

**From:** [Lindsey Green](#)  
**To:** [Elisha Milne](#); [Victoria Mance](#); [Bill White](#); [Ken Melanson](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment; Mark & Irene Frey C37-24  
**Date:** January 17, 2025 9:38:06 AM

---

**From:** Elaine Rundle [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2025 4:48 PM  
**To:** Lindsey Green <[lgreen@southgate.ca](mailto:lgreen@southgate.ca)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment; Mark & Irene Frey C37-24

Thursday, January 16, 2025

Township of Southgate  
185667 Grey Rd. 9  
Dundalk, Ontario  
N0C 1B0

Attention: Lindsey Green, Clerk

Dear Lindsey  
Re: Application for Zoning By-law Amendment  
Mark and Irene Frey  
411575 Southgate Sideroad 41  
**Subject Land C37-24**

We received a Notice of Public Meeting letter regarding the above application, on Monday, January 6, 2025, which has left us very little time to peruse the proposal set forth in the report from Ron Davidson Land Use Planning Consultant Inc. and to do any research and prepare for said meeting. It is very disconcerting that it took so long for the adjacent landowners to receive any correspondence regarding this matter, given that it has been in the works for months.

The report from Jason Dodds of the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority, dated October 4, 2024 mentions 7 times that Mark Frey plans to build an "agricultural storage shed". Why would an agricultural storage shed require a zoning by-law amendment? And why, suddenly, would the Hazard Zone mapping area change, as indicated in the amended map that was included with the correspondence sent by Mr. Dodds to the township on October 3, 2024?

We find that the wording in the proposal from Ron Davidson is very vague and hard for a lay person to grasp. We were left with more questions than answers. It states that Mr. Frey proposes to erect a new building on the site, which infers that it is not yet built; we are wondering then, what the recently-constructed concrete structure with the high concrete partitions is?

We also ask for clarification on exactly what "the home industry that would involve the making of certified organic soil additive" is. Again, because we find the wording vague, we would like to know **exactly** what the "food by-product" is. There are many organic soil additives and the proposal does not state what that is specifically and just because something has the appearance of ground coffee,

as stated on page 2, does not mean that it will smell like ground coffee. We are very concerned that this may smell like AllTreat Farms in Arthur once did.

The report states **repeatedly** that Mr. Frey has no intention of operating a grain drying business in the near future and we, respectfully, question if even mentioning this is, in fact, only a way for the home industry of soil additives to qualify as agriculture, in order for the by-law amendment to pass. A loophole, per se. Table 7, Section 5.4 Rural Land Use Type of the Official Plan specifically identifies grain drying as an example of agricultural-related use.

Mr. Frey states that the soil additive business will employ only himself and his immediate family members. He further states that should the business expand to include the grain drying operation it would only employ himself and his children. We don't know the exact ages of his children, but the 3 oldest children that pass by our house on their way to school appear to be only 6,8,and 9 years of age, approximately. Far too young to be anywhere near either of these business operations, for safety-sake. This is most-concerning to us.

Subject Property - on page 2 of the report makes no mention of the construction business, Cross Country Eavestrough, that already operates out of this farm and includes multiple employees on-site. Figure 1: Site Plan does not label any of the out-buildings as such. Why is that?

Mr. Frey, as stated on page 6 of the report, may be of the opinion that any noise emanating from these operations will be minimal and not audible from the front of his property, but what about the neighbours behind and beside him? The report infers there is only one nearby house 290 metres to the west of the site. There are, in fact, 3 residences to the west of this site as well as a farm to the east, a farm to the north, our residence to the south and another residence to the west of us who may be impacted. Perhaps outside minimum distance separation requirements, but all closely situated to the Frey farm.

Grain dryers can be very loud and, apparently, produce sound levels from 85 decibels up to 112 decibels. Noise pollution is another concern.

Mr. Frey states that should the grain dryer be added it would not intensify the noise level as it would be located inside the building. Is locating a grain dryer INSIDE a building not a huge fire risk?

Page 8 of the report mentions that the trees along the easterly rear lot line of the subject property will provide for a visual screening of the site - we are confused by this as there is merely scrub brush along the easterly fence-line not a solid visual barrier. Is Mr. Frey proposing to plant trees to provide a berm? Is that what is indicated on Figure 1: Site Plan drawing?

Page 9 of the report states that the subject lands are recognized as NOT being situated within a prime agricultural area! How can that be? We recognize that there are veins of aggregates in this area, but Mr. Frey himself farms and there are on-going farming operations on 3 sides of the Frey property.

Figure 2: Township of Southgate Zoning By-law Schedule A diagram shows that the proposed home industry would be in the Hazard Land mapping zone and yet in Figure 3: Proposed Zoning, the

Hazard Zone mapping magically divides to put the home industry outside of the Hazard Zone. There is a drainage ditch/water course to the north of the proposed industry. Is the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority not concerned about this?

We want to state that, as things stand right now, we are opposed to this proposal and we want to be notified of the decision of the Township of Southgate Council. We will be attending the meeting at the Holstein council chambers on Wed, January 22, 2025. Is it possible for all our concerns and questions to be put forth at the meeting? Will answers to some of our questions possibly be provided before the meeting? Or, if not, then, at this meeting?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dwight & Elaine Rundle

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]