

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

11. Lands south of Exeter Road, North of Dingman Drive, east of White Oak Road and west of the Marr Drain - Recommended Urban Growth Boundary Expansion for Future Industrial Growth (O-8014/O-8362)
 - Michelle Doornbosch, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Farhi Holdings – indicating that her client has a parcel of land that has been identified in the staff report as being Wonderland Area 3 that is shown on page 194 of the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC) Agenda; advising that this property is on the northwest corner of Wonderland Road and Highway 401; realizing that the Chair advised the public that all previous comments have been reviewed; however, this is the first time that they have actually been in front of the Committee to discuss this parcel in particular so this is all new information even coming forward to staff; advising that they did have a chance to look at the summary that was provided for these blocks and they do have some concerns with some of the information that was provided; outlining that, on page 193 of the PEC Agenda, this parcel is noted as having compatibility issues with existing and planned land uses; noting that this information is in the middle of the chart on page 193 of the PEC Agenda; questioning the appropriateness of the rating or scaling that has been provided; indicating that the lands that surround this property are similar to the lands that are proposed surrounding the blocks of land as suggested as being appropriate at the Veterans Memorial Parkway; advising that there are the four blocks that are proposed by staff as lands to be added to the Urban Growth Boundary; reiterating that those lands are surrounded by some Open Space lands, some Agricultural lands and this subject parcel would generally be in the same vicinity of that type of development, but, again, is approximate to Highway 401; referring to the chart located in the staff report, it is also noted that there is development or acquisition concerns; advising that she is not entirely sure what staff means by that item in particular as their client has been promoting this and trying to come up with a solution in terms of how to develop these lands over the long term for the future; speaking to these items and our concerns about how this parcel has been scaled, we note that, at the westerly limit of the City, the Wonderland Road/Highway 401 interchange is currently under construction and the basis for that intersection was to draw traffic in from Highway 401 at the closest point of the City as people are coming in from the west; indicating that this was the basis when the discussions with the Ministry of Transportation first occurred; reiterating that the City is now undertaking this construction but there is no development that is being proposed at this limit; noting that the City's development lands do not even extend out that far, basically, it does look like an area that it's not a part of the City of London; advising that when the draft London Plan was released, it did have some discussion and notes in it with respect to the Highway 401 corridor and the Highway 402 corridor; indicating that it is noted that the Plan acknowledges that there is opportunity to capitalize on the City's proximity to the Highway 401 and Highway 402 corridors by providing opportunities for Industrial development with highway frontage and through sites that are highly accessible to these highways; recognizing that, yes, Veterans Memorial Parkway is an appropriate location, there is an interchange there, but at the same time, what kind of vision are we looking for for this City over the long term as what are we going to promote at the west end of the City; pointing out that it has also been noted by staff that a lot of the draw for the Industrial lands comes from Toronto and not from the border; noting that this could change over time; indicating that, as well as what has been promoted in the London Plan, to have a long-term vision for this City and if we are going to have a broad vision for the City, we need to contemplate what could also be considered as appropriate for the west limit of the city; outlining that, on that basis, not only that, over the long term, with respect to the Highway 401 corridor, between Highbury Avenue and Veterans Memorial Parkway, there are limited lands that do have frontage directly onto Highway 401 and, as well, even one of the blocks that is currently proposed to be incorporated does not have frontage onto Highway 401; asking staff to consider, in these sorts of instances, we are asking staff to consider what are we going

to do with the west end of the city; enquiring as to why the Wonderland Road interchange was constructed without plans for the future as to how we are going to draw that traffic in and how we are going to bring that component of the area into the City; acknowledging that the City of London boundary does extend beyond that; pointing out that, as you are at the easterly limit of the City, the Industrial lands are almost built out right to the boundary; noting that beyond that, obviously, it is a different municipality; asking the Planning and Environment Committee to look at future plans at the westerly limit and to see if there is an opportunity that we can look for a long-term vision for this area as an Industrial area as well.

