



## Planning and Community Development

Tuesday, September 29, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.

The Planning and Community Development Committee met for a joint public meeting with the Township of Chatsworth on the above date at the Williamsford Arena, Williamsford, Ontario with the following members in attendance:

County Planning Committee Members Present: Warden Eccles, Chair Arlene Wright, Vice-Chair Paul McQueen and Scott Mackey.

Township Committee Members Present: Bob Pringle, Brian Gamble, Elizabeth Thompson and Shawn Greig

County Staff Present: Scott Taylor, Senior Planner, and Monica Scribner Administrative Assistant.

Township Staff Present: Will Moore, CAO-Clerk, Ron Davidson, Township Planner, Brad Thake, Road Superintendent, and Dianne Oldrieve, Planning / Building / Licensing.

Also Present: Matt Nelson, GM Blueplan Engineering, Nolan Moss, Genevieve Scott and Don Scott, Cuesta Planning Consultants and Pearl Bumstead, Proponent

**Proposed County Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment on lands described as Part Lot 27, Concession 7 municipally known as 584015 Sideroad 60 in the Township of Chatsworth (Geographic Township of Holland) County file no.: 42-04-036-OPA-123.**

### Call to Order

Mayor Pringle called the public meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the joint public meeting on behalf of the Township.

Chair Arlene Wright welcomed everyone on behalf of the County.

Mr. Taylor presented the meeting regulations.

The proposed County Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment affect those lands described as Part Lot 27, Concession 7 known municipally as 584015 Sideroad 60, in the geographic Township of Holland, now in the Township of Chatsworth.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment (County File Number 42-04-36-OPA-123) would re-designate the subject lands from the “Agricultural” designation to the “Mineral Resource Extraction with exceptions” designation to permit the establishment of a pit operation on the subject lands. Approximately 39.6 hectares of land are proposed to be licensed for this operation. A portion of the subject lands have already been mapped as “Aggregate Resources Area” on Schedule B to the County Official Plan.

A Zoning By-law Amendment is also being processed by the Township of Chatsworth to implement the Official Plan Amendment. The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment is to change the zoning of approximately 39.6 hectares of land from ‘A1 – Rural’ to ‘M3 – Extractive Industrial’ to permit the proposed pit operation.

As required by Sections 17 and 34 of the Planning Act RSO 1990, as amended, Council shall ensure that at least one public meeting is held, notice of which shall be given in the manner and to the persons and public bodies containing the prescribed information.

In accordance with the Planning Act and the implementing Regulation being Ontario Regulation 543/06 and 545/06, the County of Grey gave notice of this Public Meeting on behalf of the County and the Township, by individual prepaid first class mail to persons within 120 metres based on the most recent assessment information provided by MPAC (Municipal Property Assessment Corporation), and to an extensive list of agencies as set out in the regulations. The public meeting notice is located on the County web site at [www.grey.ca](http://www.grey.ca).

It is imperative to note that:

Any person or public body may attend the Public Meeting and make written and/or verbal representation either in support of or in opposition to this proposal. If a person or public body that files an appeal of the decision of the County of Grey in respect of the proposed Official Plan Amendment or Zoning By-law Amendment and does not make oral submissions at the Public Meeting or make written submissions to the County of Grey before the proposal is approved or refused, the Ontario Municipal Board may dismiss the appeal.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at the public meeting or make written submissions to the County of Grey in respect of the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment before the approval authority gives or

refuses to give approval to the Official Plan Amendment, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there is reasonable grounds to do so.

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the proposed Official Plan Amendment you must make a written request to the County of Grey at 595 9th Ave. East, Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 3E3. This can be mailed to the County or deposited with the Administrative Assistant, Monica Scribner this evening.

If you wish to be notified on the decision of the Zoning By-law Amendment, please make a similar request to the Township.

If there are any comments, questions or concerns for those in attendance this evening please address the Chair and give your name and Lot and Concession, or civic address, for the record.

## Comments received from the following:

### *Agency Comments:*

#### Historic Saugeen Metis, dated September 4, 2015

No objection or opposition to the proposed development including the land re-designation, rezoning, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.

