

# **Summary of Comments**

**B-2026-001**

**10 Hamilton St**



## COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT MEMORANDUM

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** B-2026-001 & B-2026-006  
**RELATED APPLICATION(S):** N/A  
**TO:** Sarah Burton Hopkins, Secretary Treasurer Committee of Adjustment  
**FROM:** Toomaj Haghshenas, Development Planner  
**SUBJECT:** Consent to sever 10 Hamilton St and 3 Cook Ave to create one (1) new residential lot with frontage on Hamilton Street.

---

### PROPERTY INFORMATION:

<b>Municipal Address</b>	10 Hamilton Street
<b>Legal Description</b>	PLAN 99 LOT 3
<b>Official Plan</b>	Residential Low Density 1 (Schedule B2)
<b>Zoning By-law</b>	Residential 1 (R1) Zone

<b>Municipal Address</b>	3 Cook Avenue
<b>Legal Description</b>	PLAN 99 LOT 2
<b>Official Plan</b>	Residential Low Density 1 (Schedule B2)
<b>Zoning By-law</b>	Residential 1 (R1) Zone

### RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Department recommends deferral of application B-021-2023 subject to the following requirements:

1. That the Cookstown EA process for WWTP expansion is completed and that Council approves a new protocol for allocation unit distribution.

### REASON FOR APPLICATION:

The applicant is proposing to sever the subject lands located at 10 Hamilton St and 3 Cook Ave to create one (1) new residential lot. The severed lot is to be created from portions of both 3 Cook Avenue and 10 Hamilton Street, and is proposed to have an approximate lot frontage of 18.40m along Hamilton Street with an approximate total lot area of approximately 738 m<sup>2</sup>. The first retained lot at 10 Hamilton St would have an approximate reduced lot area of 640m<sup>2</sup> (currently 1,008m<sup>2</sup>) and maintain a lot frontage of 20.02m off Cook Ave. The second retained lot at 3 Cook Ave would have an approximate reduced lot area of 642m<sup>2</sup> (currently 1,012m<sup>2</sup>) and maintain a lot frontage of 20.10m off Cook Ave.

**SURROUNDING LANDS:**

<b>North</b>	Single-detached dwellings
<b>East</b>	Single-detached dwellings
<b>South</b>	Hamilton St (local road) and single-detached dwellings
<b>West</b>	Cook Ave (local road) and single-detached dwellings

**ANALYSIS:**

<b>Site Inspection Date</b>	May 5, 2026
<b>Consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The subject lands are within the Village Settlement Area of Cookstown as defined by the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS 2024). Section 2.3.1.1 states that “settlement areas shall be the focus and growth of development”.</p> <p>Section 2.3.1.2 states that land use patterns in settlement areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses which efficiently use land and resources and optimize existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities. The subject lands are located within the settlement area of Cookstown and represents intensification on a public street that contains single detached lots, however public servicing is not currently available for the area.</p> <p>Section 3.6.1 states that that municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas. Section 3.6.7 states that Planning authorities may allow lot creation where there is confirmation of sufficient reserve sewage system capacity.</p> <p>This application proposes intensification in an area with limited existing sanitary infrastructure. Staff report DSR-123-23 has identified limitations of the existing Cookstown Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), stating that 15 residential allocation units are available in the Cookstown settlement area until an expansion of the WWTP is complete. However, it is noted that these 15 units have not been redistributed for future residential development at this time, and their redistribution must occur in a comprehensive and equitable manner for all applicants waiting for residential development. Staff request deferral until servicing allocation is available through the completion of the Cookstown EA process for WWTP expansion and Council approves a new protocol for distribution of the remaining units of allocation.</p>
<b>Conforms to the County of Simcoe Official Plan:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The subject lands are designated ‘Settlement’ in the Simcoe County Official Plan. Section 3.5.8 indicates that settlement areas shall be the focus of population and employment growth and their regeneration shall be promoted. Intensification shall occur in built up areas per 3.5.24 and higher density development is permitted in built-up areas subject to the compatibility of the development with adjacent residential areas (3.5.30).</p>

	<p>Section 3.5.16 a) states that consideration will be given to “the required infrastructure and public service facilities are approved and implementable in a timely and cost-effective manner”. Residential allocation for this proposal would need to be approved by Council subsequent to the Cookstown EA process being complete, therefore approval of the required infrastructure is pending.</p> <p>Staff are of the opinion that the application would conform to the policies of the Simcoe County Official Plan once the Cookstown EA process is complete and Council approves a new protocol for distribution of the new allocation units.</p>
<p><b>Conforms to the Town of Innisfil Official Plan:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The subject lands are designated “Residential Low Density 1” on Schedule B1 to the Town Official Plan. The designation permits single detached dwellings. The lands are also located within the Village Settlement Area of Cookstown.</p> <p>Section 9.4.2 states that Village Settlement Areas will accommodate limited growth due to servicing constraints. Section 9.4.4 states that Further allocation of growth to Cookstown, if determined through a municipal comprehensive review conducted by the County of Simcoe, shall only be considered if the servicing capacity of Cookstown has the ability to be expanded to accommodate additional growth. Section 9.9.2 states that Infill and intensification are encouraged and will be directed to the delineated built-up areas of Alcona and Cookstown to the extent that servicing permits. At this time, there is no servicing allocation available for the proposed development.</p> <p>Section 9.11.1 (iii) states that when determining the progression of development within a settlement area, “priority is given to proposals that optimize existing infrastructure and public service facilities.” The application is not consistent with his policy until servicing allocation is granted by Town Council.</p> <p>Section 10.1.47 states that the design of new or infill development adjacent to protected heritage properties, or the adaptive reuse of heritage structures shall incorporate the principles of heritage conservation. Design of these developments shall be sensitive to the existing heritage structures. If future approvals resulted in lot creation on the subject lands, a heritage permit would be required to ensure heritage compatibility.</p> <p>Section 10.2.4 of the Official Plan states that the maximum permitted density of the Residential Low Density 1 area shall be 13 units per net hectare and the minimum shall be 10 units per net hectare. ‘<i>Net hectare</i>’ means the area of land of the lot and includes local roads as per the definition in Section 23.3.91. The proposal to sever the subject lands would be lower than this range, at an approximate density of about 7 units per net hectare. However density is</p>

