

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF McNAB/BRAESIDE
May 6, 2013
PUBLIC MEETING UNDER THE PLANNING ACT

A Public Meeting under the Planning Act was held at 6:00 p.m. to consider proposed amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law for the Township of McNab/Braeside in accordance with the provisions of Section 34 of the Planning Act, 1990.

All members of Council were in attendance for the meeting this evening.

Also in attendance: Bruce Howarth, County of Renfrew
Anne McVean, County of Renfrew
Janet Bradley, Township Solicitor

Janet Bradley - Solicitor for the Township was requested by Council to Chair this meeting on behalf of Council.

Members were asked to state any pecuniary interest and the general nature thereof before the item is discussed. No disclosures of pecuniary interest were declared at this time.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Blimkie, seconded by Councillor McIlquham, **THAT** the Public Meeting agenda dated May 6, 2013 for the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments proposed by Miller Paving be adopted as submitted and circulated. **CARRIED.**

Purpose and Effect of the Official Plan Amendment - The entire 132.7 Ha (328 ac) Miller property is designated Mineral Aggregate. This designation permits a quarry and associated manufacturing uses. The purpose of the proposed Official Plan Amendment is to permit an asphalt plant for permanent use on a specific portion of the property. The proposed Official Plan Amendment would implement a site-specific Mineral Aggregate-Exception One designation on approximately 4.5 Ha (11 ac) of the subject property to permit a permanent asphalt plant as an additional use.

Purpose and Effect of the Zoning By-Law Amendment - Approximately 30 Ha (74 ac) of the Miller property is zoned Extractive Industrial (EM) and licensed for extraction as quarry. The proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment is to permit the expansion of the licensed area of the existing quarry and to permit an asphalt manufacturing plant as an additional use on a specific portion of the property. The proposed amendment affects only the lands beyond the existing licence and EM zone. This is about 103 Ha (254 acre) of the total Miller property. The proposed Zoning Amendment would rezone the property from Extractive Industrial Reserve (EMR) to Extractive Industrial (EM), Extractive Industrial-Exception One (EM-E1) and Extractive Industrial Reserve-Exception One (EMR-E1). The proposed EM Zone will permit an expansion of the existing quarry in an expanded area of approximately 79 Ha (195 ac) hectares of land. The EM-E1 Zone will permit an asphalt manufacturing plant on approximately 4.5 Ha (11 ac) of the expanded quarry. The proposed EMR-E1 Zone will limit approximately 24 Ha (59 ac) of the property to the conservation of wildlife in

natural conditions.

Additional information regarding the Zoning By-Law Amendment was available for inspection at the Township of McNab/Braeside Municipal Office during regular office hours and on the Township Website.

The land affected by the amendments are Part of Lots 16 & 17, Concession A(12), (geographic Township of McNab), Township of McNab/Braeside, located on Usborne Street (County Rd. No. 3).

The notice of the public meeting was read by Ms. Bradley. Ms. Bradley advised that the notice of the public meeting was circulated to all property owners within 120m of the subject property as well as all of the applicable agencies. The notice of the proposed amendments and public meeting was also posted on the Township website and published in the Arnprior and Renfrew newspapers on April 18, 2013. Verification was received that the notice of the proposed amendment was posted on the subject property as required.

Skelton Brumwell acting as the agent for Miller Paving had submitted the following information with the application that was also submitted to the County of Renfrew Planning Department:

- a) Miller Braeside Quarry Site Plan (Drwg No. 2033-1-5 incl.)
- b) Planning Report and Summary Statement
- c) Natural Environment Report Level I & II
- d) Hydrological Investigation
- e) Traffic Impact Study
- f) Acoustic Assessment
- g) Air Quality Assessment
- h) Emission Summary and Dispersion Modeling Report
- i) Blast Impact Analysis
- j) Hydrogeological Investigation

Ms. Bradley advised that over the last six years and subsequent to the applications being received many written submissions have been received to date which form part of the public record and have been provided to Council for their consideration regarding their decision on the proposed application.

Ms. Bradley then introduced the Township Planner - Mr. Bruce Howarth to provide a brief overview of the application process to-date.

