

Addendum to Attachment 4. Summary of Public Comments and Responses Received After June 22, 2023

	Comments	Township Response
T. Sevelka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided papers regarding aggregate extraction operations and their adverse effect (regarding property values, flyrock, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed aggregate operation expansion is a sand and gravel operation, not a quarry operation so blasting and fly rock are not relevant to this particular application. • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions).
I. Adams (representing J. and S. Adams)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose approval of ZBA 11-2022-RA • If approved, Township should ensure appropriate steps taken to protect neighbours' enjoyment of property. • Rezoning agricultural lands to permit an industrial use is not compatible with existing residential neighbourhood. • While the PPS does support aggregate extraction, policies would only apply in the circumstance that there is no other surrounding development (Section 2.5.2.4). 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Proposed site plan includes noise and dust mitigation measures. Community Liaison Committee to be established to facilitate ongoing discussions regarding operations. • Provincial, Regional and Township planning policies provide for aggregate operations, even within the Greenbelt. The applicant has addressed potential issues related to the proposed pit expansion through technical reports. • The PPS supports aggregate operations subject to provisions. Section 2.5 of the PPS continues to apply. Section 2.5.2.4 provides protection for aggregate operations from uses that would preclude or hinder their expansion/ continued use but doesn't preclude an expansion if matters of public health, safety and environmental impact are addressed.

<p>I. Adams cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given family's experience with CBM and the Sunderland south pit (noise and dust in spite of a temporary berm), no confidence that the pit activities can be mitigated to the extent that it doesn't substantially affect existing residents (noise, dust, and wells) and don't trust what CBM says • What will CBM do to protect parents' property from noise and dust issues? • When south pit activated 25 years ago, were promised a 30m treed buffer between property and extraction activities that did not materialize. • How will CBM respond if neighbours raise issues. Will there be a protocol to address noise and dust concerns that CBM will follow, along with the well water complaint protocol? • For the well survey, can residents hire their own company to do the survey at CBM's expense? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following measures proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise will be mitigated through equipment controls & perimeter berms. ○ Directional backup alarms will be used on equipment (called quackers), which limit noise. These alarms are designed to focus the noise to a certain area or only be slightly louder than the ambient noise in the vicinity of the vehicle and only those who are directly behind the vehicle will hear it. ○ Calcium and water will be applied to internal haul roads and processing areas to mitigate dust. • Staff cannot speak to the past application process, but the approved plan for the existing south pit outlines a 15m setback to the Adams property. • CBM has complaint protocol in place and a Community Liaison Committee is to be established to facilitate ongoing discussions regarding pit operations. • The private well survey will be completed by an independent third party consultant that is retained by CBM. They are bound by professional designations (either P.Eng. or P.Geo.) to be unbiased and report on the facts. It is standard practice for the operator to arrange the well survey. CBM is not prepared to reimburse those residents who wish to engage their own company.
-----------------------	---	---

	Comments	Township Response
P. Renz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed by recommendation to re-zone and permit CBM to operate a new aggregate pit • Strongly encourage Council to vote against the proposal. Don't accept what they're asking for. • The planning recommendation is not reliable. Submissions from third party firms paid by CBM are used as the basis for the recommendation. These firms manipulate data to support CBM. Township has not done its due diligence to independently verify findings represented by CBM. • Will result in drastic reductions in property values. Will Brock Township reduce our taxes accordingly? • Considering class action lawsuit to recover damages • What consequences will CBM face for the rules they break. There needs to be a terms of operation agreement with defined penalties. • Move the southern boundary of the extraction area/ berm 200-300m or more to the north to mitigate damaging effects of noise, dust, environmental habitat & potential water table issues. Berm currently proposed 100ft from property line with sound decibels reaching up to 120. • Loaders, backhoes and dozers by themselves can create decibel levels of 106. According to CDC, noise exceeding 70 DB over prolonged period can cause hearing damage. CBM proposing to dig 65 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Technical reports & studies have been carried out by qualified professionals bound to a professional code of conduct. • All reports have been reviewed by MNRF, MECP, LSRCA, Region and Township, and peer reviewed by consultant(s) retained by the Region. • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). Taxes are based on MPAC's assessment. • Aggregate pits are under MNRF's jurisdiction and enforced by MNRF. • An agreement with the Township would not have any legal authority over matters already addressed under the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA). • The Noise Impact Assessment submitted and reviewed by the Region's peer reviewer looked at the predicted sound levels under the worst case scenario and shows the proposed extraction area will operate below the required noise limits established by the Province (MECP) with the proposed berms and noise controls in place as recommended by the acoustic engineer. The back up alarms on the