	<p>measured over the entire neighbourhood, not simply on a site-specific severance basis. Some lots may be larger due to different designations and zoning. The proposed severance is within the Coosktown Heritage Conservation District (HCD). A lower density (that is, below the 10-13 range the Official Plan states), would be more compatible with the larger lots found in the HCD.</p> <p>Section 10.2.11 states in cases of existing oversized lots, the lot may be subdivided such that any new lot(s) meet the minimum lot area requirements of the zoning by-law, any required variance is no greater than 20% of the applicable zoning provisions and the frontage is consistent with the average frontage on the same street within 250 metres. The severed and retained lands will not require any additional variances. The general intent of the frontage consistency policy is to ensure new infill is not out of character with existing lots. The proposed lots would not be out of character with surrounding lots, and the proposed frontages is considered compatible with the lot frontages on Hamilton St and Cook Ave.</p> <p>Sections 15.1.6. and 15.1.7 state a Tree Protection Plan shall be required as part of development applications that identifies, preserves, and compensates trees on the lot, including any trees removed five years prior to the development application. In future, if the lot was considered again at a time of servicing availability, these matters would need to be addressed.</p> <p>Considering the above, Staff are of the opinion that the application does not conform to the Town of Innisfil Official Plan at this time. Staff will re-evaluate the application through an OP lens should residential servicing allocation be secured through Council and hence recommend deferral.</p>
<p><b>Complies with the Town Zoning By-law:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The subject lands are zoned “Residential 1 (R1) Zone” in Zoning By-law 080-13, which permits single detached dwellings and requires a minimum 15m lot frontage and minimum 600m<sup>2</sup> lot area. Both retained lots, along with the proposed severed lot, will meet the frontage and area requirements of the Zoning By-Law, so the application does comply with the Zoning By-law. However sanitary servicing is not available and Staff recommend deferral.</p>
<p><b>Conforms to Section 2, 51(24) and 53(12) of the <i>Planning Act</i>:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Staff have reviewed the matters under Sections 2, 51(24) and 53(12) of the <i>Planning Act</i>, which would include consideration of Coosktown Heritage Conservation District Guidelines under Section 2 (d) and 51(24) (a) and (g), and are of the opinion the proposed development is premature to be considered until the deferral requirements are met.</p>

**CONCLUSION:**

The Planning Department recommends deferral of applications B-2026-001 and B-2026-006, subject to the proposed requirements.

**PREPARED BY:**

Toomaj Haghshenas  
Development Planner

**REVIEWED BY:**

Steven Montgomery, MCIP, RPP  
Supervisor of Development Planning



Building Department

MEMORANDUM TO FILE

**DATE: May 14, 2026**

**FROM/CONTACT: Jocelyn Penfold**

**FILE/APPLICATION: B-2026-001**

**SUBJECT: 10 Hamilton St./3 Cook Ave.**

---

**Comments to applicant/owner for information purposes** (Comments help provide additional information regarding the development of the subject lands to the applicant. Comments are not conditions of approval):

1. Please note that additional information (such as, but not limited to, septic review, limiting distance calculations or engineered documents, etc.) may be requested at building permit stage in order to review for compliance against the Ontario Building Code.
2. When applying for building permit for a new dwelling, please provide a lot grading plan designed by a Professional Engineer or an Ontario Land Surveyor to the satisfaction of the Building Department.

**Condition of Approval** (Conditions of Approval are specific enforceable conditions regarding the subject lands should the Committee of Adjustment approve the application).



Engineering

**MEMORANDUM TO FILE**

**DATE: May 21, 2026**

**FROM/CONTACT: Adil Khan ex 3244 akhan@innisfil.ca**

**FILE/APPLICATION: B-001-2026**

**SUBJECT: 10 Hamilton Street**

---

**Comments to applicant/owner for information purposes** (Comments help provide additional information regarding the development of the subject lands to the applicant. Comments are not conditions of approval):

1. When applying for a building permit, please submit engineering design drawings and all other supporting documents in accordance with Town Standards and to the satisfaction of the Town.

**Condition of Approval** (Conditions of Approval are specific enforceable conditions regarding the subject lands should the Committee of Adjustment approve the application. For example: The applicant/owner shall apply for a building permit for the construction of a new dwelling to the satisfaction of Community Development Standards Branch)

1. Should trees be removed tree compensation shall be provided in accordance with the Town Standards.

**MEMORANDUM TO FILE**

**DATE: May 13, 2026**

**FROM/CONTACT: Codi Bissette, codib@innpower.ca**

**FILE/APPLICATION: B-2026-001**

**SUBJECT: 10 Hamilton St - Cookstown**

---

**Comments to applicant/owner for information purposes** (Comments help provide additional information regarding the development of the subject lands to the applicant. Comments are not conditions of approval):

**Customer has engaged Innpower and have an active service layout and offer to connect for the new connection at 10 Hamilton St. When/ if the lot behind 10 Hamilton St. requires servicing, a new service application will be required.**





## MEMORANDUM TO FILE

**DATE:** May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2026

**FROM/CONTACT:** Thomas Steube-Chapman, InnServices

**FILE/APPLICATION:** B-2026-001 10 Hamilton Street & B-2026-006 3 Cook Street

**SUBJECT:** Severance Application for 10 Hamilton and 3 Cook Street – InnServices  
Comments and Conditions

### **Comments to applicant/owner for information purposes:**

1. New water and sanitary service laterals, from the existing municipal water and sanitary main to property line will be required, to accommodate the creation of the new lot
2. Prior to submitting a Right of Way Activity Permit (RAP) to the Town of Innisfil, the Owner/Applicant shall submit an Additional Service Connection Application to InnServices to service the proposed severed lot, complete with the applicable Additional Service Connection Application fees.
3. Prior to issuance of building permit(s) the Owner/Applicant shall have an issued RAP with The Town of Innisfil for works to be completed within the Town's road allowance in accordance with Town Standards that address, but may not be limited to, such matters as connecting new water and sanitary service laterals, to the existing municipal water and sanitary mains and restoration of the Town's road allowance. All works shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Town and InnServices.
4. As part of the RAP, the Owner/Applicant shall provide drawings, plans, cost estimates, specifications, reports, studies and certifications signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer for the proposed development that address, but may not be limited to the servicing of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Town and InnServices.
5. The Owner/Applicant will retain a contractor to execute the installation of the services. This work may commence only after the applicant has an issued RAP with the Town of Innisfil and all fees have been paid to the satisfaction of the Town and InnServices.