- Richard Zelinka, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of TRY Recycling – advising that TRY Recycling operates the Dingman Environmental Centre located at 3544 Dingman Drive; indicating that this is a major recycling facility for the recycling of construction and demolition waste; pointing out the area that he is talking about using major landmarks; noting that it is at the southeast corner of the Dingman area; advising that, through its recycling program, the TRY Recycling facility diverts a lot of waste that would otherwise go to landfill sites in the area and converts them into usable materials; advising that this has always been recognized as a good location for this, being next to these somewhat offensive City facilities, the sewage type facilities, this was seen as a good location for what is a general industrial facility; noting that it is not a Light Industrial facility, it is a general industrial facility; indicating that the Official Plan in this area was put into place to provide for this facility; zoning was put into place to provide for it, over the entire site; indicating that there is a Ministry of the Environment Certificate of Approval for the recycling facility over the entire site and a City site plan covering the operation; advising that, at this time, TRY Recycling's plans are to continue and to expand its operation within this area of the City, in accordance with the approved Ministry of the Environment and City plans; pointing out that TRY has asked that the existing General Industrial designation be retained on the lands; noting that TRY is aware that changing conditions over time may affect their long-term desirability at this location and has, therefore, agreed that the lands can be properly reviewed as part of a future Secondary Plan for the area; expressing support for that as we have no issue with that matter; reiterating that TRY is content to have their lands included in that and generally supports the direction that City staff is taking; however, there is one issue that Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, touched on that he would like to bring to the Planning and Environment Committee's attention; pointing out that, at the north end of the site, within the existing General Industrial designation and zoning, there is a portion of a vegetation patch; indicating that natural heritage studies were completed as part of the Dingman Area Plan which was prior to this operation being established; advising that those studies determined that this portion of the patch did not warrant retention as part of the long-term strategy for the area indicating that all those lands were zoned and the Official Plan, the Zoning By-law, the Official Plan, the Site Plan By-law and the Ministry of the Environment plan all recognize that; advising that, after having this area declared as an area that was not appropriate or necessary for retention, TRY Recycling did not go ahead and cut down all the trees in that remnant area; noting that that could have been done, it could have been done in accordance with the approved designation for the area and zoning, but TRY retained the vegetation patch in its entirety as a buffer for the area between its operation and the lands to the north, which are also Industrial but the intention was to make sure that there was a good separation there; indicating that they have asked that all of the TRY Recycling lands that are currently designated General Industrial be left in the General Industrial designation; advising that the current recommendation from staff is to redesignate the northerly area with an Environmental Review designation effectively putting the current operation and lands into a situation of non-conformity with the Plan; recognizing that there are approvals in place for the continuation of the operation; however, he believes that a land owner should not be penalized for retaining trees on a property and the approved plans should not, through this process, be made non-conforming with the Official Plan; pointing out that, on the other hand, TRY is not opposed to those lands being studied as part of the Secondary Plan process; noting that the Secondary Plan Draft Terms of Reference include a review of natural heritage features and natural hazards within the area and that can be done without these lands being in an Environmental Review designation; noting that the

Terms of Reference do not make specific reference to the designation of the lands, only to the natural heritage features; indicating that, as Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, has said that this is a new application, because of the change to the Official Plan and the change to the South West Area Plan; noting that it is a new application, on behalf of the City in this case, that it was necessary to put these lands into an Environmental Review designation; however, their request to planning staff initially and to the Planning and Environment Committee tonight is to leave the TRY lands, the lands that have been approved for the current operation, in their existing General Industrial designation; advising that, by doing that, there is no change to the Plan; noting that these lands are not part of a new application and there is no imperative to make such a change; and, asking that the recommendations, as passed on to Council, leave the existing lands, the TRY lands, in their General Industrial designation, the Official Plan and their Industrial designation in the South West Area Plan as well.

- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of John Cox – indicating that Mr. Cox owns lands at 3640 Dingman Drive, just to the west of the lands that Mr. Zelinka was talking about; advising that he will echo many of the comments that Mr. Zelinka made in that they would request that their lands remain in the General Industrial designation; advising that they believe that redesignating these lands is premature at the moment considering that they do not know the specific nature of what the Urban Reserve lands to the west may develop for; outlining that the Commercial Industrial designation that the City is proposing for their lands is intended to act more or less as a transition from sensitive land uses towards heavier industrial uses; however, those sensitive land uses do not yet exist; advising that, at this point, we would like to retain the ability to use those general industrial lands for general industrial purposes; and, requesting that the Planning and Environment Committee omit 3640 Dingman Drive from the proposed Official Plan Amendments to redesignate the lands as Commercial Industrial and leave the lands as General Industrial.
- Alan R. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, on behalf of Cardigan, Brunlyn Farms Inc. and Ed Pearl Holdings - using the map on page 78 of the staff report (page 239 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda) as best as he can to describe where his clients' lands are located; indicating that Cardigan owns 100 acres of land from Highway 401 running parallel down the future extension of the Veterans Memorial Parkway down to Wilton Grove Road; advising that Brunlyn Farms Inc. owns slightly less of 100 acres of land because there has been a taking for the interchange, but they own a similar amount of land on the west side of the future Veterans Memorial Parkway and Ed Pearl Holdings who owns lands on the north side of Wilton Grove Road; pointing out that however you look at the lands of Cardigan, Brunlyn or Pearl, they share one thing in common, they are the best Industrial lands available for development between the Greater Toronto Area and the Windsor border; expanding on that this way, the Veterans Memorial Parkway was built by the Province in the late 1970's, early 1980's and it was known as Highway 100 and it was built by the Ontario government to open up for London, in east London, large amounts of industrial land; outlining that that has worked, it has worked on both sides of the now Veterans Memorial Parkway from Highway 401 north to the Airport Road/Huron Street industrial area; indicating that the Veterans Memorial Parkway interchanges are now being improved because this is not a full interchange; noting that it has insufficient on and off ramps so what has happened in the last year is the Ministry of Transportation has expropriated land from both Cardigan and Brunlyn for the interchanges and the City of London has expropriated land from his clients in equal amounts for the extension of the Veterans Memorial Parkway as a freeway, but not an Ministry of Transportation Ontario freeway, to go all the way down to Wilton Grove Road and then from Wilton Grove Road, you lead into other areas; reiterating that the Veterans Memorial Parkway interchanges are being improved now; advising that the Province has spent millions of dollars on acquiring land, doing ecological studies, the City is spending now millions of dollars to extend the Veterans Memorial Parkway to Wilton Grove Road, on acquiring land and it is going through the expropriation process because the city appraisers have undervalued it; noting that this is not a big surprise, they do that all the time to try to get you to the table, but it is going to be expropriation and that process is underway; indicating that there is the land costs and the construction costs; advising that the reasons given by the Province in the 1970's for