<p>P. Renz cont.</p>	<p>hours a week for 5 years. 20 DB not just twice the noise of 10 DB, it's actually 100 times. It's not a linear equation but a logarithmic one. Even the best soil berms with grass can only be expected to absorb 5 DB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can Township accept money from CBM for Township golf tournament just before a rezoning vote? The optics are very bad and put into question the impartiality of the process. • Has there been direct indigenous consultation and approval to the rezoning proposal? • This process is being pushed through too quickly. No time has been given for proper consultation. We have not been listened to and deserve a face-to-face meeting with council. 	<p>equipment provide an extra level of noise control. The berm has been placed in a location where it is required for noise attenuation based on the noise assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The berm is located within the 30m setback from the south property line, with the 20m road right-of-way there's at least 50m between the closest residential property limit and the limit of extraction, with the closest residence approx. 100m from the extraction area. • Businesses throughout the Township sponsor the Township's golf tournament which is used to raise money to assist non-profit organizations in providing youth-oriented programs. CBM has been a sponsor for many years. • Recommendations for this project are based on planning principles and the planning context as outlined in Provincial, Regional and local planning policy documents in accordance with the Ontario Professional Planners Institute Code of Professional Practice. • At least 9 indigenous communities have been involved in the consultation process as part of the ARA process (as outlined in the Planning Justification Report). • This process has been ongoing for close to 2 years with at least 3 public meetings held. An in-person meeting was held with residents on July 26, 2023.
----------------------	--	---

<p>P. Renz cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit and see the area. See what damage will be caused. • Don't let CBM dig below the water line. No guarantees that there won't be impacts to local wells. Why risk it? • What are the benefits to the Township? Where is the cost/benefit analysis? Receiving extra tax revenue? Is CBM sharing profits with the Township? Are they repairing Reg. Rd 13? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Township staff undertook a site visit as part of this process. • The Water Resources Report submitted includes a complete evaluation of potential impacts of the proposed below water extraction on groundwater quality and quantity in the area around the CBM pit, including private water wells within 500m and natural heritage features near the site. The study concluded that the proposed below water extraction can be carried out with no hydrogeological effects on groundwater use in area. • Recommendations for this project are based on land use planning principles and the planning context as outlined in Provincial, Regional and local planning policy documents. • CBM is assessed and taxed accordingly. • In accordance with the ARA, licensed aggregate operations contribute to municipalities through the TOARC levy which is assessed annually based on the tonnage shipped from the site. • Any planned improvements to Regional Rd 13 would be up to the Region as this is a Regional road and their plans include ongoing improvements along Regional Rd 13 over the next few years.
----------------------	---	--

	Comments	Township Response
J. Mears	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachment 4 of report 2023-DS-013 does not adequately address residents' concerns provided since September 2021 and the petition. • Disappointing that Township planning approach has not adopted a more holistic approach towards residents, concerns and unique nature of this rural community. • Residents concerned this large-scale gravel operation is planned too close to homes and similar to the north pit, a previously rehabilitated area such as the current south pit may ultimately end up as one large lake with this proposed site. • Extraction occurring in highly vulnerable aquifer, the source of potable water. Surrounding wells could be exposed to contamination from aggregate. Extraction proposed 12m below water. • CBM claims past and current operations extract below the water table and deny any issues have occurred. However, the Pines development is at a much high elevation and further away. Residents to this proposed expansion are closer & down grade. • Concerned that the water resources study and hydrogeologic assessment did not include our pond within the 120m study area. It is fed by underground streams and constant flow 24/7 by weepers under the house. It is an insurance requirement in case of fire and vulnerable to water level disruption from below water extraction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachment 4 of report 2023-DS-013 outlines a summary of public comments & questions received & staff's response. • The Zoning By-law Amendment process was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act. • The proposed rehabilitation plan for this subject property includes 3 pond areas that are separate from the other south property. • The Water Resources Report includes a complete evaluation of potential impacts of the proposed below water extraction on groundwater quality and quantity in the area around the CBM pit, including private water wells within 500m and natural heritage features near the site. The study concluded the proposed extraction can be carried out with no hydrogeological effects on groundwater use in area. • Past and current operations include the north pit, as well as the existing south pit adjacent to this proposed expansion, which is located closer to the residents along Sdrd 17 than the proposed expansion area.

