses indicate that this is a large intensification project rather than a modest local commercial use. Approving this rezoning would represent a significant departure from the intent of existing land use planning policies and zoning frameworks.

Additionally, the applicant's planning materials repeatedly frame this proposal as an intensification initiative, which should raise concern regarding long-term precedent-setting impacts in a rural settlement area.

2. Reliance on Private Well and Septic Raises Serious Water and Environmental Concerns

The applicant's materials confirm the development will be serviced by a **private on-site well and private septic system**, as municipal water and sanitary servicing are not available in this area.

This is a critical concern because the surrounding community relies on groundwater as a primary drinking water source. A development of this scale will introduce significant new demand on the aquifer system and raises legitimate concerns about both water quantity and water quality over the long term.

A large commercial development relying on private water extraction and private sewage treatment is not comparable to existing rural residential use. It represents a fundamental shift in risk exposure for the surrounding community. Many residents are already experiencing a problem accessing water to sustain life in this community and have had to invest thousands of dollars to truck water.

3. Shallow Groundwater and Dewatering Requirements Increase Risk to Surrounding Wells

The Geotechnical Assessment identifies groundwater as being encountered at relatively shallow depths across the site, with groundwater levels observed as close as approximately 1.4 to 1.8 metres below ground surface in multiple boreholes. The report notes that groundwater conditions can vary seasonally.

Further, the Planning Justification materials confirm that **temporary groundwater controls will be required during construction**, including the use of a **dewatering system**.

This is an important point for Council to consider. Dewatering activities can alter groundwater flow and reduce water availability in nearby wells, even temporarily. In an area where residents depend on well water for daily living, any interference with groundwater conditions creates a legitimate risk to drinking water reliability and security.

The fact that dewatering is explicitly anticipated confirms that groundwater conditions are not trivial and should be treated as a serious environmental and community impact.

4. Excessive Impervious Surface Coverage (Paving) Will Permanently Alter Drainage and Recharge

The Stormwater Management Brief models the primary drainage catchment area of the proposed development (approximately 4.332 hectares) as being **85.7% impervious**.

This is an exceptionally high level of impervious coverage and demonstrates that the proposal is effectively a large paved commercial facility. This level of land coverage is incompatible with the natural infiltration and groundwater recharge functions of the current landscape.

Converting a largely permeable rural site into an 85%+ impervious development has long-term consequences including:

- reduced groundwater recharge
- increased runoff volume and speed
- increased downstream erosion and ditch impacts
- greater risk of flooding and ponding
- increased pollutant loading into the local watershed

Even with engineered stormwater controls, the land itself is being fundamentally transformed in a way that is not reversible.

5. Stormwater Management Approach Relies on Municipal Ditch Discharge and Includes Uncontrolled Drainage

The Stormwater Management Brief confirms that runoff from the development will discharge into the **municipal ditch along Moxley Road**, which is identified as the “legal outlet.”

In addition, the stormwater report states that approximately **0.708 hectares** of the site will drain **uncontrolled** into adjacent roadway ditches due to grading constraints.

These are serious concerns. The municipal ditch system is not designed to function as a high-capacity stormwater conveyance system for large-scale commercial development. Reliance on ditch discharge shifts risk and responsibility onto public infrastructure and creates downstream impacts that may not be fully understood at this stage.

The fact that part of the site drains uncontrolled raises additional concern that runoff impacts are not being fully mitigated or contained within engineered systems.

6. Documented Oil/Fuel Spill Risk Confirms Industrial-Scale Environmental Threat

The stormwater documentation explicitly identifies the site as an **oil/fuel spill risk location**, and the design includes an Oil Grit Separator (OGS) system.

This designation is extremely important. It confirms that the anticipated land use includes activities where spill and contamination risks are real and must be planned for.

In a rural settlement area reliant on groundwater wells, spill risk is not a minor technical detail—it is a direct threat to drinking water quality and environmental integrity. Council must consider the long-term risk exposure created by a development that is acknowledged in its own technical documents as a fuel/oil spill risk site. I remind you that Greenville is a UNESCO world heritage site AND a protected water zone. This proposal does not align with either of those designations.