the Highway 100 interchange and by the City at the hearing of necessity on the expropriation; noting that the hearing of necessity in the Hearings Room on the Lower Level of City Hall was that this, on the part of the city, this was the best, most cost effective industrial land in the City, in the southeast portion, anywhere; pointing out that there are services on Wilton Grove Road, it has high profile, Highway 401 exposure and, as he said, both sides of the Veterans Memorial Parkway extension to Wilton Grove Road are easily serviceable; going to pages 90, 91 and 92 of the staff report (pages 251, 252 and 253 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda) is the Official Plan Amendment and if you could turn to page 92, this is where the Minimum Distance Separation problem arises; indicating that, on the far right hand side of the page, you see a solid arc and it is described as the Urban Growth Boundary with existing Minimum Distance Separation 1 Constraints for Type "A" land use and you will see the arc from the London Dairy Farm which houses some 3,000 head of dairy cattle in a barn and then extends onto the Cardigan lands; pointing out that there is a hash mark in there but he cannot quite determine from the hatching inside that area but that encompasses almost all of the Cardigan lands and as he reads the map and the designation it appears to mean that the area is thought to be outside of the Urban Growth Boundary and not developable at this time; pointing out that the blue area means that it is in the Urban Growth Boundary but there are limited types of industrial uses and the yellow is lands that are designated Urban Reserve Industrial but outside of any restrictions; indicating that it is not necessary to create that arc; advising that the Minimum Distance Separation can be varied; advising that what you are putting in here in your mapping is a roadblock to a variance; indicating that there also are many other opportunities that are common throughout the Province; pointing out that he has used them throughout the Province for agricultural operations where there are warning or notice clauses on title to warn a landowner undertaking industrial development or non-farm residential uses of the existence of the odor source; advising that there are also measures that can be taken by London Dairy Farms to mitigate some of the odor impacts from the manure pile and he is sure you have all seen what is on that land next door; asking that the Cardigan lands be brought into the Urban Growth Boundary without those limitations; pointing out that the pernicious part is that when you read the colour, the blue are uses limited to industrial only and those secondary uses that are permitted in the industrial designation; advising that what you are losing is the most valuable industrial interchange and the serviceability of the land in that area; pointing out that the other property owner that he has is Ed Pearl Holdings and he spoke to this at the Planning and Environment Committee meeting many months ago; referring to page 78 of the staff report and it also is clearly serviceable off of Wilton Grove Road, has a Highway 401 exposure and has easy access to that interchange; advising that, in what is recommended to you, there is land being recommended that is just to the west of that; pointing out that, again, there is this sort of hop skipping around a parcel of land that is to be designated Urban Reserve Industrial, another 100 acre parcel is left in Agricultural and then another piece and that happens on both sides of Wilton Grove Road and he cannot discern from the staff report why there is this some on the north side of Wilton Grove Road, some on the south side when the services exist in the area and Highway 401 and the Veterans Memorial Parkway are so readily accessible; indicating that if you talk to your London Economic Development Corporation, and this was mentioned earlier, what Industrial landowners want and users want, is high profile, high visibility, land that is readily accessible; pointing out that the one that he is most familiar with is the land that Woodstock opened up on the 401/403 interchange; noting that London unfortunately lost an industry to that location; further noting that it is a trucking operation; recognizing from your facial expression that that is a bit of a sore point, but that went down Highway 401 because it was priced cheaper because it was in Woodstock, but any commercial real estate agent, any landowner interested in developing industrial land, they focus first and foremost at the Veterans Memorial Parkway; indicating that that is why Highway 100 was put there initially by the Province, that is why you have expropriated land to go down to Wilton Grove Road and continue that so these lands should go in; advising that he is not here to say take this land out, take that land out, he thinks that that is a mugs game and he thinks that it is justifiable that you can ask the Province to go higher than that; expressing that he does not think that there has been the appropriate discussions held

with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and elected officials about what London needs here and that there can be exceptions to the magic number of a 20 year supply; indicating that many municipalities have well in excess of a 20 year supply; noting that Brantford does; and, advising that he just finished a large project in Brantford.