<p>J. Mears cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note staff recommend “The well water complaint protocol should be revised to require that the Township should also be notified in the event of a complaint.” CBM response plan includes a cistern water supply to an effected well which could be problematic in the winter. The ZBL should not be approved until the Township has a protocol in place to adequately respond in the event of a complaint. • The private well survey should be done as required for approval of the license by MNRF not prior to below water extraction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our 30-ft deep well is in a vulnerable position, just 50m from the CBM boundary and down grade from the excavation. CBM mapping does not identify our registered well. • Request a site plan correction that clearly identifies the location of our well at the end of Conc Rd 2. • Want to ensure survey process carried out by certified well inspector independent from CBM. It should be quantitative, including well depth, pressure and quality of water and confirm the position of registered wells in MECP database. • Survey information should go into CBM database and shared with well owners to ensure all aspects of potable water supply for residents is respected. • All residents should be notified prior to the survey taking place and present. All residents and the Township should receive a copy of the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBM already has a complaint protocol process in place. The Township requested to be notified so that there is some additional accountability in the process. • The water well complaint response plan provides for number of options that take various factors into consideration (such as weather). • The Water Resources report notes that conducting the private well survey in advance of the license being granted is not considered necessary given the direction of the groundwater flow and background information. The well survey will take place prior to any extraction as a condition of the ARA license. • MECP well records contain 6 well records within 500m of the site, as outlined on Fig. 10 of the Water Resources report. The report recognizes that there are other wells within 500m that are not included in the MECP database & therefore, not shown on Fig. 10 (such as this resident’s well). • A private well survey is to be completed at residences within 500m regardless if the well is shown on the map in the report, subject to the landowner’s permission. Residents will be contacted directly to obtain specific details of their wells. • The private well survey will be completed by an independent third party consultant that is retained by CBM. They are bound by professional designations (either P.Eng. or
---------------------------	--	---

<p>J. Mears cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning Act provides for the protection of Public Health and Safety. • With as many as 60-70 large gravel trucks daily entering and leaving the site, dust containing silica will be carried by wind into the forest, wetlands and surrounding neighbourhood where all residents are at risk, young children especially. It takes minute amounts of silica to lodge in lung tissue and this remains a risk despite claims otherwise. • These clouds of dust and noise of rocks slamming into the trucks box from the excavator were observed often and brought to CBM's attention previously when the south site was operating. • Residents bordering the north pit report a significant amount of dust and CBM pays for cleaning. Clouds of dust carried by wind into environmental areas from previous south pit was significant and required calls to CBM to mitigate. • This proposed operation will come much closer to surrounding residents with potential to affect health, restrict enjoyment of property, & way of life. 	<p>P.Geo.) to be unbiased and report on the facts. It is standard practice for the operator to arrange the well survey. Results of the survey will be included in the first annual monitoring report, which the Township has requested circulation of and can be shared with residents through the Community Liaison Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing monitoring will also continue to take place throughout extraction at the monitoring wells outlined in the report. • An Air Quality Impact Assessment and Noise Impact Assessment were submitted and reviewed by the Region's peer review consultants. Both studies demonstrate that the pit expansion can take place within the required limits and provisions as set out in Provincial guidelines. • No exceedances of the Ministry's regulatory standards are expected and no significant off-site dust is expected. • Noise from the proposed operation will be mitigated through equipment controls and perimeter berms. • Mitigation measures are proposed to be put in place to address any potential dust and noise. Berms are only one of the measures recommended to help with noise mitigation.
---------------------------	---	---

<p>J. Mears cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In our experience with the south pit, a berm provides limited protection and during establishment it is disruptive to residents in close proximity due to noise and visibility of heavy machinery and dust and dirt carried by winds until the vegetation establishes which can take months. • CBM must agree to provide cleaning services (interior and exterior) for those impacted by dust similar to those around the north pit • If a tree screen planned on Conc. Rd 2, we ask that it be a mix of native and indigenous species • The technical reports and studies were carried out by qualified professionals, members of OSSGA (Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association) - a clear conflict of interest despite being bound by a professional code of conduct. • Property values are significantly effected by 25 to 30% and Township response is missing but no problem increasing already high taxes on surrounding residents. • Even best efforts at rehabilitation cannot replace a lost ecosystem. Cannot replace the significant and complex microbial biodiversity which exists in healthy soil. We have neither the understanding nor the technology to recreate an established ecosystem and while the ecosystem may eventually repair itself this can take centuries. • Unsubstantiated, unscientific claims related to the rehabilitation plan that it will produce a net ecological gain. It will be a long time before fish can live in the ponds. Stretching credulity to state that the plan is better from a carbon perspective than the current agricultural pastureland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should issues arise during extraction, CBM will respond to complaints in accordance with their complaint response protocol. • A tree screen will be provided along Conc Rd 2 and will include a mix of native, indigenous species. • All reports have been reviewed by MNRF, MECP, LSRCA, Region and Township, and peer reviewed by third party consultant(s) retained by the Region. • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). • Provincial planning documents permit aggregate extraction operations and rehabilitation is required to meet specific policies. The rehabilitation plan is expected to result in a net-positive impact on the ecological conditions and functions of the valleyland through an increase in natural cover, increase in riparian buffer and enhancing wildlife habitat.
---------------------------	---	---

