

From: [Lindsey Green](#)
To: [Elisha Milne](#); [Victoria Mance](#); [Bill White](#); [Ken Melanson](#)
Subject: FW: CR37-24 Zoning Bylaw Amendment
Date: January 20, 2025 12:50:35 PM
Attachments: [C37-24 MacTavish.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
Importance: High

Thank you,

Lindsey

Lindsey Green, Dipl.M.A.

Municipal Clerk

Township of Southgate

185667 Grey County Rd. 9, Dundalk, ON N0C 1B0

519-923-2110 ext. 230 | Fax 519-923-9262

lgreen@southgate.ca | www.southgate.ca



From: MacTavish [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2025 11:43 AM
To: Lindsey Green <lgreen@southgate.ca>
Subject: CR37-24 Zoning Bylaw Amendment
Importance: High

Hello Linsey Green,

We have attached a written document containing some of our objections to the Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment Proposal CR37-24. Please consider the attached document to be a written submission in objection to the approval of CR37-24. Please ensure we are kept informed of the status and all changes regarding the Zoning Bylaw Amendment Proposal.

Regards

David and Colette MacTavish

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Re: C37-24

Application for Zoning By-law Amendment

Part Gore Lot A, Concession 9

Geographic Township of Egremont, Township of Southgate

County of Grey

411575 Southgate Sideroad 41

Owner: Mark and Irene Frey

To ensure there is no question regarding the proposed zoning bylaw amendment application for 411575 SR41 we strongly oppose the approval of this application. We thought it best to limit our comments to a single page. This application has been prepared by a professional Land Use Planning Consultant. In our minds that means the application is intentionally worded in a manner most likely to gain approval from the Township and to mitigate objections from neighbours and the community. In our opinion the omissions, vague wording and lack of transparency are intentional. Please take our points below into consideration:

- 1) We are concerned that the manner in which the introduction and in fact the whole application is worded. In our opinion it is intentionally vague allowing for a much broader future use. It is likely the impact will be much more severe more unacceptable to the neighbours and the Township. While I am unable to provide direct legally binding proof there currently appears to be two commercial non-agriculture businesses (Cross Country Eavestrough and Riverside Construction) operating from that address in direct contravention of the current zoning. Given this disregard for current restrictions how can the community have any faith that proposed zoning change will be adhered to.
- 2) There is mention of an increase in heavy truck traffic on local roads but it has been restricted to just the delivery of the primary product from the unknown source. If anything one would expect the truck traffic estimated for primary delivery has been drastically understated. All other truck activity associated with the intended business have been conveniently not mentioned. I expect they will be considerable. This would be further exasperated by a grain drying business. At this time, there are a considerable number of heavy trucks on SR41 and as has been the case while I have lived in the area there is very limited adherence to speed limits and no effort to enforce those limits.
- 3) "Certified Organic Soil Additive" page 1: The implications related to a product that is "Certified" and "Organic" are quite broad terms and are often used to mislead. Who is certifying this soil additive and how is that organization qualified to certify the end product. Organic implies chemical free which raises another issue, what is the food by-product (page 2) being used and how is it determined that it meets the strict adherence to being "organic". Organic can be nothing more than chemical compounds with carbon atoms. These types of details should be included with references. Is the term "Certified Organic Soil Additive" nothing more than an attempt to disguise a bulk fertilizer distribution facility.
- 4) In addition, on page 2 there is a reference to another site where a biodigester is used to remove ammonia. For transparency more information should be included about licences etc. related to the source of the material and specific details about the source to ensure all legal requirements are being met.
- 5) On Page 2, Vegetable oil (very generic, what vegetable oil?) is to be used to reduce dust, how much oil will be stored on site, how will be transported, how will it be applied and what measures will be taken to ensure there is no possibility of leakage and eventual contamination of the adjacent Environmentally Protected Areas.
- 6) There is no mention of odours resulting from the soil additive function. Is this an oversight or intentional omission?

Hopefully the Township of Southgate will give our comments serious consideration.

Regards

David and Colette MacTavish,