### **Condition of Approval:**

1. That the Owner/Applicant request and obtain one (1) additional unit of sanitary allocation from The Town of Innisfil for the proposed severance, from the remaining available units of allocation that are still available in the Cookstown Sanitary Sewer

Allocation Policy CP.01-12-11 and all related Cookstown Sewer Allocation Town of  
Innisfil Staff Reports.

## Resident Comments #1

### **B-2026-001 – 10 Hamilton St & B-2026-006 – 3 Cook Ave**

The current conditions on both Hamilton Street and Cook Street do not support additional density. As these streets exist today, they already experience significant parking and access constraints that raise serious safety and operational concerns. When the church on Hamilton Street is in session, on-street parking routinely prevents effective snow removal and does not allow emergency vehicles to safely pass during any season. Despite repeated calls to bylaw enforcement—who have responded promptly on each occasion—the Town has not implemented any permanent solution, such as resident permit-only parking, to address what is already a hazardous situation. Introducing additional density without first resolving these existing conditions will further compromise safety and access.

In addition, neither the applicant nor the Town has presented a construction management plan outlining how the project will be carried out or how current residents will be protected and compensated for noise, dust, dirt, and general disruption. Recent tree removal activity on the site illustrates this concern clearly: a large hole remains along Hamilton Street, no advance notice was provided to residents, and my home and vehicles were negatively impacted by excessive dirt and debris. This occurred before construction has even begun. Before any permits are issued, the Town should also be assessing the broader infrastructure implications of this proposal. If road widening, servicing upgrades, or other infrastructure works are required, the Town and the applicant must confirm in writing that any such impacts or land requirements will be borne entirely within the applicant's property limits.

Existing residents should not be required—directly or indirectly—to subsidize the needs of a for-profit development through loss of land, increased disruption, or reduced quality of life. Allowing a for-profit business to significantly disrupt a stable residential area, while potentially diminishing property values and neighbourhood safety, without a clear, enforceable plan is not consistent with good planning policy or the established intent of this neighbourhood. There are many young families on this street, and my partner operates a licensed daycare from our home. Safety, access, and predictability are therefore critical concerns. I understand that the applicant may be the same developer responsible for the construction of several homes on Cook Street in the past. Having lived in this area for over 11 years—and as a construction professional myself—I can state that those works did not meet the cleanliness and safety standards that should be expected, further reinforcing concerns about site management and neighbourhood impact.

Planning should not be reduced to the question of whether a building can physically fit on a lot or whether basic servicing capacity exists. The more appropriate questions are: Is the neighbourhood ready for an additional dwelling? Can the existing infrastructure and parking arrangements safely support it? Can current residents reasonably expect that the character and function of their neighbourhood will not materially change? The original planning intent for this property was a single dwelling. That intent remains appropriate today. At a minimum, no permits should be issued until the parking situation on Hamilton and Cook Streets is permanently resolved and a comprehensive construction and neighbourhood impact mitigation plan is presented, reviewed, and agreed to well in advance of any work proceeding. "Our Place" requires that growth be supported by sustainable and timely infrastructure, not retroactively justified after approvals are issued. The Comprehensive Zoning By-law explicitly exists to

Resident Comments #1  
Continued...

implement the policies of the Official Plan, reinforcing that servicing, access, and compatibility must be resolved as part of the planning process—not deferred to later stages.

## Resident Comments #2

As per the Town of Innisfil Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 080-13, minimum lot frontage being 15m<sup>2</sup> and total lot area being 600 m<sup>2</sup>, all three residential lots would meet the requirements of the Zoning By-Law. While the proposed lots may comply with the Zoning By-law, zoning compliance alone does not necessarily demonstrate conformity with the heritage character objectives of the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Plan and Guidelines.

### **The Town of Innisfil Official Plan**

Section 5.2.16 In addition to the polices of this plan, the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District Plan and Design Guidelines shall be implemented.

Section 10.1.40 Building height, massing and architectural features of infill development and intensification shall respect and fit into the context of the local character of the Primary, Urban and Village Settlements in which they are located.

### **The Cookstown Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines:**

3.1.1.4 Providing guidance for new development that promotes growth and infill that is compatible and that maintains, enhances and appropriately incorporates the historical character of Cookstown.

3.1.2.1 Recognizing that Cookstown's cultural heritage landscape, includes street patterns, parks, trees, open spaces, monuments, built features and all manner of items that contribute to the visual experience of the village, whether publicly or privately owned.

3.1.3.4 Ensuring that infill development or redevelopment is compatible whittle heritage character and pedestrian scale of the District.

3.3.1 Development Pattern: Cookstown's irregular lotting and street pattern resulted from the development of the community at the intersection of four separate townships. This unique and distinguishing factor contributes to the character and history of Cookstown.

3.3.3.2 New buildings shall be designed to respect the character defining elements of the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District and be visually compatible with neighbouring properties and buildings in terms of scale, height, materials, setback from the street edge and relationship to the street.

3.3.8.1 Lot patterning and the street grid shall be maintained to retain the functional relationships, spatial organization and building settings of the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District and shall promote pedestrian movement throughout.

5.3.2.2 Vacant Properties are used properties that do not currently contain any permanent buildings, and for various reasons have not been developed, but are capable of supporting the HCD heritage character with their future development

**Comments: see below**

Resident Comments #2  
Continued...