<p>J. Mears cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about rehabilitation not replacing what's lost and how ensure rehabilitation plan will be implemented? CBM showed picture of rehabilitation example in the north pit that has since been excavated further and now included in the north pit lake. Residents do not trust CBM's rehabilitation plans and concerned the same thing will happen here in that that the 3 proposed ponds will be joined into 1 big lake. • Disagree with Township's response with agricultural lands being Class 6. This area has grown a flourishing crop of soy for several years and qualifies as Class 1 or 2, moderately high to high in productivity. Request a LEAR or soil analysis be done before any decisions made. • How often will erosion and sediment control be reviewed/ maintained with respect to the fencing between the extraction area and the EP and PSW? Concerned because of ongoing issue of flooding across Reg. Rd 13 during torrential rainstorms carrying sediment into the wetland and Beaver River from gravel trucks accessing the CBM site. CBM doesn't control this environmental hazard now and doubtful they will monitor and control runoff in surrounding area. • GHG assessment was paid by CBM. Who did the assessment? The Township should have it peer reviewed. • Planners should leave their desks and come and view the rural area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation plan includes 3 small ponds, riparian and upland habitats, with plantings across the site to support species diversity and habitat enhancement. • The rehabilitation plan will create additional habitat to enhance the adjacent PSW. • Rehabilitation has been ongoing at the current CBM site in accordance with the approved plans and existing license applications. Sites are inspected by MNRF to ensure compliance with approved plans, including rehabilitation. • The land is classified as Class 6 in accordance with Canada Land Inventory (CLI) mapping based on the soil characteristics. Regardless of the soil classification, an aggregate pit is permitted. • ESC fencing will be actively monitored as outlined on the Site Plan. Aggregate pits are under MNRF's jurisdiction. Inspections and enforcement done by MNRF under the ARA. • A GHG assessment was provided and reviewed by LSRCA and the Township • Township staff undertook a site visit as part of this process
---------------------------	---	---

	Comments	Township Response
K. Bharucha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed by recommendations to accept the zoning change from RU to M4 • Encourage council to reject voting to approve this recommendation at the expense of us residents. • Just received the report and have had not enough time to digest and provide response. • Have made 2 deputations to Township Council and 1 deputation to Region over the last 2 years. • Some issues have never been responded to. • Request Council hold face-to-face special meeting to discuss all issues & concerns. • Allowing this pit expansion will adversely affect our quiet life & affect the environment, cause anxiousness re water supply • Will reduce property values by 25-30%. This is of extreme concern as we just cannot afford to lose equity so that CBM can profit. At CBM info meeting in October 2021, CBM noted they would talk if residents willing to sell house. This statement should be enforced by CBM and they should consider compensation for property value losses. • Would the Township have an Operations Agreement with CBM in place prior to any approvals being given re items like water wells, hours of operations, beepers etc. which would be rigidly enforced? • Has the planner ever done an on-site visit? A Planner has to give equal consideration to residents not just CBM. • The subject farmland is Class 1 or 2 not Class 6 as erroneously stated in the CBM reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Council deferred the June 2023 report to September. • In person meeting held with residents on July 26, 2023. • Mitigation measures are proposed to be put in place to address any potential impacts. • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). • Financial compensation is at CBM's discretion. • Matters such as well monitoring, hours of operation, noise/beepers are addressed under the ARA. An agreement with Township would not have any legal authority over ARA matters • Township staff undertook a site visit. • Land is classified as Class 6 in accordance with Canada Land Inventory (CLI) mapping based on the soil characteristics. Regardless of soil classification, an aggregate pit is permitted in accordance