- Tommy Faulkner, London Dairy Farm – advising that he and his family own London Dairy Farm; indicating that he wrote out for each of you what he hopes you will understand as their position; indicating that he is kind of in an uncomfortable position because he can tell you what he thinks is good for them, he can tell you what he thinks is good planning and then he is kind of forced to tell you what he thinks is not good planning which kind of is not any of his business; outlining that to say that the City should be looking here or there is not what he likes to do because it is not really his business but he is forced to do it because he thinks that there are alternatives that they have missed and it is kind of defending what he thinks; indicating that what he is going to tell you is the gist of what he has to say; hoping that when you read through what he has written, that you get it; advising that he does not believe that people can stop development, it is just a fact of life; advising that he is not here to stop development but it has to make sense; advising that, if the City is going to develop stuff, in his opinion, you would take everything on the north side of Highway 401 and you would develop it and when you are done with that, you would skip over to the south side of Highway 401 and start there; pointing out that if you take a marker or a place like Highbury Avenue and, instead of saying north and south, you go east and west, you will say that the City has developed stuff on the west side of Highbury Avenue so now they are going to come east and he gets that; advising that he happens to be on the south side of Highway 401 and he happens to be on the east side of Highbury Avenue, so if development comes from the north to the south, he gets it, if development comes from Highbury Avenue to the east, he gets it; pointing out that what he does not get, what he thinks is very bad, is to develop anything on the south side of Highway 401 east of him because that boxes him in; outlining that why he thinks that is bad for the City is because they are the second largest dairy farm in Canada; pointing out that they employ a gazillion people; noting that he has 2,500 paid hours a week; advising that we are no little thing here; pointing out that they have got slow moving vehicles and, according to Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, they have 3,000 animals; enquiring as to whether or not you can imagine how much manure that is; noting that the truck out five, six tractor trailer loads of manure a day; reiterating that it is a huge operation; talking about the the minimum distances that Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates referred to, they are called minimum distances, not maximum distances; indicating that anything that would apply, any rule that was made for an average farm to keep them away from something that was offensive to other people, that is a minimum distance; indicating that, with them, that is almost too small and you could make a good argument that it is too small; advising that he respects Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, he respects everybody's own opinions, but you hear what Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, said, he is against the hop skipping approach, he is here to represent his clients' interests, but in his words, he said that hop skipping approach; advising that that is what will happen if you put something east of him as he will be boxed in; asking the Planning and Environment Committee to think how bad that would be, to box in the second largest dairy farm in Canada, between two industrial areas; pointing out that you have got all those conflicts, smell would be one, slow moving vehicles would be one, animals would be another and then just mix it all up with people, it is a recipe for disaster; reiterating that he is not trying to stop development and he is not trying to throw up whatever cards are emotional, it is just that to him it is just really really bad planning to take a place their size and box it in; having said that, that is ninety percent of what he wants the Planning and Environment Committee to understand and try to deal with; indicating that he tried to point out other things and he had to get involved in this process and, frankly, he hates it, he does not enjoy any of that; noting that he had a lot to do with Gregg Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research and Mr. Barrett explained to him that on the north side of Bradley Avenue, there is a thing they call the donut, a big open space on the north side of Highway 401; advising that he enquired as to why that was not developed and Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research advised him that it is more expensive to develop that, to bring the services there than it is to bring the services

east of him on the south side of Highway 401; indicating that he asked if the land is ever going to be developed and he said of course; advising that he told him that, you are going to have to develop it one day so pay for it now or pay for it later; noting that if you pay for it now, it might cost you a few more bucks, but it is orderly development; indicating that if you pay for it later, you do what happens with what Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, said, you get this hop skip approach and you have stuff on the east side of him and stuff on the west side of him and all kinds of developable land in an area where it all makes sense but for a few bucks you do not want to do it; reiterating that you are going to have to do it anyway so pay now or pay later; indicating that that is the kind of stuff that he had to begin to understand and he offers it for your consideration for alternatives; reiterating that he does not like doing that, it is not like he loves to say you have a better idea here and a better idea there it is just that he is being defensive on a do not put it next to him, not because he does not want development, not because it is not going to happen one day, just do not do it yet because there is an orderly way of making development and it goes contiguous to other things and that would be better planning and better for people in London and everybody else; and, asking the Planning and Environment Committee to read what he has provided and if you have any questions, please ask him as he is available any time anyone wants to talk to him. (See attached communication.)