- The current lot sizes of 3 Cook Ave. and 10 Hamilton St. are in keeping with other lots on Hamilton Street and are a part of the historic lotting pattern that defines the character of our HCD. Changing the lotting pattern and reducing these two lots to create another lot would alter this established pattern and disrupt the HCD's historic character.
- The cumulative impact of new development in the HCD must be considered. New developments have already impacted the heritage character of the HCD. We have seen this in the HCD along Cook Ave. south of Hamilton St. 12 Cook Ave. was severed into lots that changed the lotting pattern of the HCD, and the resulting appearance is that of a subdivision /monobuilds, not of a heritage district. The streetscape appearance and lotting pattern is similar to that of Victoria St. East, east of Cook Ave. that is not part of the HCD. Any further new development needs to enhance the heritage character of the HCD and not erode it.
- Residents of Hamilton St. have experienced infill development in the HCD (i.e. 4 Cook Ave. and 6 Cook Ave.) that is not compatible with the neighbouring heritage properties in terms of height, scale, relationship to the street and it detracts from the visual experience of the HCD looking up from King St. S. and down from Cook Ave. It dominates and overwhelms the neighbourhood, and the streetscape character of Hamilton St. has been negatively altered due to their imposing presence. As we have sat on our front porch, patrons attending the South Simcoe Theatre on 1 Hamilton St. have made comments related to this infill that include, "How did the Town of Innisfil let those "monster houses" be built? They don't fit here!"; "is that a "condominium" up there"?
- Would approval of these severances create a precedent for additional lot fragmentation on the adjacent property of 2 Albert St.? This area of Cook Ave., Hamilton St and Albert St. is a prominent block, a gateway to the HCD, and thus it is important to preserve its historic character and lotting pattern.

Although the application may satisfy the minimum zoning standards, it does not adequately respect the established lot pattern, streetscape character, and broader heritage objectives of the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District. We respectfully submit that applications B-2026-001 – 10 Hamilton St. and B-2026-006 - 3 Cook St. be refused.

Resident Comments #2  
Continued...



Above outlines the historic lotting pattern for Hamilton St. and Cook Ave. that defines the character of our Cookstown Heritage Conservation District (HCD)

See additional pictures below

Resident Comments #2  
Continued...



New development in the HCD on Cook Ave., south of Hamilton St., that is not reflective off the heritage character of the HCD. (circled in orange)

Additional pictures below

Resident Comments #2  
Continued...



Infill in the HCD , 4 Cook Ave. and other lots on Cook Ave. , that can be seen from 7 Hamilton St. and not compatible with neighbouring properties in the HCD.

Resident Comments #2  
Continued...

See additional picture  
below



## WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF IVERON ICON MOTHER OF GOD APOSTOLIC AUTOCEPHALOUS ORTHODOX CHURCH

*Filed with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Town of Innisfil Committee of Adjustment*

**Re:** Applications for Consent — File Nos. B-2026-001 and B-2026-006  
**Subject Lands:** 10 Hamilton Street and 3 Cook Avenue, Cookstown (Plan 99, Lots 2 and 3)  
**Applicants:** Luca and Isabella Greco  
**Public Meeting:** Thursday, May 21, 2026, 6:30 p.m., Council Chambers, 2101 Innisfil Beach Road  
**Submitting Party:** Iveron Icon of the Mother of God Apostolic Autocephalous Orthodox Church (the “Church”) registered owner of 21 Church Street, Cookstown

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The Church is the registered owner of 21 Church Street, Cookstown and also manages the operation of the Georgian Cultural Center Iverioni located at 19 Church Street, Cookstown. Both properties are listed contributing properties within the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District (the “HCD”), designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18. Of particular significance, the principal Church building at 21 Church Street is a Gothic Revival structure built in 1872 when the people of Cookstown gathered brick from Craigvale to build the first Presbyterian Church in Cookstown. Since 2020, the Church building is the home of a growing Georgian Christian Orthodox congregation whose liturgical, sacramental, and pastoral activities continue to anchor the village core.

### 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Subject Lands lie within the same HCD, specifically:

- 3 Cook Avenue (Plan 99, Lot 2) is a listed contributing property, and
- 10 Hamilton Street (Plan 99, Lot 3) is the immediately adjacent historic plan lot within the contiguous fabric of contributing properties on Hamilton Street.

The applications appear to propose to carve the rear portions of both Subject Lands and combine them into a new residential lot. The new lot will be the largest of the three resulting parcels. Each parent loses more than one-third of its area. Respectfully, the Church submits that this is not a marginal rear-yard severance; it represents a significant reconfiguration of two contributing historic Plan 99 lots into three new parcels, that is likely to have an impact on Church operations and services.<sup>1</sup>

To be clear, the Church does *not* oppose residential development in principle and speaks not as an outside objector, but as a steward of two listed contributing properties within the same designated cultural heritage landscape as the Subject Lands. The Church's submissions, respectfully, are that the lot proposed, the manner of its creation, and the present record do not provide sufficient certainty that the heritage character of the HCD will be maintained should the consents be granted. Nor does the present record provide sufficient clarity regarding future consultation with adjacent heritage stakeholders, including the Church, should additional approvals or public works become necessary following the proposed consents..

The Church is further concerned that the proposed redevelopment may introduce a dwelling of massing, scale, and visual prominence incompatible with the historic streetscape immediately surrounding the Church and the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District. While newer residential development exists in portions of the surrounding area, much of that development is either visually buffered from Church Street or integrated within

<sup>1</sup> The application materials disclose that the existing 3 Cook Avenue property is 1,012 m<sup>2</sup> and is to be reduced to 642 m<sup>2</sup> (a reduction of 370 m<sup>2</sup>), with the existing 10 Hamilton Street property at 1,008 m<sup>2</sup> to be reduced to 640 m<sup>2</sup> (a reduction of 368 m<sup>2</sup>), resulting in a new lot of 738 m<sup>2</sup> with 18.40 m of frontage on Hamilton Street.

more contemporary residential contexts. By contrast, the proposed development appears positioned in a manner that may materially alter the historic sightlines, architectural rhythm, and cultural landscape associated with the Church and its immediate heritage setting.