<p>K. Bharucha cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmlands in Ontario are disappearing at the rate of 319 acres per day. • There is enough gravel supply in Ontario currently to last for 10 more years. • LSRCA had to say OK as they are under ARA and are not allowed to say much else. • Registered well is within 50m from CBM's property. What if my well dries up, loses pressure or is contaminated? CBM says they will provide cistern, what happens in the winter when cistern freezes? CBM claims that never happens but have heard it does. • Golder notes the water flow is west to east but know it's flowing north to south. • Concerned about pond on property that is needed for insurance for fire purposes • Pg 3 of 4 in the Site Plan package shows water level of pond ASL at 265.5m and ground floor level of my house at 265 ASL. Want this verified by engineers, not landscape architect. 	<p>with Provincial, Regional and Local planning policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The resources found in this area are unique and produce a specific type of product that is needed. The proposed pit will provide a high-quality supply of aggregate material to local and regional markets. • LSRCA reviewed the materials in accordance with their mandate and Provincial policies. • The Water Resources Report was completed by a qualified engineer and includes a complete evaluation of potential impacts of the proposed below water extraction on groundwater quality and quantity in the area around the CBM pit, including private water wells within 500m and natural heritage features near the site. The study concluded that the proposed below water extraction can be carried out with no hydrogeological effects on groundwater use in area. • The water well complaint response plan provides for number of options that take various factors into consideration (such as weather). • While the Site Plan package was stamped by a landscape architect, it is based on the information outlined in the technical reports, including information provided by the engineer in the Water Resources report.
------------------------------	--	---

<p>K. Bharucha cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request berm be built at least 60m (200ft) from the southern fence. • Why was the objectors notice from Esher Planning only sent to some residents and not all? • The Township planner has parroted CBM's responses and not given due diligence to respond to concerns. • Urge Council not to rush to approve this without addressing all the issues because will cause consequences for years to come. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Noise Impact Assessment submitted and reviewed by the Region's peer reviewer looked at the predicted sound levels under the worst case scenario and shows the proposed extraction area will operate below the required noise limits established by the Province (MECP) with the proposed berms and noise controls in place as recommended by the acoustic engineer. The back up alarms on the equipment provide an extra level of noise control. The berm has been placed in a location where it is required for noise attenuation based on the noise assessment. • The berm is located within the 30m setback from the south property line, with the 20m road right-of-way there's at least 50m between the closest residential property limit and the limit of extraction, with the closest residence approx. 100m from the extraction area. • The objectors notice was only sent to those that provided comments directly as part of the ARA process.
--------------------------	--	--

	Comments	Township Response
E. Negrazis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose approval of ZBA • Alarming that voting on the application scheduled on the same day you are to hear final concerns from residents. We have significant concerns that warrant a time for consideration. • Just received the report and have had not enough time to digest and provide response. • Many questions and concerns brought forward have gone unaddressed. Request an in-person meeting with council and a CBM representative to discuss these issues prior to Council's vote. • Has a direct consultation been made in regard to this project with our First Nations and Metis peoples? If not, provide reason in a report. • Informed during previous meetings that well water testing had been or would be completed on neighbouring wells which could potentially be affected by this operation. We have still not had anyone assess our well. Our property overlaps with the boundary of the CBM property. • Want third-party assessment of our well to be completed to show current status and if it will be able to handle any changes in the water table due to this expansion before the application is approved, and we want to choose the company doing the assessment to ensure they don't have any ties with CBM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Council deferred the June 2023 report to September. The ZBA process was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act. • This process has been ongoing for close to 2 years with at least 3 public meetings. • An in-person meeting held with residents on July 26, 2023. • At least 9 indigenous communities (including the Metis) have been involved in the consultation process as part of the ARA process (as outlined in the Planning Justification Report). • A private well survey is required and will take place prior to any extraction as a condition of the ARA license should the ZBA and ROPA applications be approved. The Water Resources report notes that conducting the private well survey in advance of the license being granted is not considered necessary given the direction of the groundwater flow and background information. • The private well survey will be completed at residences within 500m prior to any extraction, subject to landowner permission • The private well survey will be completed by an independent third party consultant that is retained by CBM. They are bound by

