

From: [Lindsey Green](#)
To: [Elisha Milne](#)
Subject: FW: Concerns re: C37-24 Proposed Zoning Change
Date: January 19, 2025 7:56:31 PM

From: Melanie Hoerdts [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 19, 2025 2:23 PM
To: Lindsey Green <lgreen@southgate.ca>
Subject: Concerns re: C37-24 Proposed Zoning Change

Sunday, January 19, 2025

Township of Southgate
185667 Grey Rd. 9
Dundalk, Ontario
N0C 1B0
Attention: Lindsey Green, Clerk
Re: Application for Zoning By-law Amendment C37-24
Mark and Irene Frey
411575 Southgate Sideroad 41

I would like to share my concerns and questions regarding the proposed zoning amendment at 411575 Southgate Road 41.

My family was made aware of the proposal on January 10th 2025 by other residents in the area. My first question is: **Which local newspapers advertised this public meeting?** According to the Ontario Government's "Citizen's Guide to Land Use Planning" Before council passes a zoning bylaw, it must first give as much information as possible to the public. There must also be at least one public meeting before a bylaw is passed and everyone who attends the meeting must have a chance to speak. Notice of this meeting is given at least 20 days in advance, either through local newspapers or by mail and posted notice. The notice of meeting on the township's website is dated Dec 23rd 2024. I have copies of the Wellington Advertiser (our local weekly paper which is published on Thursday of each week) from December 26th 2024 and Jan 3rd 2025. Neither newspaper has the notice of meeting listed. I did not receive a notification by mail. My husband and I both drive by the subject property daily and have not seen a posted notice. On the morning of January 19th, we drove by looking for the posted notice. It is there, attached to a post along with various other signs and advertisements. The notice does not stand out at all

My initial concerns with the proposal were: noise pollution, smell, traffic and public safety.

On January 16th 2025, concerned residents from the area around the subject property gathered along with Mark Frey (the property owner) to share our concerns and ask questions. Mr. Frey also provided a sample of the "fine, powder-like material" that has the appearance of

ground coffee which he claims will be shipped to his property. When asked what the “fine, powder like material” is, Mr. Frey stated that he does not know, but shared that the product comes from somewhere 3 hours south of his location, is in Canada, is certified organic and he “thinks it might be a bakery.” After further questions as to why Mr. Frey would ship an unknown product to his property, he offered up the names ‘Good n’ Green’ as well as Tek Mac Enterprises from Meaford. In my opinion, no questions were answered, and the gathering left myself and my husband with even more questions. The Planning Justification Report prepared by Ron Davidson and submitted to the township states the product will be shipped directly to organic farms in the area. Mr. Frey shared during the gathering that he is unable to sell directly to anyone and shared potential future plans to pack the product into totes to be shipped via train across the county. These admissions by Mr. Frey point to a much larger and non-local business plan.

Following the meeting my concerns grew to include: **What is this product? Where does it come from? Where, three hours south of Holstein is there a certified organic bakery which produces so much food by product that they can ship a 40-tonne truck a week to Mr. Frey? Where does the (assumingly also certified organic) bulk vegetable oil come from? Who is Tek Mac Enterprises? What are the future plans with this property once the zoning is changed? Why here? What if Mr. Frey chooses to transport in a different product with more intense odors and a higher probability of fugitive emissions? How can changes to his business model be regulated to protect the neighbouring homes in the area?**

Very little information is available online related to either ‘Good n’ Green’ or Tek Mac Enterprises. Tek Mac Enterprises’ website is limited and offers very little information. We did find an information sheet created by a company called “Thompson Organics.” The information sheet discussed the various blends available of the ‘Good n’ Green’ product, shares that it is derived from dried microbes and notability calls the product a fertilizer. **Fertilizer.** This is now raising **concerns as to why Mr. Frey is calling his product a “soil additive” rather than fertilizer. Is it because the production of fertilizers is heavy regulated and requires many more permits than a “soil additive?”**

From my research, fertilizer and soil amendments (aka soil additives) have many similarities, but are two different products. They have different formulas and serve different purposes. Soil amendments are products added to the soil to improve its texture. The product creates air pockets that will enhance aeration while accelerating root development. Fertilizer adds nutrients to the soil and improves plant growth. It is not used to enhance soil consistency. It is only used to target specific plant needs and soil nutrient deficiencies. For example, applying fertilizer in clay soil won't make the texture looser. It will not improve the soil's consistency. Fertilizer is sold with different elemental mixtures, and the ratios in the packaging reflect the formula. 1-1-1 fertilizers, for instance, have a balanced ratio of nitrogen, potassium, and phosphorus.

The information sheet from Thompson Organics speaks of various blends and their

formulas. On Tek Mac's website, they share photos of various crops along with information on how much of their product was added for nutrition to increase yields. Without saying the words fertilizer, Tek Mac is advertising their 'Good n' Green' products as nutrition for crops, not soil additives. Another noteworthy comment on the 'Good n' Green' info sheet from Thompson Organics is that the powders are very dusty and should be applied under low wind conditions.