7. Major Traffic and Truck Activity is Incompatible with Existing Rural Road Conditions

The traffic documentation confirms a development of substantial scale, including **365 parking spaces** and **11 loading spaces**.

A development designed for hundreds of vehicles and frequent loading activity will inevitably generate significant daily traffic, including heavy truck traffic. This is not a minor increase in local trips. It is a commercial hub-style traffic load being introduced into a rural road network.

The documentation also notes that Moxley Road is a cul-de-sac, which further raises concerns regarding road capacity, congestion, turning movements, and emergency access.

This rezoning would therefore contribute to:

- increased safety risks for local residents
- increased congestion and vehicle conflict points
- increased heavy truck movement on rural roads
- noise and air pollution impacts
- increased maintenance burden on local roads

The community should not be required to absorb this traffic burden as a condition of rezoning agricultural land to commercial use.

8. The Proposal Requires Site-Specific Zoning Exceptions and Reduced Standards

The Planning Justification Report confirms that the proposal does not comply with existing zoning parking requirements and seeks a site-specific reduced parking ratio (2.34 spaces per 100 square metres rather than the standard 3.33 spaces per 100 square metres).

This request for special exception zoning should be treated as a warning sign that the project is not naturally compatible with the zoning intent or site capacity. If the proposal requires reduced standards and special treatment to be feasible, that suggests the development is being forced into an area where it does not belong.

Council should not be asked to weaken established standards to accommodate a private development proposal that is already intensive in scale.

9. Cumulative Development Impacts Are Not Being Adequately Addressed

One of the most significant planning issues is that this proposal is being reviewed in isolation when it is part of a broader wave of development pressure in the Greenville area.

The applicant's own documentation cites the Subwatershed Study and acknowledges that there are **nine new development areas**, of which this site is one.

This is a direct confirmation that the rezoning must be evaluated through a cumulative impact lens, particularly with respect to:

- groundwater supply reliability
- stormwater runoff and drainage system impacts
- traffic congestion and road safety
- land use creep and loss of rural character
- increased infrastructure burdens and long-term municipal liability

Approving a rezoning of this scale without requiring a cumulative assessment sets Council up for long-term environmental and infrastructure consequences that will be difficult or impossible to reverse.

10. Public Interest, Environmental Stewardship, and Long-Term Sustainability

This proposal is not simply a landowner's request to change zoning. It is a decision with long-term consequences for the community, for the local water system, and for the environmental integrity of the surrounding area.

Once land is rezoned from agricultural/rural designation to permit intensive commercial use, the precedent is established. Future applications become harder to refuse. The result is incremental loss of rural land, increased paving, increased water demand, and increased infrastructure strain—none of which align with responsible long-term planning.

Council has a responsibility to protect the long-term sustainability of the Greenville Rural Settlement Area, particularly where groundwater is

Request to the Planning Committee

Based on the issues outlined above, I respectfully request that the Planning Committee:

1. **Reject the proposed rezoning application, or**
2. At minimum, **defer any decision** until a full cumulative impact assessment is completed that addresses:
 - groundwater extraction and aquifer impacts
 - risk to existing residential wells
 - stormwater and ditch capacity impacts
 - pollution and spill risk mitigation
 - long-term traffic and truck movement impacts
 - compatibility with rural settlement planning objectives

Conclusion

The applicant's own materials demonstrate that this is a large-scale, high-impact development proposal, including major impervious paving coverage, reliance on private well and septic, acknowledged fuel spill risk, uncontrolled drainage to municipal ditches, shallow groundwater conditions requiring dewatering, and significant traffic and loading activity.

These factors make the proposed rezoning inappropriate for this location and inconsistent with the long-term protection of water resources and rural land use integrity.