- Roger Caranci, 101 Goldwick Crescent, on behalf of 1787996 Ontario Inc. and 401 L Inc. – advising that he is representing London developers that own property off Highway 401; indicating that his clients own approximately 240 acres just off Highway 401 with a lot of frontage on the 401; noting that he does not have the exact amount of run of Highway 401, but there is altogether 240 acres; noting that 150 are inside the Urban Growth Boundary; pointing out that his clients are simple in what they want to do and are simple by what they have done in putting this parcel together; advising that, over many years, they have first purchased 95 acres, and, in discussing issues with the City of London, they were not pushed, but they saw that it would be better for them to buy another parcel of land, which is 85 acres and then purchase another piece of land after further discussions with City of London officials; outlining the reason for doing that is that there are some limitations to the property but they wanted to put a parcel together that would help industrial or commercial development in the City of London; indicating that, if you are trying to get your bearings on this, this is very close to where PenEquity will be building and where there development is; noting that this is just west of PenEquity on Highway 401; advising that their concerns are that more land be put in place before lands develop that the City of London already has under their disposal to do this; reiterating that these are local developers who want to see things happen here; outlining that they want to see things as, and I will echo what Mr. Faulkner said, they want to see things done in an orderly fashion rather than a hop skip and a jump which Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, used that term in describing that; indicating that he does not want to belabor the point, he just wants to be here to say that they are concerned that other pieces of land will open before this piece of land is actually developed; pointing out that you will notice and we talk about it all the time, we talk about Downtown development, we do not want to see the City of London, the centre of the core become a zone where nothing happens, we want to see where things actually do happen; indicating that he will argue with Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, that this is probably the best parcel of land, the best area of the City of London to be developed, it is between the Wellington Road overpass and the Highway 402 overpass; thinking that it is the best parcel of land; reiterating that they just want to advise that, in their thoughts, that in order to develop pieces of land, we must do it orderly and this is probably the best way to do it rather than putting pieces of land in right now; and, indicating that they are not against doing that but it should come at the time when you have exhausted the pieces of land that you have right now.
- Scott Snider, Turkstra Mazza Associates, on behalf of Tradewinds Properties and Bluestone Properties Inc. – indicating that they are the largest landowners within the White Oak/Dingman area; advising that this has been a long process, as you heard it started in 2011 and he does not want to make it longer; advising that his clients strongly support what staff has recommended in their report, they have done that since the beginning and they continue to take that position because they think that it is good

planning and, because, of course, they care about it because of the impact on their lands; indicating that while Mr. Caranci and Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates, can argue about whether they have got the best employment site, we have a terrible employment site, we lose on that category; indicating that the lands are designated for industrial uses and that is the problem, those lands will not be taken up for industrial uses, which is why they need to be converted to some other use; indicating that, as you know, there are two things before the Planning and Environment Committee, two different Official Plan Amendments and we think that the staff have done their job to demonstrate that they are both supportable, but he is here to say that the conversion of the Official Plan Amendment does not depend on the Urban Growth Boundary expansion; pointing out that, in other words, we understand that the City sees them as tied because, in order for you to get the Urban Growth Boundary expansion, you need to free up some employment lands already within the Urban Growth Boundary, which is fine; noting that they do not have any problem with that, but they do not need you to have that Urban Growth Boundary because there is sufficient employment lands within the City of London numerically, even without that Urban Growth Boundary expansion to allow the conversion of the lands in question in the White Oak/Dingman area; reiterating that they do not need that expansion and you will hear and he has already heard, that the big battle is around where should the expansion lands be and should you expand the Urban Growth Boundary; pointing out that, if you look at the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing letter, they are hammering away at whether you should be expanding the Urban Growth Boundary because that is what they are in the business of doing; reiterating that we do not need that to be done in order for them to have the conversion so that they can have some useful purpose for the lands that they have already in the Urban Growth Boundary; indicating that, if he can turn you to one page only in this report, he will turn you to page 11, (page 172 of the Planning and Environment Committee Agenda); referring to the paragraphs related to “Land is not required for employment purposes over the long term”; indicating that those relate to his clients’ lands, largely, and there is the first, second, third paragraph, the second last sentence “As discussed in greater detail below, they are poorly located and there has been virtually no interest in developing these lands for industrial uses. The London Economic Development Corporation has indicated that there will be no demand for these lands over the long term.” and then going on to say that “Having these lands remain within the industrial land use designation will be wasteful of existing services in the area and, furthermore, limits the ability of the municipality to plan for industrial land uses in locations where there is a long term opportunity for attracting industry to the City and region.” and then the next paragraph, after the first sentence, “it will represent a removal of very ineffective lands from the City’s vacant industrial land inventory, allowing for a re-allocation of this inventory elsewhere. It will also allow for the efficient use of existing and planned infrastructure on these lands and in the area. The lands within the study area are not required to meet the needs of future industrial growth.”; advising that the Provincial Policy Statement, fundamentally, is about making sure that this uses lands that are serviced efficiently and that is what the first portion of this Official Plan Amendment does because it takes service lands and gives them a use that can be used instead of sticking them with a use that will never happen with an employment use; urging the Planning and Environment Committee, if for whatever reason, you are convinced by anybody to reconsider your Urban Growth Boundary and we are not saying that you should, we think staff have done their job but we do not think that you should delay any longer the conversation of my clients’ lands so we can move that thing forward no matter what happens with the Urban Growth Boundary; indicating that it will support it because there is a surplus of industrial designated lands and no process argument, no argument from someone who is outside the Urban Growth Boundary now and wants in will change the fact that you have got service lands today in this area that cannot be used; pointing out that that is inefficient and no process argument will ever change that; and, urging you to approve the Official Plan Amendment tonight.

