

**From:**

**Subject:**

**Date:**

Re: RE: CBM Aggregates Sunderland - Notice of Recommendation Report (June 26)

June 25, 2023 11:40:49 AM

---

Hi Stephanie - Unfortunately I will be unable to attend the meeting on the 26th. Please accept this as my written submission on behalf of myself and my parents.

To Mayor Schummer, Regional Councillor Mike Jubb, and council,

I wish to once again voice my opposition to the approval of zoning bylaw amendment 11-2022-RA (CBM Sunderland), and if the decision of council is ultimately to approve the amendment, that the township ensure appropriate steps are taken to protect the neighbours' enjoyment of property.

I continue to maintain that approving this rezoning, of agricultural lands to permit an industrial use, is not compatible with the existing residential neighbourhood. If it were not for the presence of the existing aggregate operations, I highly doubt council and planning would even contemplate such a dramatic change in use.

While the Provincial Policy Statement's section on rural areas does support aggregate extraction, and Section 2.5 does speak to the protection and - dare I say - exploitation of mineral aggregate resources, it would appear that the language in that section would only apply in the circumstance that there is no other surrounding development (Section 2.5.2.4). In this case, that horse has already left the barn (as it were), and the area has been allowed to develop over the last 65 years (since the establishment of the aggregate facilities to the north and west of the subject land) into a residential neighbourhood. Given my family's experience with CBM and the Sunderland South pit (noise and dust, in spite of a temporary berm), I have no confidence that the activities of the pit can be mitigated to the extent that it doesn't substantially affect the existing residents, either noise and/or dust, not to mention the potential impact on wells for residents who are 'downstream' (based on the movement of the groundwater) from the operation.

With respect to our property, again I ask (I asked this at the regional planning committee meeting, and have yet to have a response): what will CBM do to protect my parents' property from noise and dust issues? When the Sunderland South pit was re-activated 25 years ago, my parents were promised a 30-metre treed buffer between their property and extraction activities; that did not materialize. When they raised issues of noise and dust, they were told to "mind their f---ing business." Can I expect a similar response if they have issues with the new extraction activities? Will that be the response for other neighbours if they raise issues. Will there be a protocol to address noise and dust concerns that CBM will follow, along with the well water complaint protocol?

I recognize the conundrum council faces in opposing the recommendation of its

planner. To do so puts the municipality in a tenuous position should the matter go before the Ontario Land Tribunal. At the same time, however, the municipality needs to ensure the interests and protection of the neighbours remain paramount.

Respectfully,

Ian Adams

(representing John and Susan Adams, S690 Regional Road 13, Sunderland).