

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

17. Industrial Land Review” Urban Growth Boundary for future Industrial Growth (O-8014)

- Alan R. Patton, Patton Cormier & Associates, on behalf of three property owners, being Cardigan Inc., Bruinlyn Farms Inc. and Ed Pearl Holdings - identifying the lands owned by Cardigan and Bruinlyn Farms; indicating that the proposal brings Cardigan into the Urban Growth Boundary but with an urban reserve designation; advising that Bruinlyn Farms is on the other side of the future Veterans Memorial Parkway extension down to Wilton Grove Road; advising that the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is expropriating property from Bruinlyn for an additional cloverleaf and is also expropriating a parcel of land from Cardigan; advising that the City is moving to expropriate land all the way down to Wilton Grove Road to build Veterans Memorial Parkway as an arterial road; advising that they are challenging the expropriation and the Hearing of Necessity is to be held later this month; stating that Hearings of Necessity are basically can you justify the expropriation; indicating that the interesting thing is that what is proposed by the City is to take land from both of my clients, some from the MTO and the largest chunk by the City; advising that after the taking Bruinlyn will be left out of the Urban Growth Area but will have frontage on a major arterial road from Wilton Grove Road; indicating that the City, in order to service these lands for industrial use, will have to either bring services along the Veterans Memorial Parkway as an arterial road or bring services along Wilton Grove Road past my clients property and past the farming operation Mr. Card has written about; indicating that one way or another the Cardigan and Bruinlyn lands will be serviced, but inexplicably your building massive infrastructure while leaving one side of the road out of the urban growth boundary even though it serves the same function or characteristics of the other side; stating that it doesn't make sense; stating that Cardigan is in and Bruinlyn is inexplicably out for no valid planning reason, however, we know that the farm operation that Mr. Card has identified is there; indicating that the City is going to have to make a decision; indicating that this land is probably the most valuable strategic piece of industrial land with massive infrastructure being invested by the province, and the City to be not only left out but put in urban reserve; indicating that both sides of the extension of the Veterans Memorial Parkway down to Wilton Grove Road will be shovel ready with either having to provide services down the south or down Wilton Grove Road; stating that he expects to find that out at the hearing at the end of June; identifying the third clients property Ed Pearl Holdings; stating that they have fantastic visibility to the 401 and frontage on to Wilton Grove Road; stating he doesn't see the validity of excluding lands on the north side of Wilton Grove Road where they have frontage and visibility on the 401 and access to the improved Veterans Memorial Parkway; stating it just makes no sense to hop, skip and jump around; advising he knows the farm operation wants to be left alone; indicating that this raises some significant problems that the City will have to deal with; indicating that this is a policy decision; indicating that in terms of the objective for prime industrial land clearly desirable, that is what Pearl Holdings is; expressing that as a lawyer with a background in planning and 30 years' experience he cannot see any justification for leaving that strip of land, from the extension of the Veterans Memorial Parkway over to where it is to be included, out and indicating that the land is serviceable; advising that he is familiar with Woodstock; indicating that they brought all the land of this type along the 401 at the 403 corridor and serviced it quickly; stating that they now have a new Sisco plant and other industrial land and are taking advantage of the 401 corridor; advising that is what industrial users want; stating that he has made his pitch on behalf of Cardigan; indicating that they should stay and that they are going to lose land lightly in an expropriation even if the hearings officer at the Hearing of Necessity says it's does not sound fair and reasonably necessary to take it, indicating that the expropriation act says thank you for your opinion but we are taking it anyway; indicating that it's a 120 foot wide arterial road right down to Wilton Grove Road and when you take that and start building that he would hope that you would put the infrastructure in but if not you had better plan on infrastructural along Wilton Grove Road otherwise what are you really achieving you will not achieve the

success along the south side of 401 and it's just not continuous or integrated and for the life of me I cannot explain it to my client because I just don't think it's justifiable; requesting that the City would at least, on behalf of his clients, send it back to staff and bring at least those 3 in; stating he doesn't know who owns the rest of it; indicating he guesses that Mr. Card's client owns the dairy farm and that he may address that in terms of their causing problems; indicating that is not a location for agricultural operations but it's there; and, thanking the committee.

- Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning, on behalf of three property owners – advising that she is representing two landowners in the White Oaks Business Park; realizing that these properties are not part of the properties that are under consideration, but they are the two major landowners that have requested the City to consider the redesignation of those industrial lands for other purposes; stating that the reason for this is that they have tried, unsuccessfully, over the years to generate interest from any industrial users for their properties; noting that these are the Bluestone properties and Tradewind properties; advising that they own, combined, 100 hectares of land in the White Oaks area; indicating that the properties run from Exeter Road to the north, all the way down to Dingman Drive; indicating that they are the two major landowners in the White Oaks Business Park and have had little, if no interest, in those properties; she has had ongoing discussions with staff about the appropriateness of that area for business employment purposes as it has limited visibility, it has significant servicing constraints and it also has concerns with accessibility off of Wellington Street; indicating that they have suggested that the City look at this area and consider reallocating those industrial lands in a more strategic location and that is what is being presented to you this evening; indicating that it makes imminent sense to look at the lands along Veterans Memorial Parkway in proximity of the 401 interchange; advising that Bluestone and Tradewind properties are in support of this initiative; advising that they believe that the City needs to be competitive and the most competitive and most strategically located lands are along the Highway 401 corridor, and that is what you have at the Veterans Memorial Parkway location; indicating that the third owner that she is here on behalf of this evening is VMP-1 parcel, as referenced in the staff report; advising that the property is located south of Bradley Avenue, just east of Highbury Avenue; indicating that what the Committee will find quite obvious is that with these shaded areas being brought in, you now have this hole in the donut, land that is completely surrounded by lands within the Urban Growth Boundary and, in particular, this parcel that is south of Bradley Avenue also has exposure to Highway 401 and is going to be immediately west of business employment lands and to the north of business employment lands so it would make sense that this parcel is considered in the context of this larger urban growth expansion; advising that she has had some discussions with staff and she understands the concern is that, by bringing this land in, south of Bradley Avenue, it would then create this little isolated parcel which, as she understands, has been identified for future community growth; indicating to the Committee and staff is that when the White Oaks Official Plan Amendment is being reviewed, and if there is the opportunity to reallocate additional industrial lands, the parcel both south and north be looked at in the context of employment and not to shackle this parcel by saying that it cannot come in until the larger lands north of Bradley; expressing support of the expansion in this area of the City; and, believing that it is appropriate but we also think this parcel needs to be looked at as one of the strategic parcel as well, in context with what the City staff is recommending to you this evening.
- Stan Topilko, 4563 White Oak Road – indicating that he had requested, years ago, to have his property included in the Urban Growth Boundary; advising that he was lacking industrial sewer and some other infrastructure; and, indicating that today that has changed and there is a major sewer going down Dingman Road. (See attached presentation.)
- Gary Brown, 35A-59 Ridout Street – indicating that he has a hard time disconnecting this from the current industrial development charge review that is going on; advising that it is his understanding that the taxpayers will pay completely to service this land; indicating that he is not sure why we are expanding our industrial growth boundary but he will leave it to people who know a lot more about it than he does; indicating that this is a good plan; enquiring as to the dollar figure to what the taxpayers are going to have to

pay because we pay for the roads, we pay for the sewers and the water service on all industrial lands; noting that it is all 100 percent exemption, no matter what, with no conditions; and, enquiring as to, for every hectare that we add to the Urban Growth Boundary, what is that going to add to the taxpayers to service and develop this land.

- Alex Sumner, 1871 and 1913 Bradley Avenue – advising that his family came to this area in 1817 from Vermont so they have spent a lot of years paying taxes here; indicating that they put in a request to have their properties included; outlining that some of the merits of the property are that the City has already spent huge infrastructure bringing a water main on the eastern boundary of their property to service the Summerside subdivision approximately 15 years ago; indicating that there was an expropriation from the Ministry of Transportation for the access to Highway 401 and, as you know, a private developer brought services to the Summerside subdivision; reiterating that there are a lot of merits to this property; indicating that he has not reviewed the scoring system that the Planning Department used; advising that they have also been private builders and developers for the last 30 years and they have their own ambitious plans for this property; realizing that it will be employment land in the future; advising that there is a major employment land developer to the east of the City of London that we have to compete against and they have their own Planning Department; requesting the Council members be fair in their consideration because they would like to bring some private plans forward for development; and, indicating that they would hate to be shut out if they are thinking that the City is the only developer on Bradley Avenue; advising that they have been there for so long that they are not just speculators, they have paid their dues there; reiterating that they would like the Committee to give fair consideration to include that area within the Urban Growth Boundary; and, noting that it is not just planning by numbers, it is people who invest in the community, spend their lives here and there are good opportunities on this property for economic development for the private sector and the whole city.
- Richard Laidlaw, 1361 Wilton Grove Road – indicating that his property is just on the west side of Highbury Avenue; indicating that just west of his property is Hubrey Avenue, which is all industrial park; indicating that what the City is proposing on the east side will now be industrial park and he is sitting in the middle and he is excluded; enquiring as to why he has been excluded; believing that it is not because he has partly swamp land because looking at the map provided at the meeting, he sees a fair number of parcels with swamp land included in what you are considering; and, enquiring as to what considerations were taken and why the line was not just drawn straight across along Green Valley Road instead of taking this little hop to the north and then back to the south again.