- Robert Statton, on behalf of John Seeback, Seeback Properties, 461 Exeter Road – advising that his client has a large holding of industrial land, is a long-time owner and he has opposed this application and similar applications over the last couple of years; advising that his opposition is two-fold, one is it is an attempt to down zone his lands to

an Industrial Transition zone and he also opposes the change of the Industrial lands to Residential; indicating that it is a total negative to John Seebach's lands, he has a total industrial use that is 24/7, it generates approximately 60 local jobs and if you change that to transitional industrial it cannot continue except as a non-conforming use, which is a total down zoning; indicating that he has gone through what is proposed and, as he mentioned, he is in total opposition; pointing out that if you look at the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing letter dated February 26, 2014, it clearly outlines that the procedure being used by the Planning Department and its approach are wrong; outlining that the key words in the whole report are "premature" and it needs a comprehensive study; noting that that is their wording; indicating that that is the Province of Ontario outlining that the Planning Department is on a wrong footing; advising that there should be a full and complete comprehensive study; reiterating that what you are being asked to look at is totally premature; advising that, if you look through their letter it clearly outlines, in about seven different areas, that it needs proper study; and, reiterating that it is premature and he urges everyone on the Planning and Environment Committee to read that February 26, 2014 letter from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

- Sandy Levin, 59 Longbow Road – indicating that there is no opposition to the redesignation of the natural heritage features from Environmental Review to Open Space; asking that if, nothing else tonight, it would be appreciated if you would move those forward; indicating that if it means separating that issue from the larger issue, you may want to consider doing that because obviously you have got a tough decision because somebody is not going to be happy tonight; thinking that you would make Nature London happy because they have been involved in this from the beginning, particularly through the Environmental Assessment for the Highway 401/Veterans Memorial Parkway interchange; pointing out that you have the hard data to support the redesignations; asking a question because Mr. MacBeth, Planner II, had mentioned that you have other parcels that are going to be or should be redesignated because of the data that was collected during the 2008 Study of the Environmental Review Lands; and, indicating that the question is - are there any other lands that are outstanding from that study that have not yet been redesignated that should be redesignated because they were found to be significant.
- Jim Urling, Mainline Planning Consultants – (See attached communication).
- Tom Grieve, properties located at 1874 and 1806 Wilton Grove Road – advising that his properties are located on the north side of Wilton Grove Road and backs onto Highway 401; expressing partial agreement with what Mr. Patton, Patton, Cormier & Associates said and he agrees with what Mr. Faulkner, London Dairy Farm, said tonight about the whole idea that it looks like we are doing hop, skipping and jumping and not in an orderly fashion; indicating that he is not going to tell you how to zone the land or how to change the Official Plan because he knows that development will occur in time, he understands that, but when you look at the map, it looks so funny that you have land heading east changing into the Urban Growth Boundary and then you skip over 200, 300 or 400 acres and then you put a piece of land right next to the big dairy farm, which if anybody knows anything about farming, you know you are going to have problems there; indicating that the problems are not going to happen tomorrow, they are not going to happen the next day, but you are going to have problems putting in industrial lands east because the winds generally come from the west and that is the way that the smell goes; indicating that he lives east of there and he does not tell Mr. Faulkner, London Dairy Farm, this very often, but he never smells his farm but he knows people that are east of that and that is not what they say; knowing that Mr. Faulkner, London Dairy Farm, has got a really good farm and that they do the best that they can, but it is a farm and what do you expect; and, asking the Planning and Environment Committee to be careful what you do because you might shoot yourself in the foot.
- Ali Jomaa, 1431 Sunningdale Road, representing himself and the Clarke family - expressing support with the planning staff working and studying to make sure that everything is done in the most efficient way possible; supporting them and hopes that everyone else will support them; advising that their job is not that simple; indicating that he would like to go back a few months, maybe a year, in December, to 2013, when we were talking about expanding the Urban Growth Boundary and, at that time, we discussed that Council had made a decision to form a Working Group to discuss how to