Thank you for considering this submission. I appreciate the Committee's responsibility in making decisions that balance growth with environmental stewardship and community safety.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Andrews

To whom it may concern, specifically the Planning Department Committee and Council, and our esteemed Mayor,

Regarding 471 Moxley Road, Flamborough (Ward 13)

I am writing about the proposed zoning changes (and consequent construction) that are being proposed for the field that lies directly across from my home. I need you to hear my concerns – I am desperate for you to understand how negatively you will impact my life if this project goes ahead. PLEASE.

Due to numerous health issues, I haven't been able to get out since before Christmas – it is now the middle of March. I am forcing myself to go to the library today (I can't afford the internet or even a cell phone) to get this letter to the Planning Division. It is so hard to do this, I don't even have words... but I feel this is my only chance to speak up, so I am determined to get this done. I had hoped to have it completed long before now, but my health keeps getting in the way.

In 1963 my parents chose this property precisely because of the surroundings - a small group of close neighbours in a rural setting. I have lived here my whole life – this is home in every sense of the word. In fact, everyone who has chosen to make a life here has done so for the same reasons – location, environment, community. You are now, with no good explanation, trying to take that away with your shocking proposal to change the zoning from Agricultural to Settlement Commercial, and build an obnoxious complex of buildings that are neither wanted nor needed. This has hit all of us really hard. You are like a dark foreboding cloud now that hangs over us, threatening to destroy all we hold dear about this area. Our quiet, clean, contented little crescent, where each morning and evening people happily walk their dogs and their children, ride their bikes, where there's minimal traffic, and friendly neighbours – it's a good little life and we don't take it for granted – we cherish it. But now, out of the blue, here you are, trying to push your own agenda onto an already established community, chosen by many BECAUSE of that beautiful, open expanse of field – it quietly but perfectly keeps the quarry at bay, allowing our crescent to exist and thrive. How would you feel if something similar was done to you where you live? Strangers coming along, wanting to completely change the life you had built, with no regard for your feelings, your wants or needs, just a desire to make money, to hell with what it was that made you choose where you live – you don't matter or fit anywhere in their plans. Seriously, how would you feel? We all know that if this happens, property values will go down – some are already saying they will sell immediately if this goes through. But what about those of us who can't move, or really don't want to – and why should we have to change our lives because some selfish developers see an opportunity?! Why should we have to tolerate losing out on potential profit when we do sell? People move to this Flamborough area knowing that (aside from it being just what they wanted) property values will continue to rise, as homes like these in established, quiet, small rural communities, are harder and harder to find. We all make our choices, based on individual desires, and then we invest huge sums of money, hard-earned for years (the biggest purchase most of us will ever make), and we do it knowing it's an investment in our future. But then you come along – who do you think you are? You

who will drive down property values without a care as to whose life you are impacting. You seem to think you're pretty important, and that you can just plow ahead with your plans, with absolutely no regard to what you're doing to the people who call this place home. Your first step wasn't even to survey the community, do an assessment of what people here actually want. Yours was to send out one inane water assessment after another, asking us to draw our entire water system, wells, weeping tiles (to scale no less), technical questions, too, that most normal people have no knowledge of – basically asking us to do your work for you. FYI – everyone was disgusted and insulted by these questionnaires, and your complete lack of interest as to what you were actually doing to the residents – you were telling us that we didn't matter. Again, how would you feel if this was being done to you? I ask it again because I really want you to think about it. As for the water, the field is downhill – it will probably always have enough. But those of us who live here, who actually need that water? Already there are houses in the back of the crescent, a little uphill from the field, who don't even have enough water to do a load of laundry. We can't afford anyone else taking from the water table. There are plans to build 12 new houses back there too – there goes more water. DO NOT continue to threaten our already delicate water supply!!! We were here first. We matter!

We are a close-knit group and I have yet to speak to even one person who wants what you are proposing. The area, as it is now, is what we all chose, just as you chose the area you live, rightfully expecting it to remain the same. But there you are now, looming over us like a dark cloud – we feel the threat of you every day. We shouldn't have to. As I said – nobody wants your project! If we want anything shopping-wise, doctors, dentists, veterinarians, both Waterdown and Dundas are mere minutes away. If our cars need service, the garage is just up the road (I can see it from here). There are new little boutiques and a spa just down the street in Greenville. Nothing you could add would enrich our lives - we don't want you here, we don't need you here. And you are already causing damage to people, those people you clearly think very little of, so, let me tell you about one of them – me.