Mr. Howarth explained that the original applications were received in December of 2007. Mr. Howarth further explained that at that same time Miller's also submitted an application to the Ontario Minister of Natural Resources for a licence under the Aggregate Resources Act for a Class

"A" Category 2 Quarry Expansion Below The Water. Mr. Howarth explained that on February 15, 2008 the Township deemed the planning application complete. In support of the application Mr. Howarth advised the applicant provide eight (8) supporting studies being the Traffic Impact Study, the Acoustic Study, the Air Quality Assessment, the Hydrogeology Investigation and the Hydrology Investigation, the Natural Environment Reports, Blasting Impact Assessment and Planning Report. The applications along with all the supporting studies were all posted on the Township's website at that time for the public's review. Mr. Howarth explained that the peer review process which took place over the next six (6) years whereby the Township chose their technical experts to review the submitted applications and corresponding studies and review them on a professional basis to ensure that the methodology and conclusion and recommendations were in line with the provincial guidelines and standards. Mr. Howarth explained that there was a lot of correspondence back and forth between the Miller technical team of experts and the peer review team which the Township hired and final peer review sign off was received by the Township in September of 2012. Mr. Howarth explained that once the final reports were all received the Township website was updated so that the final revised reports as well as all the correspondence back and forth was on the website for public review.

In conclusion Mr. Howarth advised that since the peer review sign off the Township held a series of three (3) special meetings between January and March for Council to become familiar with the applications once again and review the applications and all corresponding peer reviews and have any technical questions they had answered by Planning staff who also provided a follow up report on such on April 9, 2013 which was also posted on the Township website. Mr. Howarth explained the process for the public to continue to make submissions up until such a time as Council is prepared to make a decision on the applications and further advised that his intent was to have his final Planning review and recommendation in a report ready to be submitted to Council for their May 21, 2013 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting at which time Council will need to determine their next steps.

Gary Bell, Planner - Skelton, Brumwell & Associates

Ms. Bradley then introduced Mr. Gary Bell who is a land use planner for the firm of Skelton Brumwell & Associates in Barrie, Ontario. Mr. Bell explained his firm had been retained by Miller Paving in 2005 and 2006 to assist them in the planning, engineering, and environment related matters for their proposed quarry expansion and asphalt plant. Mr. Bell explained he was present this evening to present the proposed Official Plan Amendment and the Zoning By-Law Amendment that are subject of this evenings public meeting under the Planning Act. Mr. Bell informed everyone present this evening that Miller Paving operates the quarry to extract and process very high quality limestone and this quarry serves both local construction needs as well as regional needs in Renfrew County. Mr. Bell further stated that the upper lift extraction extends to near the permitted limit and Miller requires additional aggregate reserves to continue to supply construction operations in Eastern Ontario. Mr. Bell explained the proposed applications have been submitted to expand the Braeside Quarry for aggregate reserves and to add a Hot Mix Asphalt Plant to the site. A ready mix concrete plant is permitted and planned for development in the existing quarry. Mr. Bell advised

that there are a number of approvals in place for the quarry now. The existing quarry is licensed for the extraction of up to one million tonnes annually to extract below the water table. It has a Permit to Take Water under the Ontario Water Resources Act, Section 34 for pumping out collected surface water and an Environmental Compliance Approval for the discharge if necessary of the collected surface water. Mr. Bell further advised that under the Township's current Official Plan the entire site is designated Mineral Aggregate Resource Area and aggregate extraction is permitted subject to zoning and a licence under the Aggregate Resources Act. An asphalt plant for permanent operation requires an Official Plan Amendment (OPA). Under the Township's current Zoning By-Law the existing quarry is zoned Extractive Industrial (EM) and the expansion area is zoned Extractive Industrial Reserve (EMR) which protects the resource for potential future extraction. Mr. Bell advised that in December of 2007 an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) was submitted to the Township for permission for an asphalt manufacturing plant. A Zoning By-Law Amendment was also submitted at that time to permit expansion of the quarry and an asphalt plant in the expanded area. A licence application was also submitted to MNR under the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA) for extraction and related facilities and uses in the expanded area. Mr. Bell advised that applications for an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for air and noise emission on the asphalt or concrete plants will be submitted to MOE and approval prior to the installation of the plants. Mr. Bell reviewed the mapping of the physical context, existing land use and bedrock resource. He advised that 31 million tonnes of rock can be extracted from the total quarry extraction area as proposed. He addressed the setback to extraction with regards to the zoning as well as the natural heritage protection area. This also identified the significant wildlife protection area to be reserved along with the wildlife corridor which is to remain undisturbed and vegetated.