Accordingly, the Church seeks specific relief outlined in Section 6 below and also seeks explicit assurances from the Town of Innisfil that (1) the applications comply (or will comply) with all Heritage statutory requirements, including the provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment *before* any construction occurs, and (2) the creation of the new lots will not have an impact on the Church's day to day operations, including its grounds and all celebrations and services that take place there on a weekly basis.

### 3. HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND THE COOKSTOWN HCD

The Cookstown HCD Plan, at Section 3.3.1 (Development Pattern), expressly identifies the historic lotting and street pattern of Cookstown as a *distinguishing factor* of the District. Section 3.3.1.1 further provides that “Lot pattern, and building scale and footprints along Queen/Church Streets and King Street, shall be maintained, and that significant changes to existing heritage setbacks and frontages along those streets shall be discouraged.” While the policy's express language refers to Queen/Church Streets and King Street, the District-wide preamble to Section 3.3.1 characterizes Cookstown's irregular lotting pattern as a *distinguishing factor* of the District as a whole, and the policy's principle — protection of the historic lot pattern as a character-defining attribute of the HCD — applies to the Cookstown HCD generally, including the Subject Lands.<sup>2</sup> The applications as presented on the record do not appear to address the HCD plans' character statement. On its face, the Church is concerned that this may result in a material alteration of the historic lot pattern within the HCD. The Church respectfully submits that compatibility within a Heritage Conservation District involves not only land use, but also the preservation of visual, spatial, and cultural relationships between contributing properties.

The Church is additionally concerned that approval of the present applications, without clear heritage and compatibility safeguards, may establish a precedent for similar lot reorganizations and intensified redevelopment within the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District, cumulatively eroding the historic lot fabric and cultural heritage character the District was established to conserve.

HCDs are paradigm cultural heritage landscapes; however, the HCD is not addressed in the application materials despite statutory requirements for its consideration as part of any planning activity. Specifically, section 2(d) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, identifies the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, or historical interest as a matter of provincial interest. Section 51(24)(a), as applied through section 53, also requires the Committee to have regard to that interest. Further, section 3(5) of the *Planning Act* requires the Committee's decision to be consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 (“PPS”), which provides *inter alia* at section 4.6.1. that protected heritage property, which may contain built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes, shall be conserved.<sup>3</sup> Finally, while section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* requires a Part V permit for any future construction on the new lot, this fact does not appear to be acknowledged or addressed in the application materials.

Accordingly, the Church respectfully asks the Committee to confirm, on the record, whether the applications have been circulated to Innisfil Heritage Advisory Committee (IHAC), whether a Heritage Impact Assessment (“HIA”) has been required of the applicants in advance of any committee decision, and if heritage staff comments have been received and considered as part of the Committee hearing. Further, the Church respectfully asks the Committee to request the following as part of its approval process:

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.innisfil.ca/media/file/hcd-final-guide>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ontario.ca/files/2024-10/mmah-provincial-planning-statement-en-2024-10-23.pdf>, at p. 28.

- (i) a Heritage Impact Assessment addressing consistency with the HCD Plan, the Innisfil Official Plan cultural heritage policies, and the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024;
- (ii) any evidence of circulation to the Innisfil Heritage Advisory Committee, or any heritage staff comments;
- (iii) a stormwater management plan addressing surface drainage from the newly created lot;
- (iv) confirmation of adequate municipal water, sanitary, and storm servicing capacity;
- (v) a building envelope sketch demonstrating compliance with the Town of Innisfil Bylaws (i.e. Zoning By-law 080-13) without recourse to future minor variances; and
- (vi) a Traffic Impact Brief or equivalent access and sightline analysis addressing the proposed new driveway on Hamilton Street, its relationship to the Hamilton St/Cook Ave intersection, and the cumulative interaction with the Church's Sunday and feast-day vehicular and parking patterns.

#### **4. CLARIFICATION REGARDING THE REFERENCE TO A PLAN OF SUBDIVISION**

The Church is concerned that the applications, though brought forward to Committee as two consents, operate as a single coordinated act of land assembly that appears to be, in substance, a plan of subdivision. The surveyor's title block on the Grading Plan dated January 22, 2026 (prepared by J.D. Barnes Limited) contains an Owners' Certificate that reads: "I (WE) BEING THE REGISTERED OWNER(S) OF THE SUBJECT LANDS HEREBY AUTHORIZE ARN PROJECT MANAGEMENT TO SUBMIT **THIS DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION TO THE CITY OF VAUGHAN FOR APPROVAL.**" Two features of this certificate are noteworthy:

- First, "Draft Plan of Subdivision" is the formal name of the instrument filed under Section 51 of the *Planning Act*, not under Section 53; and
- Second, the reference to the City of Vaughan — which is not the approval authority on this file — indicates that the certificate is template text carried over from a prior subdivision file in another municipality and appears to have remained from a prior subdivision template.

The Church does not wish to assume the applicants' intention. However, the Church respectfully notes only that the work product was prepared on a subdivision template, and that this is consistent with the cooperation letter in the application materials, when taken together, appears to support the conclusion that the proposal is, in substance, a plan of subdivision. Accordingly, the Church respectfully submits that the proposal ought properly to be considered, if it is deemed by the Committee, in substance, a coordinated act of land assembly.

#### **5. EFFECT ON THE CHURCH AS A PLACE OF WORSHIP AND THE WIDER GEORGIAN ORTHODOX COMMUNITY**

The Church at 21 Church Street has anchored the Cookstown community since 1872 and remains one of the defining heritage structures contributing to the identity and historic character of the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District. Under the current auspices of the Georgian Orthodox Church since 2020, the property continues to serve as an active religious, cultural, and community landmark within the village core. It is today the home of a large and growing Georgian Orthodox congregation and a gathering place for worship, for seasonal liturgical celebrations central to Orthodox practice, for processions and outdoor observances on principal feast days, for weddings, baptisms, and funerals, for chanted services and choral music, for children's programming, for community meals, and for community support and outreach. The audible and visible expressions of that community life — bells, voices in song, periodic outdoor gatherings during processions and on feast days — are part of the heritage character of the Church and the village core. The Church respectfully submits that future residential development within the immediate vicinity of an established and long-standing place of worship should be planned in a manner recognizing the pre-existing lawful religious, cultural, ceremonial, and community activities historically associated with the Church property.