<p>E. Negrazis cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to trust anything CBM says when preventative measures that were supposed to be put in place to protect the homes around the north pit and existing south pit were not followed through and other residents have reported no treed buffer provided around the Adams' residence, boundaries growing outside of what original approval, ponds flooding during downpours and leaking contaminants into wetlands. • If approved, what plan has been put in place to mitigate this behaviour from occurring in the future? What will their consequences be when they don't follow through with their promises? • Expect a detailed Terms of Operations Agreement between CBM and the local government to be established prior to approval, and demand these terms be enforced with disciplinary action. • If operations agreement not possibility, want amendments to original site plan to make it possible to address issues that come forward. Want a community liaison group created. This group would consist of a few people who can be the voice of the community, CBM management/ supervisors who work directly with the Sunderland pit, and members of council. Meetings would be arranged on an agreed upon schedule, and they would be mediated by an external party. CBM would be responsible for the costs of facilitating these meetings. 	<p>professional designations (either P.Eng. or P.Geo.) to be unbiased and report on the facts. It is standard practice for the operator to arrange the well survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregate pits are under MNRF's jurisdiction. Inspections and enforcement done by MNRF under the ARA. • Community Liaison Committee will be established to facilitate ongoing discussions regarding operations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agreement with the Township would not have any legal authority over matters addressed under the ARA and could not be enforced. As noted above, a Community Liaison Committee will be established with CBM and representatives from the community.
--------------------------	--	--

<p>E. Negrazis cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this is approved, how will we be compensated for the potential damages to our property from dust accumulation, compromised water wells, and any other unforeseen effects on our properties? • CBM has previously mentioned supplying us with cisterns if needed but who will actually pay the costs to upkeep these throughout the year, particularly over the winter? • If wells are damaged, we want new wells drilled. We will not accept cisterns on our property creating yet another eyesore and another maintenance cost/issue. Any and all detrimental affects caused to our homes and property by this expansion should be covered financially by CBM. • No mitigation strategies available to completely prevent noise and dust from diminishing the peace, comfort, and enjoyment of our adjacent homes • What about the obvious depreciation of the value of our homes and property? Have been told that our properties will decrease in value from 25-30%. Who is going to compensate us for this massive loss of equity? Will CBM buy us out? • At CBM info meeting in October 2021, CBM noted open to discussion re compensation. When will this discussion take place? • Either CBM/local governments arrive at a fair compensatory amount to offset future losses upon sale, or CBM buys our properties prior to Council's approval at a replacement value that residents can rebuild in another area. • Want a written agreement with CBM detailing how they would compensate for potential damages to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation measures are proposed to be put in place to address any potential impacts. • The water well complaint response plan in place should any impacts arise, provides for number of options that take various factors into consideration (such as weather). • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). • Financial compensation is at CBM's discretion.
--------------------------	--	---

<p>E. Negrazis cont.</p>	<p>property. They should be paying for cleaning homes & vehicles & guaranteeing potable water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepared to initiate a class action lawsuit against Township and Region if issues on public record are not addressed and we suffer losses in equity resulting from an unsubstantiated approval. • Told CBM was one of the main sponsors of the Township’s golf tournament. It is our opinion this is a gross conflict of interest for Council and employees to accept this when CBM currently has this application seeking approval. • Question if there have been any other “gifts” or offers accepted from? • The Township has not addressed any of our concerns and the planning report is not sufficient. • Feel residents’ concerns have been intentionally ignored and fear CBM has had undue influence on local government officials and Town employees who are involved in this application process. • Have yet to receive the required notice or any direct written notification from CBM regarding this expansion. Didn’t receive the initial notification nor the notice of objection. Request required notice be issued and notification period for the application be restarted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should issues arise during extraction, CBM will respond to complaints in accordance with their complaint response protocol • Businesses throughout the Township sponsor the Township’s golf tournament which is used to raise money to assist non-profit organizations in providing youth-oriented programs. CBM has been a sponsor for many years. • No gifts or offers have been received by Township staff directly. The recommendations for this project are based on planning principles and the planning context as outlined in Provincial, Regional and local planning policy documents (not bribes) in accordance with the Ontario Professional Planners Institute Code of Professional Practice. • Issue with mailing address discrepancy through MPAC identified, which resulted in the mailed ZBA notice being returned. Notice provided via different means (i.e. mail, newspaper, signs, website) to help make residents aware of applications and offer opportunity to provide comments. Mr. and Mrs. Negrazis have been involved in this process since October 2021.
--------------------------	---	--

<p>E. Negrazis cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want berm moved back (north) to further mitigate dust and noise issues keeping pit operations as far from homes as possible. • Issues with Regional Rd 13 with respect to flooding and just getting worse. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Noise Impact Assessment submitted and reviewed by the Region's peer reviewer looked at the predicted sound levels under the worst case scenario and shows the proposed extraction area will operate below the required noise limits established by the Province (MECP) with the proposed berms and noise controls in place as recommended by the acoustic engineer. The back up alarms on the equipment provide an extra level of noise control. The berm has been placed in a location where it is required for noise attenuation based on the noise assessment. • The berm is located within the 30m setback from the south property line, with the 20m road right-of-way there's at least 50m between the closest residential property limit and the limit of extraction, with the closest residence approx. 100m from the extraction area. • Any planned improvements to Regional Rd 13 would be up to the Region as this is a Regional road and their plans include ongoing improvements along Regional Rd 13 over the next few years.
--------------------------	---	---