Mr. Bell spoke on the noise analysis and nearest receptors as well as the noise impact at those receptors. Mr. Bell explained that on-site noise generated by the proposal will be in compliance with the MOE noise limits as per set out in the guidelines. Air quality of the proposal was assessed for dust impact at the nearest residences using a model of the proposed operations and based on the results of the Regulation 346 dispersion model all air emissions meet MOE criteria. Mr. Bell further advised that the impact of air quality from the site operations would not constitute any adverse effect at the property line, at the residences within or beyond the 1000m area of influence. Mr. Bell advised that with regards to the blasting impact analysis blasting operations required for mineral extraction at the proposed Miller Braeside Quarry expansion can be carried out safely and well within governing guidelines set out by the MOE. In conclusion regarding the hydrogeological assessment Mr. Bell advised that the analysis of the site conditions shows that the proposed excavation will not impact the local groundwater setting due to topography and geology. The expansion of the quarry which will remain at least 5m above the main water bearing zones in the area will not have additional impact. He also advised that the continued management of discharge from the quarry in the manner currently used at the site will maintain the natural surface water and shallow ground water flow regime and a groundwater monitoring program is proposed that will provide protection to surrounding groundwater users against perceived or actual impact from the proposed quarry operation even though no additional impacts are predicted. With regards to the hydrological investigation the ultimate quarry dewatering operations will not result in harmful

alteration or destruction of fish and aquatic habitat on Ryan Creek. The proposed quarry expansion and asphalt plant will have no anticipated negative impacts on natural heritage features and functions. Mr. Bell finished his presentation by stating that the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), conform to the Township Official Plan and represent good planning for the site and the Township.

Mayor Campbell asked Mr. Bell if the 31 million tonnes included the nature reserves. Mr. Bell responded by stating that the 31 million tonnes is the net amount of the reserves that can be available for actual extraction.

Ms. Bradley then introduced Mr. Wilf Ruland, a hydrogeologist and professional geoscientist who had been retained by FACT-MB.

Mr. Wilf Roland (Expert)

Mr. Roland explained that he was here to speak on the potential water impact as a result of these applications. Mr. Roland explained that quarry applications anywhere around the Province are always a matter of interest and concern because any quarry can bring with it several types of water related impacts because once they go below the water table they have to pump to keep the quarry dry and all that water that is pumped just gets discharged off to surface creek and is basically lost to the ground water environment so there is risk of wells going dry. Because the quarry is a big industrial operation Mr. Roland explained that there is a real risk due to the fact there could be spills and fuel tanks and big machinery on site and leaks and possibly water contamination. Mr. Roland commented on the one matter that really stood out to him when reviewing this proposal was the sheer number of 100 or more homes surrounding the existing quarry. Mr. Roland advised that the existing quarry has been there for some time and is approved for based elevation for 125m above sea level but for most of the time the quarry has been operating 10m higher 135m above sea level. Mr. Roland further stated that in terms of water impacts, the existing quarry is just starting to have water impacts. Mr. Roland also stated that we really don't have a lot of information yet to substantiate what sort of effect a deeper quarry is going to have at this location. We do know however, the existing quarry footprint is going to quadruple from 17 hectares to 68 hectares. Mr. Roland stated he felt this expansion was a bit excessive. Mr. Roland stated he felt a more reasonable expansion would be to perhaps double the current footprint and see what effects would be felt by the surrounding homes. Mr. Roland also added that because the quarry is situated on the Braeside Ridge which is a ridge of bedrock the only place the water that is available to well as well as the quarry can come from is from the ridge itself.

Mr. Roland stated he felt a water balance for the Braeside Ridge should be prepared so we know how much of the available water the quarry is going to take because everyone living in this area will have to share what is left over. In an average year on the Braeside Ridge in the area surrounding the quarry there is about 600 million litres of water going into the ground in this area. The quarry is currently taking over 100 million litres per year out of this 600. With the proposed expansion Mr. Roland stated in his best estimate the expanded quarry will be taking over 300 million litres. Mr.

Roland advised that he felt Miller's proposal is just far too ambitious and he recommended the Township request Miller's to provide a water balance for the ridge to ensure the residents are not going to run out of water. He also mentioned water quality concerns relating to known contaminants associated with asphalt plants and advised he had many concerns because there were no details available or provided but were missing from the application regarding this new proposed plant.

Mr. Roland informed Council that he would recommend they refuse the application for the asphalt plant or table this application until such a time as the company actually provides information about what they are proposing to do as asphalt plants vary hugely with respect to operations and possibly designs or types of plants and currently the Township has no idea of what the company is proposing. In conclusion Mr. Roland stated that in his opinion Miller's track record wasn't good and this would indicate concerns with future operations. Mr. Roland thanked Council for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mary Campbell inquired as to where the water table was. Mr. Roland explained that this proposal is far below the water table. He further explained that the existing quarry is already below the water table and provided a brief explanation on what the water table is.