#### Saugeen Conservation (SVCA), dated January 13, 2014

All of the plan review functions of interest to this Authority have been assessed with respect to this proposed Official Plan Amendment and proposed Zoning by-law Amendment. The Authority has no objection to the approval of the proposed pit application for a Category 1 Class 'A' Pit License. As such, the proposed amendments that will re-designate and re-zone the property to permit the establishment of the pit operation are acceptable to the SVCA.

#### Saugeen Ojibway Nation, dated January 10, 2014

The Saugeen Ojibway Nation have reviewed the application and note that is within their traditional territory. Given the potential for impacts, further consultation and accommodation are required.

#### Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, dated August 7, 2015

Based on the information contained in the report, the Ministry is satisfied that the fieldwork and reporting for the archaeological assessment are consistent with the

ministry's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists and the terms and conditions for archaeological licenses. This report has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Please note that the Ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.

Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), dated May 20, 2015

The MOECC has no further outstanding concern with this proposed ARA application.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), dated January 27, 2015

Our Ministry's concerns/comments related to hydrogeological matters, as identified in our letter dated February 18, 2014, are addressed in the addendum report and revised site plans and we have no further concerns.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH)

MMAH helped co-ordinate the technical review by partner Ministries.

Lea Consulting- Peer Review done on behalf of the Township - ongoing

Identified some concerns with the proposal from a traffic and road assessment standpoint. Staff will be seeking advice from Lea on the traffic and road submissions, submitted on behalf of the proponent, received last week.

Ministry of Transportation (MTO)\*

\*Although inadvertently not read out at the public meeting, comments have also been received from the MTO. Initially MTO had indicated some concerns with the proposal; however the MTO issued a further email indicating no concerns with the supplemental work prepared on behalf of the proponent.

County and Township staff have subsequently shared the Lea Consulting Peer Review comments with MTO to see if the Ministry has any further comments.

*Public Correspondence:*

- Concerns over impacts on neighbouring farms
- Preserve existing farmland / avoid loss of good farmland
- Rehabilitation plan questions
- Drinking water safety concerns / impact on wells
- Concerns about the identification of the water table
- Concerns about extraction being too close to the water table

- Traffic concerns
- Seeking clarity of traffic studies
- Increase in traffic/heavy truck traffic
- Concerns over road conditions along the haul route including the ‘S’ bends
- Concerns over ongoing maintenance of roads
- Proposed haul routes through Berkeley
- Impacts on Berkeley
- Concerns over Highway 10 / 60 Sideroad intersection
- Need for road upgrades / increase in taxes as a result of the pit
- Tax reassignment after potential development
- The pit is not for the common good, but only benefits owner / operator
- Negative impacts on surrounding property values
- Keep the unique beauty of area intact
- Impacts on rural community values
- Impact on tourism
- Noise impacts
- Environmental concerns
- Impact on air quality
- Karst topography concerns
- Impact on wildlife
- Concern over endangered species
- Concerns that the extraction method is dangerous
- Clarification needed on the pit license application
- Growing number of gravel pits in the area, is there a need for more?
- Tertiary aggregate – not primary or secondary and therefore not consistent with Provincial Policy
- Questions over Provincial Policy Statement consistency
- Questions over County Official Plan conformity
- Concerns over accuracy of technical studies
- Support for the pit stating there is demand for good aggregate product that continues to grow due to increased growth and upgrades to infrastructure
- After extraction and rehabilitation, the area could be turned back into farmland. The gravel deposit would provide material for building homes, roads for ease of travel, employment, etc. and then be available later for future food production as proved in the Tara area

List of names who submitted comments:

Adrian and Andrea Smith

Andrew and Patty Caine

Angela Boersma

Anna James

Barbara and Eric Shaw

Barb and Terry Hinch

Birgit and Garry Wright

Brian Crocker

Calvin Russell

Carl and Sharon Hurd

Carrie James

Charlie and Jackie Damato

Chatsworth Taxpayers For A Safe And Healthy Environment

Claire Crocker

Clifford Verdon

Clinton Smith

Daryl Heatherington

David and Barbara Cassidy

David and Josephine Millican

David and Ruby Ollerton

Dawn Gillen

DC Curt

Don and Doris Sowerby

Donald T Curry

Doug Crocker

Dufferin ATV Club

Frank and Pam Stemmler

G. Bryan Young

George Burbidge

Gilbert and Sharon Van Eck

Gregory and Darlene Elchuk

Helmut Pankratz

Hugh and Marnie Graham

James and Susan Hunter

James and Barbara McCleave

Jean and James Witten

Jean Buchanan

Jennifer Base

Jennifer Miske

Jessica White

Jim and Ruth Martin

Joanne and Richard

John and Alicia Quinn

John Dickson

Judi Shropshire

Juifer Burble

Julie Williams

Karl Backhaus

Kathy and Ray Stephenson

Kathy McCarthy

Ken Byers

Kim Fullerton

Kurt Berger

Larry and Sharon Neely

Laverne Rogers

Leona Roach

Lesley Lewis

Lisa Ruddy and Jeff Misiurski

Liz Zetlin

Lynn Buttineau

Mike McMurray

Nancy Lou Hill

Naohiko and Anne Kurita

Nicoll Wilson

Norman Ragetlie, Ontario Farmland Trust

Peter and June Walinga

Ray Hillifer

Richard and Joanne Bickley

Rhonda Ross

Robert Wenting and Richard Devrieze

Rolland and Julia Poisson

Ryan and Jody Johnson

Sara Kurita and Marc Dryer

Sean Russell

Sharon and Larry Neely

Sharon and Stewart Hyde

Sharon Mohr

Shawn Wilson

Shirley and Mo Shpur

Susan McDonald



Stan and Liz Hierons

Susan and Jim Hunter

Toby Chong-King

Tony and Marni Shpur

Trevor and Lynda Kendall

Val Ames and Robert Ginzel

Viola Sowersby

William Celhoffer

The County and Township also received a petition in opposition to the proposed pit signed by many residents.

Chair Wright gave direction on the evening's events, mentioning that no decisions will be made tonight. This meeting is a chance for the public to voice their comments and ask any questions.

Mr. Davidson made some procedural remarks on behalf of the Township, and introduced Cuesta Planning staff.

Ms. Scott presented on behalf of the proponent. This proposed pit will require an Official Plan Amendment, as well as a Zoning By-law Amendment and a license from the MNRF. The Bumstead land consists of a farm, residence, barn and outbuildings. It is located in an area with a mixture of farms and non-farm residential uses. It is currently being used for mixed crop production. Their farmstead is proposed to remain on-site.

Approximately 39.6 hectares would be licensed for Class 1 Mineral Resource Extraction with the remaining lands to be used for visual screening, buffer lands and environmental setbacks to minimize any impacts. The maximum annual extraction rate will be 150,000 tonnes. The proposed pit would be developed in three phases; with approximately 1/3 of the pit in each phase. Hours of operation will be 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. Monday to Friday, and 7:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m. Saturdays. No operations are proposed for Sundays or holidays.

This application was submitted in 2013 and a significant amount of work has been completed to date. Treed berms would be planted and matured by the time the second phase starts. Rehabilitation would level the lands, with the topsoil spread back across the site, to ensure the rehabilitated lands would be farmable. It is the intent of the land owner that the property would continue to be farmed as extraction is on-going. A maximum disturbed area provision will be attached as a note on the operations plans for this pit.

There have been hydrogeological, traffic, road, archaeological, and environmental studies completed for this proposed pit. The on-site aggregate deposit was determined to be of a very high quality resource, suitable for the construction industry.

The Natural Environment Technical Report concluded that no significant long term natural environmental impacts affecting significant features or functions are expected from the proposed pit. MNRFC has now signed off on this study. A letter of acceptance on the Archaeological Assessment was received by the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport in 2015.

Surface and groundwater protective measures have been taken to make sure the appropriate mechanisms are in place on the license, to ensure the quality and quantity of the water resource will not be impacted. MOECC have signed off on this matter, including any potential impacts on karst topography.

To lessen noise impacts, there will be treed berms installed, 150 metre noise buffers, and a site plan note that requires quieter back up beepers be used on heavy equipment on-site. Dust will be controlled in accordance with Provincial standards.