	Comments	Township Response
M. Negrazis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to zoning change & aggregate operation • Accepted existing operations when moved here in 2014 with hopes they would cease one day. • Share concerns with other residents. • Surrounding lands now residential which does not lend to further aggregate operations. • Subject property is prime farmland, which is being lost in this province to development. • If water table affected, how will we be compensated? • Didn't move to rural property to pay high taxes to have water delivered to CBM in a cistern. • Availability to water is a basic fundamental right. • Property value could be affected negatively up to 25%. How will we be compensated for this? • How does the Township explain the delay in making the recommendation report available? Residents didn't have adequate time to prepare response and raise concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Provincial, Regional and Township planning policies provide for aggregate operations, even within the Greenbelt. The applicant has addressed potential issues related to the proposed pit expansion through technical reports. • The well water response plan will provide for number of options should any unexpected issues arise as a result of these works that will take various factors into consideration (such as weather). • Property value impacts are not taken into consideration with respect to land use planning matters (based on past OLT decisions). • Financial compensation is at CBM's discretion. • The recommendation report was provided on the Thursday prior to the Council meeting as part of the agenda. Council deferred the report to September 2023.
M. Krendler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly object to ROPA application and oppose ZBA application • No consideration for local residents that was given. • Take more time to re-think this issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • This process has been ongoing for close to 2 years with at least 3 public meetings held. An in-person meeting held with residents on July 26, 2023.

	Comments	Township Response
A. Ghayyoor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly oppose approval of zoning change • This will seriously affect residents' life, health and safety in this area and is not necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Technical studies have been completed that demonstrate that the pit expansion can take place within the required limits and provisions as set out in Provincial guidelines. • Mitigation measures are proposed to be put in place to address any potential impacts.
A. Saso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of endangered plant and animal life? Have black ash trees on my property. Is there a process CBM will need to follow if they intend to disrupt them? • Noise limitations for this operation? Are they reviewed by natural resources? Have the current aggregate operation been assessed by these parameters? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Natural Environment Report was completed for the site, which identifies significant environmental features, potential impacts and mitigation measures to minimize impacts on the environment. • Resident's property is 1.6km from the proposed pit expansion so there will not be any disruption to the trees on their property. • A Noise Impact Assessment was submitted and reviewed by the Region's peer review consultant and MNRF. It addresses the potential noise impacts and shows that the proposed pit expansion will not exceed noise limits established by the Province (MECP). • Noise from the proposed operation will be mitigated through equipment controls and perimeter berms. Recommendations of the Noise Report are reflected in the ARA Site Plan that will be monitored and enforced by MNRF

	Comments	Township Response
J. Dale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBM only complying with the minimum level they need to. Should push for best management practices. • Concern with flooding on adjacent properties. Want commitment that won't happen. • Plan ahead for climate change. • Didn't look at natural ponds in the area, just wells • In light of highly vulnerable aquifer, can Township ask for wells to be surveyed in area greater than 500m? • Want to see operational plan in place. • Look at other existing operations agreements for residents' concerns that aren't captured by legislated regulations • Offer residents a buy-out to compensate for loss in property value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical studies completed that demonstrate the pit expansion can take place within the required limits set out by the Province. Additional measures have also been added upon the Township's request, such as a tree screen along the southern property boundary. • The Water Resources Report submitted includes a complete evaluation of potential impacts of the proposed below water extraction on groundwater and surface water, including private water wells within 500m and natural heritage features near the site. The study concluded that the proposed below water extraction can be carried out with no hydrogeological effects on groundwater use in area. • 500m radius for private well survey is outlined in the Water Resources report and based on industry standards/requirements. • The Site Plan package includes an operational plan in accordance with ARA requirements and addresses matters such as well monitoring, hours of operation, noise/beepers, etc. A separate agreement with the Township would not have any legal authority over matters already addressed under the ARA. • Financial compensation is at CBM's discretion.