Ms. Bradley introduced Dr. Henry Cole - an environmental and atmospheric scientist who was retained by FACT-MB to review Miller's applications and comment on such on their behalf.

Dr. Henry Cole (Expert)

Dr. Cole explained that what Miller's are proposing is to put a permanent industrial facility on this site therefore whatever impacts this causes will be over a long period of time and requires consideration. Dr. Cole advised that these studies that are associated with this application really aim at protecting peoples's health, therefore the air emission study is very critical as it relates to people's health that live in the areas. Dr. Cole advised therefore that Council really needs to do due diligence to see that these reports are done well. Dr. Cole explained that with regards to odors - some of them are very toxic and linked to cancer. He also advised that fires are also of a frequent concern when it comes to asphalt plants. He explained that hot mix asphalt plants have a lot of different equipment as well as storage piles mixing area and places with high temperature. He reviewed the three different kinds of emissions related to this type of operation. Dr. Cole stated that the receptors in this case are real people, and some of them live really close to the asphalt plant. Dr. Cole further stated that a thorough health study should be done and illustrated on a survey, prepared by Norma Moore where children in the area lived. He explained a thorough health study should be done in order to determine how many children and chronically ill people there were living in this area surrounding the quarry. Dr. Cole spoke to the 300 meter buffer zone and stated although this buffer zone was 300 meters from peoples houses it was not 300 meters from their back yards therefore they might be subject to exposure if they went outside. Dr. Cole stated it is the fine particles that get into your lungs and could cause cardio vascular disease and lung disease and aggravation of asthma etc. Dr. Cole advised that he had problems with the peer review by RWDI as they had not answered the questions and identified problems that had not gotten resolved. Dr. Cole also commented the

Ministry of the Environment has new standards and there had been no analysis done regarding this. He further questioned where the prevention plan was for associated risks pertaining to an asphalt plant. In Miller's modeling report Dr. Cole advised there was not a single diagram nor any figures which was also a great concern. In conclusion Dr. Cole stated that this is the worst documented studies he had ever seen.

Councillor McIlquham asked Dr. Cole if he thought it was not possible to have the air cleaned properly from a new asphalt plant. Dr. Cole stated that without a submitted design he has no knowledge of what the Township would be dealing with.

Mr. Trevor Turner - 1584 Usborne Street

Mr. Turner stated he was opposed to the application and an asphalt plant coming to the quarry would affect this quality of life. He stated he was discouraged and upset the process was taking so long. He further stated Miller's were not trustworthy and lost a recent court case that found them guilty. He stated the truck traffic and associated dust as well as emissions were concerns that he had and felt Miller's were only there to make money and did not care about the people. He stated that Miller's were given more time to speak and the public questions were not answered which he felt was a farce.

Mrs. Cheryl Linn Turner - 1584 Usborne Street

Mrs. Turner stated she had two small children and was concerned about the truck traffic and increased dust and noise associated with the asphalt plant. Mrs. Turner advised she was part of a law suit where Miller's were found guilty of negligence and trespass. Mrs. Turner also stated she felt their concerns were being neglected as their questions to the peer reviewers were not answered. In conclusion Mrs. Turner stated that the people in the surrounding area were going to have to deal with the negative effects such as fires, water contamination, etc. and questioned who would help in the next years when something goes wrong.

Mrs. Norma Moore - 15 Carmichael Side Road

Mrs. Moore stated that this process is bias and unfair as the public's questions have not been answered by the peer reviewers. She further stated she did not agree that the Township's Official Plan should be amended to allow a permanent asphalt plant. Mrs. Moore addressed the setbacks and stated she did not feel Miller's should be including residents property as part of these setbacks and if they did they should be paying for the use of this property. She advised the quarry should expand safely and carefully without industrialization because the risks to our water and our air are just too great. She further added she did not feel we need an asphalt plant in the Township because we can get asphalt elsewhere and the only reason to have one here is for Miller's profit with no benefits to the Township. Mrs. Moore advised that the temporary asphalt plant caused adverse affects to the quarry neighbors from 2009 - 2011 and Miller's were found guilty by the courts of nuisance, negligence and trespass. Mrs. Moore stated that she did not feel the peer reviewers would have signed off on the air quality study if they had known of the adverse effects. In conclusion Mrs. Moore stated that Council has to look at whether the benefits are worth the risks such as dry wells,

blasting accidents, cracked foundations and many more.

