

034541 Concession Road 8-9 East Luther
Roll # 124000
Trevor Pullen and Thomas Tupling

RECEIVED

SEP 24 2024

TOWN OF GRAND VALLEY

Per _____

Zoning By Law Amendment

I have been asked to appear in support of this Zoning By Law Amendment by the owners of the property and to speak to the Letter of Opposition to the said application.

The owners of the property have done the research and used reputable engineers to ensure that they are well within the guidelines of responsible planning procedures in order to develop this property to its highest and best use.

I question many of the statements made by Ms. Dickson in her letter of opposition. Her main focus according to the three phrases she uses consistently throughout that letter are Public Health, Public Safety and Environmental Protection.

I offer the following rebuttals to her statements:

There are residential properties in close proximity to all farm land, adjoining farm land and on farm land, literally everywhere. This application is no different.

Private well and septic systems are located on ALL of these properties with little or no impact on the environment.

In fact I would challenge her statements saying that these systems have more impact than toxic chemicals being sprayed on crop lands. That is simply not true.

What proof is she providing to show these same allegations that contamination and septic failures harm the eco system? Why would anyone assume that a septic system is going to fail? I am assuming that the neighbouring farm owned by her or her family has both a septic system and a private well. I ask where exactly does that differ from what the applicants are proposing which is a single family residence serviced by a private well and septic?

She offers in her letter that Jan Scheurvator is providing us with his professional opinion. In fact what he offers is a two line note that echoes her opinion. He has no professional standing or credentials that add any credence whatsoever to her opposition of the application.

If the opposer is so concerned about harmful chemicals and the propensity of those chemicals to become airborne or travel through the water table to a neighbouring property why in fact are they using these same chemicals? She also states her concern about the possibility of septic failure that may contaminate her fields, the same fields she is spraying with toxic chemicals. What if her septic system

fails? Is it not logical to assume that toxic chemicals from spraying crops is far more likely to end up in the food chain than a malfunctioning septic system?

I also question the statement she makes with regards to farm practices and people being unaware of them. That is simply ridiculous and has no bearing whatsoever on the application for a zoning by-law amendment.

One land owner's rights should not supersede another property owner's rights period.

Installing a septic system on a residential lot does not have the potential to create what the letter of opposition is describing. This is strictly fear mongering to protest a small development lot – the NIMBY syndrome appears to be the focus of the letter.

Septic VS Poison Chemicals – which has more potential to be a hazard to the environment and the community?

Again I ask:

When does one landowner's rights supersede another landowner's rights?

How would one single family home disrupt good farming practices?

What unnecessary risks?

Why would one home disrupt future development on her lands and why would council be asked to consider or take into consideration something that does not exist at present?

What exactly is the threat to Public Health and Public Safety? One can't simply make open ended statements without providing reliable proof of the allegations.

If the concern is Environmental Protection why is the farm using toxic chemicals that have the propensity to become airborne or seep into the water table?

If the farm is draining into this lot then the farm owners need to make changes to their drainage system in order not to encroach on neighbouring lands.

I too am very familiar with the Provincial Policy Statement and the Places to Grow Act and the reasoning behind both policies. Neither is in place to stop development but to ensure that development is done in a safe and structured manner.

Progression of good building practices has changed significantly since 1974 to better enhance any environmental impact. These owners have years of experience in building suitable dwellings and working within regulations from all agencies involved in the process.

I make these statements not only as a Real Estate Sales Representative with 40 years of experience but as someone that sat with the provincial representatives to develop policies to protect our environment and meet the needs of all. I spent 4 years as the Mayor of the Town of Mono and sat on the Planning

Advisory Committee and I have dealt with numerous applications for severances and zoning by law amendments in various municipalities across Dufferin County.

I firmly believe that this application meets all the standards required for Council to grant this Zoning By-Law Amendment and direct the owners to work together with the Municipal Planner and Staff to bring this application to its final stages.