

Good afternoon, Chair and Members of the Planning Committee. My name is Jenna Jancsik, and I reside at 987 King's Wharf Road. I have grown up and resided on Kings wharf road since 1996. From working in the agricultural field, alliance agri turf, formally Agrico, to completing several sustainable agriculture courses at university, I have always had a passion and connection to rural areas and agriculture. My tie to this area is what lead us to choosing our home and raising our family here. I respect developing our economy and I support self-employed and small businesses and believe we do have a need to support the developing residential areas in the city of Kawartha Lakes. However, I am here today to express some concerns, questions or comments regarding the rezoning application for 1023 Kings Wharf Road. In support of these concerns, I have gathered data from the application for rezoning, the planning justification report, septic design, the grading and drainage plan, the traffic impact brief, the Township of Emily bylaw 1996–30, the provincial policy statement, and the city of Kawartha Lakes official plan.

The proposed Zoning By-Law amendment seeks to change the land use from Agricultural (A1) to a site-specific Agricultural Exception, which would allow for a roof truss manufacturing business as an On Farm Diversified Use OFDU. In my finding from the Provincial Policy Statement section 1.1.4.1 states “promoting diversification of the economic base and employment opportunities through goods and services, including value, added products and the sustainable management or use of resources”. When speaking with the applicant he mentioned this was a family run business, **I'm wondering if this business will have employment opportunities for individuals in our municipality, and how many?**

One of the guidelines mentioned is that an on farm diversified use must be secondary to the principal agricultural use of the property. The justification report states that an OFDU must be less significant than the agricultural use on the property in spatial or temporal terms. In regards to “temporal terms, **does that refer to time spent to operate the OFDU? If the current primary agricultural use of this property is cash crops, with some environmentally protected areas, how would this OFDU be secondary in terms of temporal terms?**

Another guideline mentioned is that the OFDU includes, but is not limited to home occupations home industries Agri tourism uses and uses that produce value added agricultural products. I can understand that some of the roof trusses built will be used for agricultural buildings. In the Emily township By-law definitions wood manufacturing plant can be found under the definition of Industry-medium, means an “industry assembly manufacturing or processing plant, which is predominantly conducted within a holy enclosed building, but which may also involve open storage. Examples of such uses are sheet metal plastic, fibreglass or wood, fabricating, motor vehicle body shops or food, processing facilities” an agricultural use is defined as “a use of land buildings

or structures for the purpose of forestry field crops, fruit farming, market, gardening, dairying, animal, husbandry, aqua culture, poultry, beekeeping, and such uses as our customarily and normally related to agriculture. Does a roof truss plant fall under this parameter? ***If so I would like to know approximately what percentage of the products will be used for agricultural purposes as opposed to residential or commercial?*** If it does not fall under this parameter and is more of an industrial business, **would it make sense to look at some of the vacant properties in our industrial zoned area of Lindsay or Emily township, and/or look at taxation of industry vs agricultural?**

As noted several times throughout the justification report the on Farm diversified use will be secondary to the principal use of the property, my question is how will the municipality enforce these guidelines to ensure the use remains secondary and an efficient use of the agricultural land.

As an adjacent neighbour, along with several other rural residential families in a 1 km radius of the proposed business, our concerns are operating hours, noise level of manufacturing and transportation, and the increased traffic on our rural roads, the structural integrity of our already deteriorating roads, especially during our half load (weight restricted) season, and safety risk to our vulnerable community members, children and youth. There has been some comments made from neighbours of a smaller truss manufacturing business that the noise can be heard from distances up to 1 km away. Some residents are concerned about property devaluation, this should be considered.

Some concerns are about where the doors will be located on the building to ensure the least instructive noise output to surrounding residences. In the mapping of nearby houses in a 1 km radius there is approximately 20 homes, with the least amount of houses being in the northern direction.

If some community members and myself have some of these concerns I believe the planning committee should also consider them. And if indeed this use of land is adhering to our provincial and municipal policies and guidelines than I will support the committee's and staffs expertise and experience with similar applications, and trusting that our municipalities strategic priorities will be respected and inline with the decision. Thank you for your time and understanding.