Ms. Bradley introduced Ms. Moreen Miller - President and CEO of Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association

Ms. Moreen Miller (Expert)

Ms. Moreen Miller - President and CEO of Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association. Ms. Miller advised the OSSGA is an Industry Association representing over 250 Sand, Gravel and Crushed Stone producers and suppliers in Ontario. Moreen explained she is a geologist and also a licenced landscape architect and was in attendance to make a brief presentation of the aggregate industry of Ontario. Ms. Miller explained she was not present either to object or support the application before Council but rather provide some information from a Provincial perspective about the industry in general and the importance of stone and gravel in our community and the regulatory realm in which the industry operates. Ms. Miller explained the OSSGA represents about 75% of tonnage produced in the Province. From 1986 to 2011 (25 years) production in Ontario ranges from approximately 120 million. Ms. Miller explained that consumption is tied to population and in 2013 consumption is down approximately 3%. As our overall population increases so will our consumption of aggregate. Ms. Miller further explained that as Ontarians we consume a lot of aggregate and each person in the room this evening consumes 13 tons each annually. Ms. Miller advised that the schools our children attend and the hospitals that treat us are all made with stone, sand and gravel as mandatory base ingredients. Ms. Miller stated that it is not uncommon in other parts of Ontario to have communities virtually surrounding pits and quarries and the day to day operations co-exist within strict Provincial guidelines.

Mr. Gregg Sheehy - 766 Milton Stewart Ave.

Mr. Sheehy explained he does not live near the quarry, however, is very concerned about the concerns of the local residents. He identified several concerns such as water pollution, blasting, dust, noise, human health and pollution. He also spoke to Miller's poor track record with the temporary asphalt plant and how that would be a good indication of their future performance.

Mrs. Susan Sheehy - 766 Milton Stewart Ave.

Mrs. Sheehy spoke to three areas of concern being, cost, traffic and health. Mrs. Sheehy advised there will be high costs associated with the by-law officer attending with regards to noise complaints associated with the operation of the quarry as well as costs defending a class action caused by water contamination. The amount of truck traffic generated will also be a great cause of concern.

Mrs. Ingrid Berndt - 52 Ridgeview Drive

Mrs. Berndt stated that her and her husband Bill are in strong opposition to the proposed quarry expansion proposal. She stated the process was biased because the peer reviewers would not answer the public's individual questions. Some of the concerns he addressed were smell and health issues caused by air emissions as well as noise pollution and blasting damages. Also damage to the water table, fire and loss of property value and destruction of the alvar. Mrs. Berndt questioned where the

air and noise emission compliance approvals were from MOE. She also spoke to traffic concerns and in conclusion urged Council to turn down Miller's application.

Mr. Chris Sherrer - 1329 Usborne Street

Mr. Sherrer advised Council he was opposed to the proposed application. He stated the Company disregarded the Township noise by-law during the operation of the temporary asphalt plant. Mr. Sherrer also advised some of the data used in these studies is already 20 years old. Mr. Sherrer addressed air pollution concerns in addition to noise concerns as well as the air quality assessment approval by MOE. Mr. Sherrer stated as a result of the recent court case against Miller's he felt MOE should deny approval of these plans.

Ms. Michol Kulas - 1329 Usborne Street

Ms. Kulas spoke to the Church & Trought report regarding the air quality assessment report and addressed her concerns with Miller's operating the asphalt plant at night. She spoke to the fact that there were no details (i.e. - make, model) of the proposed plant and because asphalt emissions cause cancer it makes a great difference to the people concerned on the location of the plant. Ms. Kulas also expressed her concerns with regards to the set back of the proposed plant to the existing properties and the associated noise and odours to affected neighbours.

Mr. Mike Battiston - 1237 Usborne Street

Mr. Battiston stated his objection to the Miller Quarry proposed applications and commented that he felt the process was biased as the public questions were never individually answered by the peer reviewers. Mr. Battiston advised he was concerned about the emissions and the related dangers to public health. He also spoke to lost revenue from taxation which will result if an asphalt plant is located in the quarry. He commented on concerns of dust from the cement plant, emissions from the asphalt plant, noise associated from this type of operation as well as increased truck traffic which will result in damage to our current road system.

Mr. Mark Popiel - 1326 Usborne Street

Mr. Popiel stated that he agreed with Dr. Cole's conclusions on the air emissions issues. He also agreed with Mr. Wilf Ruland's conclusion about dangers that an expansion proposes to the water in the area and why the expansion should not proceed. He further stated that the proposal is a Class 3 industry and does not conform. The asphalt and concrete plant also do not conform. Mr. Popiel also stated there are too many dangers associated with blasting on the site to nearby neighbours and he felt this proposal would seriously affect the health and well being of the Township residents in this area.