The Church respectfully submits that the continued active religious and community use of the property reflects the longstanding role of the site as a place of worship and gathering within Cookstown for more than 150 years. Given

this, the Church respectfully invites the Committee to consider the possible impacts on the Church as a congregation and as a community, having regard to the foreseeable interaction between a new residential dwelling on the Subject Lands and the ordinary audible and outdoor activities of the Church's growing Georgian Orthodox congregation, including bells, music, processions on principal feast days, and life-event observance.

The Church's contribution to the cultural fabric of Cookstown is not limited to the built heritage of the Gothic Revival sanctuary. The Iveron Icon of the Mother of God Apostolic Autocephalous Orthodox Church serves a growing congregation that preserves Georgian Orthodox religious tradition, the Georgian language as a living liturgical language, and a distinct cultural identity within the Town of Innisfil. The associated Georgian Cultural Center Iverioni at 19 Church Street provides programming and gathering space that sustains those traditions. We would draw the Committee's attention to section 4.6 of the PPS (Cultural Heritage and Archaeology) that recognizes intangible cultural heritage as part of the wider cultural heritage framework. The Church respectfully asks the Committee to keep the cultural heritage dimension of the Church's role in view alongside the architectural heritage considerations addressed elsewhere in these submissions.

#### **6. CONCERNS REGARDING IMPACTS ON ACCESSIBILITY**

The Church is also concerned with the potential impacts of the application on accessibility, including to senior and older members of the congregation, as well as those with disabilities. As the Committee is aware, section 51(24) of the *Planning Act*, as applied through section 53, expressly requires the Committee to have regard to "accessibility for persons with disabilities and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the municipality." The *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act*, 2005, S.O. 2005, c. 11, and *Ontario Regulation 191/11* (Integrated Accessibility Standards) further require the Town to consider accessibility in planning decisions affecting the built environment. The Church's congregation includes elderly parishioners, persons with mobility limitations, and children with caregivers, all of whom approach the Church on foot from the village core. The proposed new lot would introduce a new vehicular driveway and curb cut on Hamilton Street. New curb cuts disrupt sidewalk continuity (a critical issue for wheelchair, walker, and mobility-aid users), introduce new vehicle-pedestrian conflict points, and may reduce informal accessible on-street parking used by parishioners with mobility needs. The application materials contain no pedestrian-route analysis, no accessibility impact statement, and no consultation with the Church regarding the access patterns of its parishioners. The Church respectfully submits that the Committee confirm its ability to satisfy the accessibility obligation as required by legislation and regulation.

Lastly, traffic and parking considerations connect to the foregoing accessibility analysis. Church services and feast-day observances already generate significant pedestrian and vehicular activity in the village core. Worshippers, including elderly parishioners and families with young children, regularly cross Hamilton St, Cook Ave, and Church St to reach the Church on Sundays and on principal feast days. The proposed new driveway on Hamilton Street would introduce an additional curb cut and vehicle-movement point in a streetscape that already operates near its accessibility capacity during service times. The application materials disclose no parking demand analysis, no sightline review at the proposed driveway, and no consideration of overflow parking practices associated with the Church's larger services and events. The Church already experiences significant parking pressures during Sunday liturgies, feast-day celebrations, weddings, funerals, and major religious observances, many of which attract worshippers from across the Greater Toronto Area. The proposed residential intensification and additional driveway access may further reduce available on-street parking and create conflicts affecting parishioners, including elderly worshippers and families with children. Accordingly, the Church respectfully submits that the application ought to include the foregoing as part of the Committee's consideration.

#### **6. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT**

The Church has recognized that the proposed severance of the lots does not occur in isolation. It is one in a foreseeable sequence of similar applications across the Municipality. Their cumulative effect, over time, is likely to alter the historic lot pattern and increase curb-cut and traffic density within the village core; which will impact the Cookstown HCD, including the Church.

The Cookstown HCD exists because the Town of Innisfil determined, by by-law, that the heritage character of the HCD is worth conserving. 19 and 21 Church Street are listed contributing properties within that District. The Church is therefore not an outside objector, but a steward of a designated cultural heritage landscape and wishes to receive assurances that the future construction on the lots referenced in the applications do not negatively impact its operations and its congregation.

For the reasons given, the Church respectfully requests that if the Committee wishes to grant the consents, that it does so with the following conditions:

**Primary relief sought:** the Church respectfully requests that the applications be deferred pending the filing and circulation of the technical and heritage material identified above. In the further alternative, if the Committee is minded to grant consent, the Church respectfully requests that the consents be granted subject to the following conditions:

- (i) the filing and acceptance of an HIA by a heritage planner;
- (ii) approval of a building envelope plan demonstrating siting, orientation, massing, and window placement consistent with the HCD Plan and the streetscape;
- (iii) a landscape and screening plan consistent with the HCD Plan's rear-yard and interface guidelines;
- (iv) a grading and drainage plan ensuring runoff does not adversely affect adjacent properties;
- (v) a traffic and access plan, including sightline analysis at the proposed driveway and a parking management strategy addressing the cumulative effect on the village core, prepared by a qualified transportation engineer;
- (vi) a registered notice on title disclosing the new lot's location within the Cookstown HCD and the Part V permit requirements for future construction; and
- (vii) a registered notice on title disclosing the proximity of the established place of worship at 19 and 21 Church Street and its normal liturgical activities, including bells, music, outdoor processions, and gatherings.
- (viii) an accessibility review of the proposed new driveway and curb cut, addressing pedestrian safety, sidewalk continuity, accessible parking, and the access patterns of the elderly and disabled members of the adjacent congregation, prepared in accordance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 and Ontario Regulation 191/11 (Integrated Accessibility Standards); and
- (ix) any future minor variance, heritage permit, site plan, or related planning application affecting the newly created lot or any future development thereon shall be circulated to the Church for notice and comment.

The Church further requests, in writing, that it be provided with the Notice of Decision in respect of these applications pursuant to section 53(17) of the Planning Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted this \_\_19\_\_ day of May, 2026.

