

A large background image of a quarry or aggregate processing site, showing a conveyor belt and a large pile of aggregate material. The image is semi-transparent with a green tint.

PROPOSED OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 3 AGGREGATE RESOURCES

Planning Advisory Committee Meeting

February 14, 2022

Background

- A public meeting on proposed OPA 3 was held on December 14, 2021
- At the public meeting, we:
 1. Provided an overview of the process, including consultation, to prepare the Aggregate Resources Master Plan (ARMP) and the proposed Official Plan Amendment (OPA);
 2. Reviewed the proposed OPA policies and schedule that address mineral aggregate resources;
 3. Highlighted the comments received on the proposed OPA; and,
 4. Received input on the proposed OPA.
- Following the question and comment period, the Clerk advised that three submissions were received following posting of the agenda – and a fourth was received after the public meeting



Background (cont'd)

- As a result, PAC directed staff to review additional comments from the municipalities and individuals below:
 1. Municipality of North Grenville;
 2. Township of Augusta;
 3. Mr. Tom Graham, Songwood Farm; and,
 4. Mr. Tony Sevelka
- A review of these comments and our responses is included in our memo dated January 17, 2022
- Purpose of this presentation is to provide an overview of the comments made and our responses



Review of Comments

North Grenville

- **Request** - that overburden depth for bedrock resources be reduced from 8 metres to 5 metres
- **Response** – The Provincial Policy Statement requires that where Provincial information is available, deposits of mineral aggregate resources shall be identified
- In this case, Provincial ARIP mapping shows overburden depths of 1 metre, 8 metres and 15 metres and the Province has consistently required that 8 metres be shown in Official Plans since 8 metres or less is considered to be economically viable
- **Action** – no changes have been made to the OPA



Review of Comments

Township of Augusta

- **Request 1** - that the OPA include the types of applications that require assessments be completed in support of instead of only listing exempted applications
- **Response 1** – decision was made to identify exempted applications only - since it cannot be determined with any certainty which applications will require an additional study
- **Action** – no changes have been made to the OPA
- **Request 2** - that Schedule A include a note indicating that influence areas adjacent to sand, gravel and bedrock resources also exist
- **Response 2** – Provincial policies apply equally to lands that are within identified resource areas and adjacent lands
- **Action** – Note has been added to Schedule A



Review of Comments

Mr. Tom Graham – Songwood Farm

- **Request 1** - that tertiary sand and gravel resource areas not be identified in significant groundwater recharge areas as mapped by RVCA
- **Response 1** – mapping in OPA is to be primarily used as a screening tool and does not establish the principle of extraction – lands within significant groundwater recharge areas should be subject to enhanced scrutiny in application process
- **Request 2** - there should be reference to Source Protection Plans in the OPA
- **Response 2** – Counties OP already includes water resource and source protection policies that apply throughout Counties
- **Action** – no changes made to the OPA



Review of Comments

Mr. Tony Sevelka

- **Request** - that new quarries where blasting is proposed be set back 1,000 metres from sensitive receptors to provide protection from fly-rock
- **Response** – agreed that fly-rock is an issue to consider and note that fly-rock impacts will vary depending on site – as a result, not possible to establish setback in advance
- **Action** notwithstanding the above, added requirement in OPA to look at impact of fly-rock when considering applications (would be consistent with January 1, 2022 changes to Ontario Regulation under the ARA to require quarries to implement measures to prevent fly-rock from leaving the site)



Recommendation

We recognize that the addition of the bedrock resource mapping has been concerning to some as it related to impacts of the resource mapping on rural development. This is why we have made every effort to soften the impact of the mapping on rural development, by:

1. Establishing a list of land uses and types of applications that are exempted from the potential need to prepare a study;
2. Excluding areas from the mapping if they are close to settlement areas and environmental features;
3. Providing the local municipalities with the opportunity to map and identify residential clusters and then exempt those areas from the potential need to prepare a study; and
4. Establishing policies that provide local planning staff with the ability to make a judgement call on whether such a study is required based on an assessment of the likelihood of extraction in the area.



Recommendation (cont'd)

- We have also heard from those that are concerned about the impacts of extraction on the environment – and in response we have updated the policies on application requirements to ensure that all impacts are considered
- Lastly, we have also received comments from the aggregate industry that the policies are perhaps too permissive in terms of the types of development that can proceed as of right and the other exemptions we have created
- In the end, it is my opinion that the right balance has been struck between protecting for potential resource development while promoting appropriate rural development

It is recommended that OPA 3 as modified be approved by the Counties



Questions and Comments