There was a 10 minute recess at 8:25 p.m.
Reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

Ms. Marybeth Pidgeon - 1326 Usborne Street

Ms. Pidgeon advised she totally agreed with Dr. Cole and Wilf Ruland's presentation earlier this

evening. Ms. Pidgeon explained she had moved from Toronto to this area to get away from industrialization and was distressed to see this happening in this area. Ms. Pidgeon further stated in the summer she cannot hang out her laundry because of the dust and smell as well the noise is also a concern. Ms. Pidgeon ended by stating she was not opposed to responsible extraction and expansion of aggregate from the quarry but felt there were other areas that would be better to extract limestone and not just our area.

Ms. Shannon Cassidy-Rouleau - 78 Braeloch Road

Ms. Cassidy-Rouleau stated she agreed with the evidence presented earlier by Dr. Cole and Wilf Ruland and asked that Council vote against the proposed applications to allow a permanent asphalt plant. Ms. Cassidy-Rouleau stated she did not feel Miller's have been a good neighbour and referred to their blasting accident in 2005 which resulted in damages to property wells and water supply. She also referred to the blasting accident in 2007 resulting in charges and fines under the Environmental Protection Act as well as violations to their certificate of approval in operating a temporary asphalt plant. Ms. Cassidy-Rouleau also commented on the court case where Miller's were charged with nuisance, negligence and trespass. Ms. Cassidy-Rouleau stated there were no plans to monitor air emissions or water quality on Miller's site plan. She further stated she did not feel this has been a fair process as the peer reviews contained errors which Council have not addressed nor have they addressed questions for the peer reviewer's. In conclusion Ms. Cassidy-Rouleau also voiced her concerns regarding noise control, air quality, odour and dust, blasting, along with possible consequences from earthquake or fire disaster and urged Council to seriously consider all the possible negative impacts a permanent asphalt plant would have on the neighbouring community.

Miss Traleena Rouleau - 78 Braeloch Road

Miss Rouleau addressed her concerns regarding significant wildlife habitat and natural heritage features. Miss Rouleau advised Council she was opposed to the expansion and the associated negative impacts of a permanent asphalt plant. She urged Council not to let the government pressure to protect aggregate and build roads override the needs of the community. In conclusion she requested Council vote against the proposed Zoning By-Law and Official Plan amendments.

Mrs. Regina Rolph - 85 Dochart Street

Mrs. Regina Rolph expressed her concern on whether Council had received a presentation from the Township Fire Department and stated she felt they needed to have a plan. Ms. Rolph further stated that the asphalt plant and concrete plant are merely machinery with no land tax value and the loss of taxation from one large home is far greater a risk for the Township.

Dr. Randy White - 15 Ridgeview Drive

Dr. Whyte stated as a dentist he had been involved in a lot of peer reviews and plan reviews so understood how things work in this regard. He urged Council to turn down Miller's request to amend the Township Official Plan and Zoning By-Law for a permanent asphalt plant. Dr. Whyte further stated that the studies submitted were not complete. He stated there was no study done on the total economic impact to the Township with the loss of tax total revenue by decreased value of

homes in the area, and rapid deterioration of the Township roads as a result of the increased traffic. He further added there was no study to handle natural disasters as a result of earthquakes, flooding, or forest fires as there has been no disclosure of any mitigation plans in place. Dr. Whyte added there are no studies in the follow up on disaster plans such as fire, spills, human error or contamination or even details on containment, controls or inspections. Dr. Whyte also spoke to the fact there was no public health study done on the effect of air emissions to the vulnerable population of our seniors and children and those with lung disease. In closing Dr. Whyte stated that he felt a Class 3 Industry asphalt plant is not a good mix for the rural residential neighbourhood.

Mr. Neil Masson - 1684 Usborne Street

Mr. Masson advised Council he did not agree with the proposed Zoning By-law and Official Plan amendment.

Mr. Doug Reynolds - 147 Toner Road

Mr. Reynolds advised that he felt this was a very bad development and he was opposed to it. Mr. Reynolds further added that he was very concerned about the lost taxation revenue as a result of reduced assessment on surrounding properties as a result of the proposed asphalt plant. Mr. Reynolds explained that this could result in raised taxes for everyone else to compensate for this substantial lost revenue. In closing Mr. Reynolds advised that this matter has the potential for having some very dire financial consequences for the entire Township and Council should seriously consider the direction they wish the Township to go in, whether they wish to have industrialization development or residential use development and should reject this proposal.