---

Father Thomas (Teimuraz) Bekurishvili, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Church

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

#### Resident Comments #4

I have lived at this address for 31 years and have witnessed how the new developments have already impacted the heritage character of the HCD. What is most concerning is how the appearance of these "subdivision" type homes do not "fit in" Concerning is how will reducing the size of the lots to create 3 and how this will effect the height which could infringe on the privacy of surrounding homes and block light and views that are all part of the visual experience of the HCD. Plus, if this is allowed will it set a precedent which could eventually undermine the whole purpose of having a Heritage District. I am sure there are more suitable sites for this developer to build on that is not the gateway to the Heritage District. I would like to see this application refused.

#### Resident Comments #5

We chose to move to Cookstown because of its unique small-town character and historic charm. The century homes, traditional Main Street, and strong sense of community were exactly what attracted us to the area. When we moved into our historic home in 2018, the neighbourhood reflected the heritage character that makes Cookstown so distinctive. Since then, seven new homes have been added to our block, and five of them differ significantly from the scale and style of the surrounding historic homes. The newer properties are being built on smaller lots, while the homes themselves are substantially larger in both height and square footage. This pattern of development is gradually changing the character of the neighbourhood and diminishing the historic aesthetic that residents value so deeply. While previous planning decisions cannot be undone, we now have an important opportunity to guide future development in a way that respects and complements Cookstown's heritage identity. By encouraging lot sizes, building scale, and architectural styles that are consistent with the town's historic character, we can help preserve the charm, uniqueness, and sense of place that make Cookstown such a special community.

#### Resident Comments #6

I am concerned about how we are valuing (or not) our Heritage District in Cookstown and would like to provide the following feedback regarding this application. The current lot sizes of 3 Cook Ave. and 10 Hamilton St. are in keeping with other lots on Hamilton Street and are a part of the historic lotting pattern that defines the character of our HCD. Changing the lotting pattern and reducing these two lots to create another lot would alter this established pattern and disrupt the HCD's historic character. • The cumulative impact of new development in the HCD must be considered. New developments have already impacted the heritage character of the HCD. We have seen this in the HCD along Cook Ave. south of Hamilton St. 12 Cook Ave. was severed into lots that changed the lotting pattern of the HCD, and the resulting appearance is that of a subdivision /monobuilds, not of a heritage district. Any further new development needs to enhance the heritage character of the HCD and not erode it. • Residents of Hamilton St. have experienced infill development in the HCD (i.e. 4 Cook Ave. and 6 Cook Ave.) that is not compatible with the neighbouring heritage properties in terms of height, scale, relationship to the street and it detracts from the visual experience of the HCD looking up from King St. S. • Would approval of these severances create a precedent for additional lot fragmentation on the adjacent property of 2 Albert St.? This area of Cook Ave., Hamilton St and Albert St. is a prominent block, a gateway to the HCD, and thus it is important to preserve its historic character and lotting pattern. I respectfully submit that applications B-2026-001 – 10 Hamilton St. and B-2026-006 - 3 Cook St. be refused.

## Resident Comment #7

Good evening everyone,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak regarding the proposed severance for 10 Hamilton Street and 3 Cook Avenue.

I want to be clear that my concern is about the proposal to create three lots and the long-term impact that level of intensification will have on the character of Hamilton Street that is within the Cookstown Heritage Conservation District.

In reviewing the Cookstown HCD Plan, my understanding is that it was created specifically to protect the unique scale, streetscape, green space, and character that make this community different from newer subdivisions and modern intensification projects.

The HCP Plan emphasizes compatibility, pedestrian scale, mature vegetation, and maintaining the established character of existing neighbourhoods.

Hamilton Street is one of the most recognizable heritage streets in Cookstown. It is defined not only by the homes themselves, but also by the spacing between buildings, to backyards, mature trees, open views, and green space that contribute to the feeling and identity of the street.

Once green space is lost, it is lost permanently.

The proposed severance from two lots to three increases density in a way that risks changing the rhythm and openness of the streetscape.

More houses also mean more driveways, more garages, more paving, more construction activity, and less landscape, tree preservation and green space.

I do not support creating three lots and three new homes on this site.

I would instead support development that is more respectful of the heritage character of Cookstown, specifically, maintaining the existing two lots with homes that are intentionally designed to reflect the scale, spacing, and architectural character of the surrounding neighbourhood.

This is not about preventing development. It is about ensuring that development values the heritage of the town rather than gradually eroding it.

I also think it is important to ask and I would personally like to know.

How long will nearby residents be subject to ongoing construction if three homes are permitted here? What is the anticipated timeline for excavation, servicing, grading, and building these houses?

I am home across the street every day with my twin babies, who play outside daily. And I will first hand be impacted by the construction, noise etc...

For neighbouring residents, this is not a short-term decision. The impact of prolonged construction, noise, heavy equipment, disruption and removal of mature trees and green space, and changes to the streetscape could last for years.

There are also serious concerns regarding parking, congestion, and emergency access in this area.

I would urge the Committee to review how frequently by-law officers are called to this area, particularly every other Sunday, to ticket vehicles parked illegally due to existing overflow parking issues.

Current parking conditions already create challenges for snow removal and access for emergency vehicles. Church parking and overflow traffic further increase congestion on surrounding streets, and there is currently no clear or permanent parking solution being proposed before adding additional homes and vehicles to the area. We have people asking to pay us to park in our driveway because the congestion is such an issue here....

At this time, there does not appear to be a clear construction management plan outlining how issues such as noise, dust, dirt, debris, traffic disruption, and site safety will be handled throughout what could become a lengthy multi-home construction project.

Neighbourhood safety and compatibility must also be considered carefully.

Residents already feel that local infrastructure and parking are strained. Additional density in this location is incompatible with the established character and function of the neighbourhood.

The Committee also has an opportunity tonight to recognize that previous approvals should not automatically justify further intensification. If earlier developments have already raised concerns about height, massing, compatibility, and neighbourhood impact, that should encourage greater caution, not repetition.

