

# Meeting Minutes



## Supplementary Aggregate Resources Policy Study - Working Group Meeting # 2

---

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	September 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2023
Time:	6:00 pm

---

### In Attendance

Mayor Annette Groves (AG), Councillor Lynn Kiernan (LK), Councillor Christina Early (CE), Steven Burke (SB), Jeff Hignett (JH), Mark Dorfman (MD), Mark Head (MH), Dorothy DiBerto (DD), Jesse DeJager (JD), David Sylvester (DS), Cheryl Connors (CC), Jane Thompson (JT), Neil Morris (NM), Martin Bamford (MB), John Emery (JE)

### Agenda Items

#### 1. Land Acknowledgment

#### 2. Preliminary Matters

##### Discussion

- JT sent memo with suggested agenda items, received today, to be reviewed by staff, described issues that warrant discussion, CC added 2 items to the list: rehabilitation fill and recycled aggregate.
- SB discusses meeting tone, purpose of meeting is to receive everyone's perspective and to stay on subject and follow agenda. Staff role is to listen.
- JE suggests critical issue is the CBM application

#### 3. Minutes from August 10th

- No questions regarding minutes.

## 4. Study Schedule

- JH presents draft revised project schedule, notes timelines have shifted now that the ICBL has been extended, open for discussion
  - LK notes she approves of revised work plan
  - SB mentions updating schedule to allow one meeting per month
- JT asks if open house is too early, and what is the purpose? Concerned that environment and natural heritage has been neglected
  - MD states Background Report notes the Province usurped all responsibility for aggregate from municipalities. Caledon needs to exert responsibility from the community sense, municipality has responsibility to protect community. OP covers this protects natural heritage features. Aggregates section of OP includes protections and references to other areas of plan, not replicating other sections.
  - JT has concerns with draft OP, Regional policies better, HPMARA flawed.
  - AG agrees with Jane's approach, suggests this study should have run concurrent to OP
    - SB notes that we started with direction for new OP the Region hadn't updated aggregate policies, yet environmental policies had – challenging when environmental policies come before aggregate. While we could delay natural environment section of OP, preference is to continue with current process.

## 5. Aggregate Potential Influence Area

- JT notes Region does HPMARA, then CHPMARA to follow. On existing OP, following the CCRS – more changes happened to reach current Schedule L. Suggest we look at provincial stuff and start from scratch.
- MH says that when creating HPMARA the root info that informed prior Schedule L is reproduced, to map the areas that are resource, and include anything province says is a pre-emptive constraint and local constraint itemized and with a rational explanation.
- JT concerned no mapping completed on drainage areas, MH points out that's not a constraint, exempt from analysis. CC states resource mapping is important – holds a lot of weight at the tribunal so important we get the map right; JT adds map to be as complete as possible based on submitted criteria.
- MH notes it its important source data is well understood, and happy to review all this, discusses what and why certain data is excluded/included, can review to ensure nothing missed. JT believes 125 ha constraint missing, MH notes core valley and stream corridors are mapped, small amount that prohibit aggregate, not all drainage areas. 2023 updated data is better for CAs – includes crest of slope, etc local valley and stream corridors left to Caledon to protect
- JT notes the timeline for Official Plan comments is too short – requested end of Oct.
  - SB responds environmental policies changed, are more evolved, we're meant to respond to the Regional Official Plan in Nov so keeping a tight timeline for comments. Looking at revieing environmental issues, logical to review what works with Aggregate Policies

### Mapping Discussion

- MD reviews new mapping analysis showing Area of Influence – 1,000 m from Settlement Areas and Residential Clusters. Discusses associated stats and results from analysis, notes 1000 m comes from Ministry guidelines of Land Use Compatibility measured from quarries and pits, doesn't recognize the reciprocal distance from Settlement Areas and Residential Clusters. MD elaborates that it's not a separation distance, and new residential or sensitive land use should currently be 500 m from existing quarry, 300 m from pit (though again, this isn't a reciprocal requirement). Suggests possible discussion on how to transfer this into positive direction in Official Plan. Onus is on municipality to

protect communities while Provincial Policy Statement protects resource. Nothing in PPS on social impacts. Look at 1000m distance, what is this, what questions come out of it.

- JT suggests possibility of requiring operator own these 1000 m influence areas, consider reciprocal policy, better for safe communities.
- JE notes water resources, also suggests asking for separation distance from property line, need to control for wayside pits, critical to get that a bylaw.
- MD notes aggregate operators can apply anywhere in in the Town if can demonstrate resource is present, always note they meet provincial requirements.
- MB wants to defend these areas, with experts, who can defend at OLT
- CC adds province says to protect aggregate where possible, it's in Brampton, Toronto, but this that is not possible. Need to add Palgrave Estates to distance mapping
  - MH – HPMARA is protection for potential long term use. Application of mapping criteria removing majority of resource would be hard to defend as being consistent with provincial direction

#### Mono Mills

- MD discusses how this area came to be identified, gives full history, MH notes added areas came about as better modelling and tools started to be used to update bedrock mapping.
  - JE mentions WESP done detailed mapping, work by geologists, MD explains more HPMARA map area added north of Caledon Village, need to understand how OGS made change from 2009-2015 – MH notes this was asked to the province. The province sent us information on layer thickness from new analysis. Province met Region staff, presented their work.
  - CC notes if this was known perhaps the health facility just outside Mono Mills would not have been built, feels Province doesn't care, known issue, wakes up to dust every day. MD believes the Province should make the process more transparent.
  - JT asks about a law of nuisance, MD answers OLT doesn't deal with nuisance, property values, etc.

## 6. Mineral Aggregate Resource Objectives

- NM like to tie air quality to this exercise, CC mentions Oakville's air quality bylaw linked to Health Index, MB asking if something to implement here? How to do it?
  - MD says stand-alone tests for air, noise etc. need infrastructure and people. Can craft into policies, but don't put all details, tests in Official Plan Objectives. Standards on how implemented, then bring in experts to write the bylaw.
- MD states important to read full OP, not just Chapter on aggregates, myriad of cross-references.
  - JT notes one of objectives should meet environmental standards, protect water resources, etc., MD agrees.
  - CC wonders if Mayor's motion is the right avenue, MD describes motion, JT doesn't like that if home not in cluster or Settlement Area they lose out.

## 7. Next Meeting

- Working Group review Objectives
- Review possible with local features and areas
- JT to meet with Town and Region staff outside of group
- Palgrave Estates to be buffered for 1000 m Area of Interest