Mr. Tom Peckett - 28 Braeloch Road

Mr. Peckett stated that he did not feel this proposal was a good fit for the Township - financially, economically, or health wise. He appealed to the Township Council to refuse this proposal and keep the rural culture and rural atmosphere for this neighbourhood community for McNab/Braeside.

Mrs. Marilyn Kewley - 1919 River Road

Mrs. Kewley advised Council on a hot day she could not hang out her clothes because of the smell. She urged Council to protect the lifestyle of the community we so value and our children's right to enjoy a safe, clean environment in the future and turn down the proposed amendments by Miller's as it is too high a price to pay.

Mr. Mark Teskey - 18 Hazelwood Drive

Mr. Teskey stated that he was absolutely opposed to the proposed amendments by Miller's. He advised there was nothing more he could say that wasn't already said. He relayed his conversation with Mr. Bruce Firestone relating to the future economic development of the Township. In closing he urged Council to turn down the proposal by Miller's.

Mrs. Tara Archer Teskey - 18 Hazelwood Drive

Mrs. Teskey advised she was a high school teacher and mother of two and was against any changes

that would place a permanent asphalt plant in her neighbourhood. She advised that the air emissions from an asphalt plant will send out cancer causing agents into our air as per the information received earlier from Wilf Ruland and Dr. Cole which will surely infiltrate our water as well as our soil. She also stated that the contaminants will come down through rainfall which is where the water for the Braeside Ridge comes from. She stated that once contaminated the aquifer is impossible to restore. The noise pollution and increased truck traffic, decreased property values and overall harm to our quality of life were additional concerns addressed by Ms. Teskey who in closing urged Council to not let corporate profit come first.

Mr. Duane Stevens - 299 Golf Club Road

Mr. Stevens advised Council he had moved to this area for peace and tranquility and asked Council to please not allow this proposal to go through.

Mrs. Jayne Stevens - 299 Golf Club Road

Mrs. Stevens advised they had tried to sell their house with lots of interested buyers, however, once they found out about the expansion of the quarry and a possible permanent asphalt plant they decided against buying as they felt the risk was just too high. In closing Ms. Stevens added that if an asphalt plant is allowed the house values in the area will decrease.

Mr. George Moore - 15 Carmichael Sideroad

Mr. Moore stated he is very concerned of the information Council has received and the information hidden from Council. Mr. Moore addressed several concerns identified by the peer reviewers regarding the air quality study as well as the weather monitoring information. In closing Mr. Moore also addressed his concerns with regards to the proposed location of the asphalt plant.

Mr. Pat McIntyre - 12 Ridgeview Drive

Mr. McIntyre advised he had several good conversations with MNR and MOE representatives and although we have talked about all the issues related to these proposals we have not addressed what MNR is going to do for us. He stated he is currently waiting on information as to what were the results of fines or their investigations on the issues that took place in 2005, 2007 and 2009. Mr. McIntyre stated there has been three asphalt fires in Canada since 2010 and spoke to the issues relating to asphalt fires related to the water used to fight the fires. In closing Mr. McIntyre stated there was no mitigation plans in place currently to address these concerns.

Mrs. Beth Pope - 48 Ridgeview Drive

Mrs. Pope advised Council she is apposed to the Zoning By-law and Official Plan amendments. Mrs. Pope stated the environmental impact of an asphalt plant to the community will be huge. Mrs. Pope further stated she has lived a healthy life and does not want to be affected by the negative impacts addressed earlier at this meeting by everyone. She concluded by stating that the issues of the air quality and water contamination are a major concern as well as the heavy traffic, air emissions, fire and health issues and urged Council to keep the neighborhood environmentally friendly and turn down this proposal for an asphalt plant.

Mr. Dan Pope - 48 Ridgeview Drive

Mr. Pope stated he has lived in the Township for over 30 years and had to submit a plan when he was building a house which showed everything he was proposing to build. Mr. Pope asked Council if this policy had changed?

Ms. Ursula Chavez - 9 Rockwood Drive

Ms. Chavez advised Council she stands up for human rights and urged Council to protect her rights and deny the proposed amendments as the financial gain is not worth the risk.

Mr. Mike Hibbard - 9 Rockwood Drive

Mr. Hibbard stated he was not against the quarry and he was not against the expansion, however, he was defiantly against the asphalt plant. He commented on the bad odours of an asphalt plant and requested that Council think this through. He concluded by stating that he really didn't trust Miller's and asked Council to turn down these applications.