I would respectfully ask the Committee to consider the following:

1. Oppose the proposed severance creating three lots.
2. Encourage a proposal limited to the existing two lots that better respects the historic spacing and character of Hamilton Street.
3. Require greater consideration of green space preservation, mature vegetation, and the visual openness that contributes to the heritage streetscape.
4. Request a formal construction management and parking plan before any approvals move forward.
5. Consider the long-term impacts on traffic, emergency access, neighbourhood safety, and nearby families.

6. Ensure any future development aligns with the intent of the Cookstown HCP Plan and preserves the unique identity of this area for future generations.

And finally, on a personal level, my family chose to purchase our home knowing we were near the Heritage Conservation District because we valued the character, openness, and beauty of this area.

The previous owner, Don, graciously allowed us to take our wedding photos there and even host part of our wedding celebration in that large open green space. It has always been a place that brought people together and reflected the charm and openness that make Cookstown special.

Today, we have two beautiful twins who play outside every single day and love watching the animals run across the field. Those green spaces and open views are not just planning concepts to us, they are part of our family's daily life, memories, and the reason we chose to build our lives here.

I hope the Committee carefully considers what makes this area special before allowing changes that may permanently alter it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Resident Comment #8

Residents of Hamilton St. have experienced infill development in the HCD (i.e. 4 Cook Ave. and 6 Cook Ave.) that is not compatible with the neighbouring heritage properties in terms of height, scale, relationship to the street and it detracts from the visual experience of the HCD looking up from King St. S. I personally moved away from the city because I wanted to live in a Heritage Conservation District with historic character, established homes, and a streetscape that felt human in scale, rather than dominated by oversized development. Instead, the development beside and behind my property has resulted in large houses that tower over my home and backyard. The view is not reflective of a heritage district, but of incompatible large-scale development. I do not want to see this repeated elsewhere within the Heritage Conservation District.

The current lot sizes of 3 Cook Ave. and 10 Hamilton St. are in keeping with other lots on Hamilton Street and are a part of the historic lotting pattern that defines the character of our HCD. Changing the lotting pattern and reducing these two lots to create another lot would alter this established pattern and disrupt the HCD's historic character.

The cumulative impact of new development in the HCD must be considered. New developments have already impacted the heritage character of the HCD. We have seen this in the HCD along Cook Ave. south of Hamilton St. 12 Cook Ave. was severed into lots that changed the lotting pattern of the HCD, and the resulting appearance is that of a subdivision /monobuilds, not of a heritage district. Any further new development needs to enhance the heritage character of the HCD and not erode it.

Would approval of these severances create a precedent for additional lot fragmentation on the adjacent property of 2 Albert St.? This area of Cook Ave., Hamilton St. and Albert St. is a prominent block, a gateway to the HCD, and thus it is important to preserve its historic character and lotting pattern.

I respectfully submit that applications B-2026-001 – 10 Hamilton St. and B-2026-006 - 3 Cook St. be refused.

## Resident Comment #9

We would like to register our opposition to the severance of these two lots to create 3 smaller ones. Although such severance may fall within general bylaws, it certainly does not meet the standard of the Heritage Conservation District.

The streetscape provision applies to all streets within the district (2.3.3) and subdividing these lots would dramatically change the existing streetscape. This section also addresses concerns about the removal of mature trees that are integral to the character of the neighbourhood.

The protection of mature vegetation is a concern for all in the neighbourhood (3.3.7.1j).

The smaller the lot the more difficult it will be to ensure that the infill is compatible with the area(3.1.3.4, 3.3.7.1, 3.3.7.2, 3.3.7.2).

We would certainly hate to see anything similar the 4 newer homes on Cook that do not blend in with the rest of the community.

The nature of the Heritage District both engenders and enhances the sense of community that makes Cookstown a wonderful place to live. This does not prevent infill, but that infill must be consistent with the nature of the community and we feel that this severance would not contribute positively to our community.



20 May 2026

**Town of Innisfil**  
2101 Innisfil Beach Rd.  
Ontario

Attention: **Committee of Adjustment and Staff**

Re: **Response Letter – May 21 C of A meeting Items 6.2 and 6.3  
3 Cook (B-2026-06) and 10 Hamilton (B-2026-01)  
Town of Innisfil**

Dear Committee of Adjustment members,

We are representing the Owner’s at both 3 Cook and 10 Hamilton.

The Owner’s are looking to sever off the rear yard portion of their respective properties to then be joined to create one lot on Hamilton.

We strongly object to Staff’s recommendation for deferral. The application meets all policy and zoning requirements of the Town. The creation of the lot also supports the Town’s Official Plan objective of increased density in Cookstown. This is clearly written through Staff’s report yet deferral is being recommended because of servicing allocation.

Deferral is not necessary and unwarranted simply because of allocation. This item can be a condition of approval which is being proposed by InnServices comment letter dated May 12, quoted below:

*Condition of Approval:*

- 1. That the Owner/Applicant request and obtain one (1) additional unit of sanitary allocation from The Town of Innisfil for the proposed severance, from the remaining available units of allocation that are still available in the Cookstown Sanitary Sewer Allocation Policy CP.01-12-11 and all related Cookstown Sewer Allocation Town of Innisfil Staff Reports.*

Staff have indicated that 15 allocation units are available but no Town protocol exists for distribution of these 15 units; Because of this deferral is recommended.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

| \_\_\_\_\_ || \_\_\_\_\_ |



Good morning,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Consent application on the property located at 10 Hamilton St in the Town of Innisfil.

The Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA) has reviewed the proposed Consent application which would facilitate severance of the back part of the lot to create a new lot, with frontage on Hamilton St, to join with the severed lot from 3 Cook Ave. Based upon our mandate and policies, we have no objection to the approval of this application.

Please feel free to contact [planning@nvca.on.ca](mailto:planning@nvca.on.ca) should you require any further information or clarification on any matters contained herein. NVCA staff appreciates the opportunity to comment at this stage in the process.

Pearl Gill | Planner I

Planning Department

Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority

8195 8th Line, Utopia, ON L0M 1T0

T 705-424-1479 ext.288

[planning@nvca.on.ca](mailto:planning@nvca.on.ca) | [www.nvca.on.ca](http://www.nvca.on.ca)

This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the original message.