Are there tests that could be done to determine what this product actually is? We still know very little about what these grounds are, but given Mr. Frey's vague description and the information gathered from the info sheet we can assume that they would be considered a 'non-agricultural source material' and would be required to follow regulations related to permanent nutrient storage facilities. These regulations speak to enhanced requirements for smell reduction. This is turning into much more than a shortage shed or barn. To date, I have not seen a copy of the blueprints for this structure or the building permit but the enormous foundation for the building is visible from the road. **Could these documents be made available?**

Again, why here? The logistics don't add up. Transport the product from three hours away, truck oil in, mix them together then ship it out again, potentially across Canada via train. Three hours south of this area, train tracks are plentiful. **Why bring it north to add one ingredient?**

The proposal already mentions a future grain drying operation. Once the zoning is changed, the residents of the area will have no input as to the size or scale of this operation. The proposal states the operation should qualify as a Class 1 Industrial Facility and notes the hours of operation are limited to daytime. Upon review of the Industrial Categorization Criteria, I am of the opinion that a fertilizer plant and grain drying operation should be at least a Class 2 Industrial Facility given noise will be audible off property, there will be dust and odor, and there will be frequent movement of products and/or heavy trucks with the majority of movements during daytime hours.

My husband and I are business owners in the town of Arthur. Our business is located in a properly zoned commercial and industrial area two kilometers from the organic processing plant. We can smell the organics plant from our business. We are also located 500 meters from a grain drying operation. The drone of the grain drying can be heard inside our business, there is noise pollution from the elevators and dust (such as corn husks) that float through the air to land on our vehicles and buildings. From experience, during harvest season, grain drying operations continue around the clock. Not just during daytime hours as the proposal would suggest. **Who would be responsible for policing the hours of Mr. Frey's operation?**

Our home is located approximately one kilometer from the proposed fertilizer factory and grain drying operation. From our experience in Arthur, there is no way this operation will not negatively impact the ability for us to enjoy our peaceful residential property. **Would you want this increased traffic, noise and smells in your neighbourhood?**

The proposal claims that “about 60 40-tonne trucks per year will be delivering the unfinished product to the Frey farm and about the same number will be hauling away” These numbers do not include the delivery of the vegetable oil additive. Additionally, “traffic associated with the grain drying operation would likely increase to several truck trips per week during harvest season.” Southgate Road 41 is already a busy road and we feel this increased traffic should warrant a traffic study. The road has narrow shoulders, pedestrian traffic and is the location of my daughter’s school bus stop.

The Public Works department has noted a Commercial Paved Entrance would be required at the subject property should the zoning be amended. Mr. Frey’s property is located on a stretch of road with a posted speed limit of 80km/hr. There is a dip in the road near the forested area of his property. **Could we please have a sight line assessment completed to ensure the trucks entering and exiting Mr. Frey’s property have a clear view and do not lead to an accident?**

I have reviewed the Township of Southgate’s Asset Management Plan 2022. The plan notes that paved road surfaces are typically assigned life spans of 15 to 25 years before planned resurfacing is required, whereas Southgate has been using a 50-year paved road life span. It goes on to read that the 2019 Triton study found, “nearly one-third of Southgate’s hardtop roads were in need of rehabilitation. Triton noted that because many Southgate roads were hard-surfaced at the time of amalgamation with thin lift asphalt pavement, many of those roads have now reached the end of their service life.”

Southgate road 41 is already in visible need of repair, with many sections crumbling away and numerous cold patches of asphalt applied. **Does the Township have a plan to resurface the road in the near future given that it is already degrading and we will be increasing traffic flow with this proposal?** The same Asset Management Plan estimates replacement value for rural paved roads at \$275,000 per kilometer. The stretch of Southgate Road 41 from London Road in Mount Forest to Southgate Road 12 is approximately seven kilometers. **Do we have 2 million dollars set aside in our budget for this project?** Not to mention the bridges and culverts along the same seven-kilometer stretch. **Should taxpayers have to endure even larger increases to our already high property taxes to foot the bill for faster than planned road decay related to the increased traffic in this proposal?**

Could I please be forwarded a copy of the 2019 Triton Study mentioned in the Asset Management Plan 2022 as well as the most recent 10-year capital budget for roads?

Can we please have a traffic study conducted before considering the zoning amendment? Beyond the volume of traffic concerns, we question if the bridge near Southgate Road 6 is equipped to handle the constant weight of these loads.

Back to the fact that this “product” they listed is very dusty and I see no reason to not call it a fertilizer, **are we concerned about fire safety?** Dust from the product as well as dust from the grain drying operation are both highly flammable. **Will this building be equipped**

with a fire suppression system? Is the Wellington North Fire Department (who responds to fire calls in our area) prepared to battle a fire on such a large structure with multiple outbuildings in close proximity? Is there a pond on the property that could be used as a water source to extinguish a fire?

Thank you for listening to my concerns, I look forward to receiving responses to all my questions prior to or during the Council Meeting. I hope you can understand my point of view and see that if this was your neighbourhood, you would also be asking questions.

I plan to join the public meeting on January 22nd via zoom and would like an opportunity to speak during the meeting. We would also like to be notified of Council's decision regarding this proposed zoning by-law amendment

Melanie Hoerd

Websites and documents referenced in my email

[Zoning bylaws | Citizen's guide to land use planning | ontario.ca](#)

[c37-24-planning-justification-report-updated_redacted.pdf](#)

[Garden Soil Amendment vs Fertilizer - What's the Difference – ECOgardener](#)

[Corn | TEK MAC Enterprises](#)

[Good-N-Green-Organic-Input-Info-Sheet2019.pdf](#) *Note: Thompson Organics was purchased by Andersons Canada in 2020.

[Non-agricultural source materials \(NASM\) | ontario.ca](#)

[Storage of non-agricultural source materials in a permanent nutrient storage facility | ontario.ca](#)

[D-6-1 Industrial Categorization Criteria | ontario.ca](#)

[c37-24-public-works-comments_redacted.pdf](#)

[filestream.ashx](#)