I am unwell. Every day is a struggle. You wouldn't know it to look at me. I don't normally tell people what's going on, but you need to know. First, I have depression, anxiety, and PTSD, none of which can be treated medically, since I am allergic to all the possible meds that would help – yes ALL (I've tried over 20 now – every time, I have unbearable side effects, so I must somehow continue on with no medicinal help – it's hell). Other therapies have been ineffective in giving me any relief. Anything else is either inapplicable, or costs a fortune (that I don't have). I am on Ontario Disability (or ODSP) which puts me way below the poverty line. WAY. Just having enough food to eat is not even a challenge – it's impossible. What does help? My environment, my surroundings. Every day, I feel a little peace looking out my front window at our field, watching the weather, the birds, squirrels, and other assorted wildlife. I watch the trees sway with the winds that sweep freely across its expanse, the nighttime thunderstorms that light up its beauty. If I can't go out, I wave to my neighbours with their kids and dogs – oftentimes we end up with a little group that's randomly joined up at the end of the driveway. We're able to talk at a normal volume (not yelling over traffic or construction), as we share a few minutes, talking about something (or nothing much). Often it's people caring about each other, asking how we can help if someone is in need. When I'm by myself, I find I'm comforted by the sounds of the birds, the breeze in the trees in summer, the squeals of kids playing outside - even the chipmunks who relentlessly scold,

then somehow change their minds and come to play around my feet (seriously!). I can smell newly planted flowers, or flowering trees, or just fresh air. If it's warm enough, I open the windows so I can enjoy the seasons and those happy sounds that distract me to some degree – all of that makes me feel a bit better, a bit more normal. Saving money is paramount, so being able to open up the house and rely on the breeze and not the A/C is something I depend on. It brings the outside in, and helps to draw me outside, which always makes me feel better. Since learning of you, my anxiety is worse. All of this will be changed to some degree, or altered completely if you go ahead with your project, that again, NOBODY HERE WANTS!

Have you even given any thought to the problems you will be putting onto us? In the beginning, noise, dust and dirt constantly blowing into our homes, exhaust fumes, tar, an assortment of odours that choke someone like me with asthma (yes, I have that, too). Construction brings unique torture – all kinds of vehicles, mostly huge, with diesel stench, the endless noise of hammering, drilling, pounding that reverberates through the ground and the air, overwhelming the senses, again, especially painful for those of us with PTSD, depression, anxiety – all of these things extremely triggering. The noise feels endless with backup beeping alarms, men yelling at each other, trying to be heard while adding to the cacophony of aural assaults. It's beyond exhausting. I also suffer from migraines, at least twice a week now. Any noise at all induces vomiting and partial temporary blind spots. My life is hard now – I can't even imagine how sick I'll be if this hellscape gets approved. I will lose all of those good things I mentioned above as windows will have to be shut, both to block out the air pollution and the noise. You will be taking away the simple things that bring comfort to what is currently a very difficult life. Please don't do this. We didn't choose it, nor do you have the right to infringe upon our peaceful lives! Seriously – ask yourselves, if you were in my shoes, or you had a loved one, even a child who required a peaceful, clean environment, the one that you chose to try to keep them as well as possible – how would you react if someone came along with plans that would challenge their health, their very existence? Would you be angry at even the suggestion, the threat of something like this? Think about it.