implement such a test or whether a test would be implemented; pointing out that, at that time, there were certain lands which were considered Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3, they were designated as the most preferred or the best positioned properties according to the serviceability studied by the Planning Department and, at that time, the Working Group was going to also discuss bringing in lands and taking lands out; expressing confusion as to how the designation of industrial lands; noting that he has no problems with studying how the industrial lands can work out to be the most strategic, but his concern here is how to designate lands of industrial land into non-industrial land where there are other areas which have been studied and planned for and budgeted as part of the services of the City of London where London has actually included them in the budget where you will not have to go out and spend extra funds to budget for more services in areas which have not been designated or planned for services; pointing out that what he is saying is that you need to restudy to make sure that you are not spending the City dollar so that we plan for expanding in the most efficient way possible; advising that he has a piece of land on 1431 Sunningdale Road and he is representing the Clarke family who has 50 acres that sides him east of his land and this is a small little piece of land which has services budgeted for it and they were expecting that at least some consideration would be come to discussing how a Working Group would go to study this; and, reiterating that the Planning Department should consider the most efficient way to designate land and it is not just because there is already a piece of land which is industrial which may not be considered the most efficient way to plan for industry.

- Rob Jackson, representing his mother who lives at 1996 Bradley Avenue – advising the Planning and Environment Committee that they have had a list of the neighbours that are on both the south and the north side of Bradley Avenue, in between Old Victoria Road and Jackson Road; indicating that there may have been some confusion along the way; advising that they are not opposed to the Urban Growth Boundary; indicating that they would like to be in the Urban Growth Boundary; advising that they feel that the land on Bradley Avenue is more suitable for development than the land on Wilton Grove Road, simply because the Wilton Grove Road area has more agricultural benefits to it; noting that it is not surrounded by industrial, residential and Highway 401; indicating that they do not have anywhere else to go, they are, as Mr. Barrett, Manager, Long Range Planning and Research, the donut; pointing out that they are up there and that they would like to be considered in there so that they are continuing to move in a logical fashion; noting that the services are there; outlining that as you go along to the Veterans Memorial Parkway, and you have heard all of this before; noting that all of the studies that were on there, there was one thing that was not on there and that was the marketability of lands on Highway 401; indicating that you have the ability for branding and marketing for any major supplier that is going to get onto that land and it is going to give them a lot more frontage than they are going to get on Wilton Grove Road and a lot more traffic that goes through it; advising that he grew up there and not too long ago, it was seven dairy farms, not as big as Mr. Faulkner's, London Dairy Farm, but they were there; indicating that since the Bradley Avenue extension went through, that became an arterial road; indicating that, with the development at Veterans Memorial Parkway, it is no longer an agricultural land; indicating that it is not safe for the guys there and no one is a full-time farmer out there; noting that the people on Wilton Grove Road are still full-time farmers; and, requesting that the Planning and Environment Committee take them into consideration when moving the Urban Growth Boundary.