

**From:** [Kayla DeLeye](#)  
**To:** [kim.mulligan](#)  
**Cc:** [Caitlin Port](#); [Luke MCLEOD](#); [Alyssa Seitz](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Lafarge  
**Date:** Monday, May 3, 2021 12:56:26 PM

---

Hi Kim,

Thank you for your feedback on this proposal - I appreciate your comments regarding protecting agricultural land. The provincial policy statement provides useful information not only on agricultural lands, but also on aggregate policies set out by the province, please see link below. This is the tool (PPS) planners use to make recommendations.

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/provincial-policy-statement-2020>

Please note your email will become part of the public record.

I have copied in Luke McLeod from Lafarge and Caitlin Port from MHBC planning, as they are the applicant and agent for this proposal.

Further review of the studies and application is currently underway, and a recommendation report will be brought to Council at a later date.

I have cc'd Alyssa from our planning team to ensure that you are included in the notice of public meeting/council decision.

Thank you,

**Kayla DeLeye** BA, MA, MCIP, RPP, Ec.D  
Senior Planner

Development Services  
County of Brant  
66 Grand River Street North, Paris ON N3L 2M2

---

C 519.732.9395 | T 519.449.3300 X 3018 | [www.brant.ca](http://www.brant.ca)



---

**From:** kim.mulligan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 3, 2021 9:47 AM  
**To:** Kayla DeLeye <kayla.deleye@brant.ca>  
**Subject:** Lafarge

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern

In regards to Lafarge enlarging his aggregates to include 1044 Colborne St. West.

This is only a 50 acre parcel of land that has produce several crops for years and as of late food crops, so it doesn't make any sense that it become land for aggregates especially since crops produce food every year but once the gravel is gone that's it, plus it is **suppose to be in a water protected zone** at least that is what the sign claims. It is not surface water if you can't walk across it without being submerged in water as Lafarge stated in the Expositor. Is

Waterford ponds surface water? I think not. Our well is between **45-50 ft deep** and since the township has put a second watershed at the airport our water pressure has decreased immensely therefore any aggregate mining should not be allowed below 40 feet. Then there is the knowledge of knowing it's not going to expand farther down the road ever. This is to let both the township and Lafarge know 1052 will never be sold or in the hands of Lafarge.

Every day in Ontario, **we lose 175 acres of farmland to non-agricultural land uses like urban development and aggregate extraction;** this rate of farmland loss is unsustainable and cannot be allowed to continue. Everyone in Ontario relies on agriculture, from the food we eat, to the jobs in our communities. Without strong protections in place for our farmland, we may not be able to provide enough food to feed our growing population.

Did you know that Ontario's agri-food sector is the largest economic sector in the province and employs over 820,000 Ontarians<sup>1</sup>? Farmland is the foundation of this sector, so when we lose farmland these jobs are put at risk. Additionally, our ability to access fresh, local food is impacted both for us now, and for future generations of Ontarians. Our future depends on the protection and stewardship of our agricultural land.

Sincerely

Kim Mulligan