

London Dairy Farms Ltd

3700 Old Victoria Rd. London

March 9, 2015

To Planning Department, Planning Committee and Council

About us

- 1.) We are the second largest milk producer in Canada. We have 2500 paid hours of employment a week on the farm and in addition to those employees many other people, such as service men, cattle and milk truckers and people supplying us with feed etc. directly make a living from our activities. We are valuable to the city. We need to protect our livelihood and it is in all of our interests to do so.
- 2.) Agriculture and industry and people don't mix very well. That is why there are minimum distances of separation required. It should be noted that these are minimum distances.
- 3.) Provincial policy 2.3 says prime agricultural areas should be protected for long term use for agriculture. The land in this area around us is as good as it gets in this province. On the west side of the city (401 & 402 area) the land though characterized similarly it is not nearly as good.
- 4.) We have built a very nice setup that lends to expansion, as the infrastructure, which is the hard part to construct, already exists. We have always had those plans. It would be unfair to make it impossible for us to go forward with them as would be the case with the creation of the proposed industrial zone east of us.
- 5.) The area north of the 401 is cut up pretty badly already and logically the next to develop.
- 6.) The area south of the 401 is prime agriculture.
- 7.) South of the 401 at Highbury are developments and we understand they will move east.
- 8.) The area south of the 401 and east of us should remain agricultural. Any development east of us would be an orphan piece, like an island, all alone. It would not be attached to anything. It is not a logical extension of any existing or proposed development.
- 9.) Any development east of us would box us in between two industrial zones. That is a bad idea. That would be very bad planning. Tractors, tillage equipment, sprayers, harvesters and other slow moving vehicles are a toxic blend when cars and people are added. In addition, manure and smells become a big issue. It is bad enough to have an industrial zone on one side but being boxed in and getting it from both sides is exponentially worse.
- 10.) We are not against development. We understand it is a fact of life. We are against industry too close to us and particularly east of us. Expansion of the industrial areas has to be needed. The approach has to be balanced and tantamount to other issues, it has to be logical. The city's position in these areas is far too weak.

### About the area and the city's process

11.) There is a huge piece of land to the north off Bradley. It is raw land surrounded by developed parcels. It is referred to as the donut. The city will acknowledge that it is fully developable but says it is more costly to do so than the lands they have chosen. We suggested that cost savings in light of provincial policy is not a valid trade off. Immediate cost savings should not make a difference and we believe it is not a valid argument because the price paid to develop will be the same. Its pay now or pay later but it's the same. In the donut there would be more land owners that the city would have to deal with than on the land they have proposed to rezone. This was mentioned as another reason that the donut has been avoided. Easier for the city does not determine good planning and is evidence of a very poor approach. We don't understand why that area would not be the first to go?

12.) The piece east of us was not the city's first choice. It was not chosen by desire but by elimination of others which cannot be termed as good planning. We were told that more land west of us was desired but it was determined that the percentage of sensitive areas on it were too high. However, we were told no one from the city ever took a close look, walked the property or tried to figure out how to get a maximum use out of it.

13.) A good argument could be made that a logical extension of the industrial zone would occur continuing east on Bradley. That land would be north of the 401 and east of the city boundary on land controlled by Thames Center. In fact Thames Center has applied to rezone it. The city of London has objected to the rezoning. What an irony. It's the right place but the city is opposed to it because they don't benefit directly. As a resident in the area and in terms of the greater good we find this appalling.

14.) The city believes industry will only move to London if it's on the east side of the city and this is just blatantly false.

15.) The city says industry will come to London to get 401 visibility. Only a few facilities, along the highway itself would be visible. The majority of buildings would be behind those few and would not be visible so that argument loses weight. Some industries such as Toyota in Woodstock on the 401 have spent fortunes hiding themselves from visibility. The majority of industries in other centers such as Kitchener, Guelph, Hamilton and the Toronto groups are not visible to major highways. Actual visibility, though the city claims otherwise, as evidenced above, is not a critical factor.

16.) We have read the "one window comments" and it appears to us that all provincial ministries are against the city either for what they are trying to do or how they are trying to do it. In that light we will say we have not been given honest or consistent information by the city either.