It gets worse. As if the depression, anxiety, PTSD, and asthma attacks aren't enough. In the past few years, I've had several emergency surgeries. I needed peace and quiet to recover. Thankfully, I had that here at home. Since that time, something changed. I now have a serious heart and lung condition, with blood clots that form in my now painfully swollen legs, then travel to various parts. Most recently, they lodged in my lungs making breathing even more difficult. (It's called pulmonary embolism – it's what recently killed actress Catherine O'Hara). I have been told that I could die suddenly, especially if one travels to my brain. When they initially diagnosed me, I was put on meds (thankfully I tolerated these) to dissolve the clots and normalize my blood. It worked temporarily – bloodwork shows I'm back in the danger zone. My doctors aren't sure what to do next. This is quite literally a silent killer. My sister lives in fear that she'll find me gone one day. I hate that my health impacts those I love. Aside from praying that today won't be the day, I've been told that the #1 thing I can do is keep myself as calm as possible – the high blood pressure (that also suddenly showed up) is dangerous in so many ways, including being able to dislodge clots that might be in my legs, throwing them into my circulation to land who knows where – frankly, it's terrifying.

Just learning of what you want to do has exacerbated ALL of my health issues – I am so scared every day that that beautiful field will be destroyed, and this community's way of life with it. Even writing this letter, I've been in tears, and can feel my heart beating irregularly – it's a very frightening feeling. Let me be very clear - I'm not just speaking hypothetically, like *if* you go ahead with your plans – the looming possibility of what you are proposing, is, right now, making my health worse. You are threatening all I hold dear about my life, and my ability to calm myself when I feel the overwhelming sense of dread again.

Tell me, when you start these projects, why is the effect you would have on the lives of the community not your #1 concern? You didn't send surveys asking if people wanted your proposal, or asking how it might impact their lives. You asked about the water because that was what would affect YOU, your project – nevermind the people. You show a shocking lack of judgement and even humanity in your self-serving approach.

If this development were to happen, there's something else that is guaranteed. What is it that always (not sometimes - ALWAYS) comes with urbanization? Crime. It's inevitable. You draw people to whatever it is you're building, you put our houses on peoples' radar. I have lived here my whole life, over 50 years. And in all that time, do you know how many crimes there have been? One. Back in the 1970's. A burglary. They caught the guy. One incident in all that time. No wonder people want to raise their families here.

Please, PLEASE put yourself in my shoes and try to empathize. Is it really okay with you to damage another person's health, literally endanger their life (my doctors have verified that you are, even now, doing just that, as the stress you are directly causing is having a negative effect on my heart and brain) just to make some money? The question should never just be, "Can we do this?", but rather, "**Should** we do this?". Or even "Should we do this HERE?". It may sound stupid to you, but that field is precious to me, my whole life. It's so peaceful and it helps me feel peaceful. Lots of little creatures make it their home; when the crops are in, they quietly help shield us from the quarry. And regarding crops, the soil here is some of the best you can find – my dad grew up farming and the soil here is what sold him on the property (everyone had huge vegetable gardens growing up – weeding in the sun sucked, but the food tasted awesome). It would be a crime to pave over that land.

This is obviously incredibly important to me. There has got to be some other place you can go, where you won't be destroying an entire community's way of life, or the health of vulnerable individuals. You have got to care about people's quality of life, and whether you are contributing in a positive or a negative way. Helping each other and being a source of goodness in the world matters. The last thing I wanted to do was to have to write this letter – it's been exhausting, and painful laying out my weaknesses, so scared I'm going to be let down and not having a clue how I'll survive. Literally.

I am so sick and tired - I never wanted this to be my life. Most of the time I can hardly believe it is. But here we are, and no matter how exhausted/angry/sad/afraid I am, I will fight for what's right, for myself and for our neighbourhood. We are not just talking about the arbitrary administration of a zoning by-law amendment, nor just about engineering and construction. You have to understand that what you are suggesting would seriously impact the lives of many people in ways that they may not be able to handle, or come back from, myself included. It's not fair. This community should always have been your first concern – people should always come before profit. Do I seriously need to say that? Apparently I do. That in itself is depressing as hell. I am begging you to leave our field alone. Let us live our lives in peace. You have no idea the harm you have already caused – please, PLEASE stop now before you make things worse. This hasn't been easy for me, and I am reaching out to you from the bottom of my heart. Please.

Sincerely,

Barbara Guild