Mr. John Kerr - 371 Golf Club Road

Mr. Kerr advised he had built his home on Golf Club Road approximately 25 years ago and advised Council of his objection to the proposed expansion. He further stated his property and family would both be put at an unfair risk because of this proposed asphalt plant. Mr. Kerr further advised that he felt any study could be made to suit the interest of the application. Mr. Kerr asked Council who will compensate them for their decreased property values. He stated that he did not accept the proposed 300m set back from his dwelling rather than to his property line. In conclusion Mr. Kerr requested Council turn down the proposed amendments.

Mr. Bill MacMeechan - Box 454, Arnprior

Mr. MacMeechan stated he had concerns with everything that was said here this evening. Mr. MacMeechan stated there would be no loss of jobs if the Council refused the asphalt plant as the trucks picking up the asphalt would do so at another site. Mr. MacMeechan requested that Council compare the amount of taxes being received from the ridge and the amount being received from Miller's pit. In conclusion Mr. MacMeechan advised Council that they know what their residents want and urged them to do the right thing.

Mr. Sean Moore - 493 Golf Club Road

Mr. Sean Moore stated to Council he was opposed to the proposed Zoning By-law and Official Plan amendments. He explained his wife and him had already been impacted by Miller's industrialization of the quarry and the use of the temporary asphalt plant. He explained that himself and some of his neighbours took Miller's to court and they were found guilty of nuisance, trespass and negligence. Mr. Moore further advised that among some of the adverse impacts were noise from the trucks along Usborne Street using their air brakes as well as after hours operation. He explained the temporary asphalt plant ran all hours of the day with the generator running 24 hours a day. He explained there were very strong asphalt odours. He advised Miller's had a very poor record of recording data such as blasting data, monitoring plant and dust management. Mr. Moore referred to the peer review

issues regarding the blasting study. In conclusion Mr. Moore advised of his concerns of adverse impacts related to this industrialization such as water quality and quantity, blasting damages, loss of property values, risk of fire and fuel spills, asphalt odours, harmful air emissions and destruction of a significant portion of the alvar and requested Council turn down Miller's requests for amendments.

Mr. Jan Selles - 110 Toner Road

Mr. Selles explained he was still waiting for the final planning report and referred to the Strong Communities Act. He also spoke to the Provincial Policy Statements and matters of interest to the Province. Among these are natural heritage, aggregate resources and water. In closing Mr. Selles stated that we are to look after our water systems and private wells are to be protected as part of this mandate and Council needs to consider this when making their decision.

Mr. Geoff Burns - 351 Golf Club Road

Mr. Burns explained the quarry is in his back yard and he does not agree for them to use part of his property as a buffer zone. He stated there are still a lot of unanswered questions regarding what equipment there is and also raised his concerns regarding air emissions.

Ms. Bradley then advised that this ends everyone who had requested to speak this evening therefore this ends the public submissions and she further explained the process to follow. Ms. Bradley then advised everyone that Council would now review all the submissions received tonight as well as everything they received to-date and at the next Planning Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for May 21st will receive the final planning report from the Township Planner - Mr. Bruce Howarth regarding the subject applications. Ms. Bradley also advised the public that written submissions can still be made until such a time as the by-laws are adopted or refused as per the prescribed notices which were given.

Ms. Bradley also advised that anyone wishing to be notified of Council's decision regarding these proposed amendments to please sign the sheet located at the door before leaving.

In addition to the oral submissions several items of written correspondence were hand delivered to the CAO/Clerk during the meeting.

The CAO/Clerk advised that should the Zoning Amendment By-Law be passed a notice of passing would then be circulated as required under the Planning Act. There would then be an appeal period of 20 days from the date of the notice of passing. The Zoning By-Law Amendment does not come into force and effect until the Official Plan Amendment has received final approval from the County of Renfrew.

The CAO/Clerk further advised that should the Official Plan Amendment be adopted by Council a notice of the adoption will be forwarded to the County of Renfrew for final approval as required.

The CAO/Clerk advised that should there be any members of the public in attendance who wished to receive further notification with regards to these amendments to please leave their name, address and phone number on the list at the back of the hall.

Mayor Campbell thanked everyone for their attendance.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m. on a motion moved by Deputy Mayor Blimkie, seconded by Councillor Styles . **CARRIED.**

MAYOR

CAO/CLERK

(Original signed by Mayor Mary M. Campbell and CAO/Clerk Noreen C. Mellema)