<p>J. Dale cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at dust and noise mitigation measures. Add dust collectors on site and more trees in the area • Residents around north pit with dust issues – CBM cleaning their houses. Needs greater mitigation measures at the pit. • Stop operations during certain weather conditions (i.e. high wind) • Need annual reassessment on ongoing basis. • Need mechanism that residents can identify ongoing issues. • Question length of operating hours. Don't want to hear it 24 hours a day. • ESC fencing needs to be inspected a couple times a year to ensure it's working. • Class 6 agricultural lands – description doesn't match the land being farmed in previous years. Question as to how it was classified as Class 6 when currently being used as a farm • If don't intend to develop/extract in the EP area, they should consider donating the EP lands to LSRCA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Air Quality Impact Assessment and Noise Impact Assessment were submitted and reviewed by the Region's peer review consultants. Both studies demonstrate that the pit expansion can take place within the required limits and provisions set out by Province. Proposed site plan includes noise and dust mitigation measures that are to be put in place to address potential dust and noise. A tree screen will be added to the Site Plan along Conc Rd. 2. • Monitoring weather conditions and taking certain actions part of CBM's dust management plan. • Aggregate operations are required to complete an annual compliance report that are provided to MNRF, Region & Township • Community Liaison Committee will be established to facilitate ongoing discussions regarding operations. • Hours of operation for this expansion area will be 7am – 7pm Monday to Friday and 7am to noon on Saturdays. • ESC fencing will be actively monitored as outlined on the Site Plan. • Land classified as Class 6 in accordance with Canada Land Inventory (CLI) mapping based on the soil. Regardless of soil classification, aggregate pit is permitted. • CBM can consider conveyance of the EP lands to a public body such as LSRCA but this is not a requirement of the ZBA application.
----------------------	--	---

	Comments	Township Response
M. Doherty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue is loss of trust in CBM based on north pit experience • No street sweeping currently being done, issue with existing berms not being done • Update analysis of area with respect to wells in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Liaison Committee will be established to facilitate ongoing discussions regarding operations. • A street sweeper is engaged when needed. • The Water Resources Report submitted includes a complete evaluation of potential impacts of the proposed below water extraction on groundwater quality and quantity in the area around the CBM pit, including private water wells within 500m and natural heritage features near the site. The study concluded that the proposed below water extraction can be carried out with no hydrogeological effects on groundwater use in area.
C. Crate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBM materials only show 1 well on property and there's 2 wells • Concerns re noise and dust. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report recognizes that there are other wells within 500m that may not be shown on Fig. 10. • A private well survey is to be completed at residences within 500m regardless if the well is shown on the map in the report, subject to the landowner's permission. Residents will be contacted directly to obtain specific details of their wells. • Proposed site plan includes noise and dust mitigation measures that are to be put in place to address potential dust and noise.

	Comments	Township Response
B. Bigras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What benefits does this bring? What is CBM doing for this community? • How determine the 500m boundary for the well survey? • Well survey should be done before decision made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations are based on land use planning principles and the planning context as outlined in Provincial, Regional and local planning policy documents. • CBM is assessed and taxed accordingly. • In accordance with the ARA, licensed aggregate operations contribute to municipalities through the TOARC levy which is assessed annually based on the tonnage shipped from the site. • The 500m radius for the private well survey is outlined in the Water Resources report and based on industry standards and requirements. • Water Resources report notes that conducting the private well survey in advance of the license being granted is not considered necessary given the direction of the groundwater flow and background information. The well survey will take place prior to any extraction as a condition of the ARA license.

	Comments	Township Response
C. Bigras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental stewardship is important • Impacts to residents • How long will berm take to build? Noise and dust to build berm • Still hear pit from further away (beepers and grinders) • Concern with increase in traffic along Reg Rd 13 • What happens to the haul route if works done to Reg Rd 13? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes proposed to lands currently zoned EP, which includes wetlands and wooded area. EP zone will be maintained and no extraction activities are proposed or will be permitted within the EP area. • The Noise Impact Assessment submitted and reviewed by Region's peer reviewer looked at the predicted sound levels under the worst case scenario and shows the proposed extraction area will operate below the required noise limits established by the Province (MECP) with the proposed berms and noise controls in place as recommended by the acoustic engineer. The back up alarms on the equipment provide an extra level of noise control. The berm has been placed in a location where it is required for noise attenuation based on the noise assessment. • No plans to increase current levels of production, so the associated truck traffic volumes will remain the same. • Any planned improvements to Regional Rd 13 would be up to the Region as this is a Regional road and their plans include ongoing improvements along Regional Rd 13 over the next few years. • A note will be added the Site Plan to note that trucks are not permitted to use Brock Concession Rd 2 or Sideroad 17.