The proposed haul route is east on 60 Sideroad to Highway 10, where the material will travel north / south to market. Road and traffic studies have been conducted and the impacts are considered not to be significant. Some posting and speed limit changes have already occurred on the haul route. Gravel pit drivers would be educated on the protocol regarding the presence of horse / riders and pedestrians using 60 Sideroad.

*The following 24 members of the public made comments:*

John Quinn, Dave Ollerton, Heather Van Fleet, Frank Horvat, Rhonda Ross, Ryan Johnson, Carrie James, Gregory Elchuk, Lisa Ruddy, Howard Newman, Bill Celhoffer, Al Ireton, John Wilkes, Birgit Wright, Jean Witten, Tobi Witten, Irvine Hollis, Scott Fisher, Andrea Smith, Bill Hartley, Jean Buchanan, Peter Bissette, Dawn Gillen, Robert Wenting and Karl Backhaus.

*Comments and questions from the public:*

- ♣ Please remember the rights of the people. We want to continue to enjoy the peace and quiet of our small town. We feel that there would be a huge impact on neighbours and the community.
- ♣ Many multi-generation families live in the area, and the impacts on young and old need to be considered.

- ♣ Concerns over the proposed increase in large truckloads using 60 Sideroad. Additional large trucks on the road will not only have an impact on the road itself, but also create driving hazards on the roads.
- ♣ Safety issues with trucks turning onto and off of Highway 10.
- ♣ Concern that the only money from the gravel is going to the owner and that the gravel will travel to the Greater Toronto Area (GTA)
- ♣ Noise, dust allergies, diesel fumes, and pollution concerns, including exhaust stacks from the trucks, will impact residents and houses along the haul route.
- ♣ Already enough consumer waste with traffic coming from the GTA.
- ♣ Will the Bumstead family be living at their current home while the pit is in operation and for the lifecycle of the pit?
- ♣ Large peat layer underneath the road will cause road performance issues and require costly repairs.
- ♣ Who will pay for the necessary road improvements?
- ♣ Concerns over current road conditions.
- ♣ Concerns over truck drivers speeding along the haul route.
- ♣ In August 2015 there was a sinkhole on 60 Sideroad.
- ♣ If trucks are re-routed south, they would not make the sharp turn at the intersection.
- ♣ Will there be a lineup of 40 – 50 trucks waiting to get into the pit at 5:00 a.m. (as is the case in Caledon) and what time the last trucks are leaving?
- ♣ Who will monitor and police the trucks such that they are not lining up early to get into the pit?
- ♣ Who will police the haul route, to ensure only the designated haul route is used?
- ♣ Will empty and loaded trucks be forced to use this haul route?
- ♣ Have other haul routes been considered which avoid Berkeley?
- ♣ Who will enforce the conditions on the license?
- ♣ The Province is under-staffed and cannot adequately enforce pits which are already licensed.
- ♣ Concerns of potential maintenance costs of existing pits.
- ♣ Will property taxes be affected?
- ♣ MPAC property values of homes near the pit could be negatively affected and if so, would create less tax generation for the Township.
- ♣ One person calculated the tax reduction numbers could equal up to 1.12 million dollars in lost assessment value.
- ♣ Glad the proponent wants to use their whole property so that they had to go through the Official Plan Amendment process.

- ♣ The Planning Committee should note that not all Official Plan Amendment applications need to be approved. When making long term planning decisions you need to make sure to look at the big picture (at least 10 years ahead).
- ♣ With there being hundreds of acres of aggregate between 60 Sideroad and Highway 10, there could be more farms that could try to open as pits.
- ♣ A statement to the Township politicians: If Township has concerns about refusing the development and having over \$80,000 in legal costs for denying the application, please consider that road costs would far exceed that cost within a short period of time
- ♣ County Plan states that two-thirds of aggregate on-site is not of high quality, and therefore not protected by the Provincial Policy Statement, nor worthy of extraction.
- ♣ Please pay attention to the attendance here tonight as well to the well documented concerns from our community. Don't base your decision on financial fear vs. the happiness of our community
- ♣ Remark that the Grey County Official Plan states that farms should be protected. Why would you consider an amendment for inferior quality gravel vs. good farmland?
- ♣ What policies justify changing this property to an Extractive Industrial M3 zone?
- ♣ Why is there no sunset clause for duration and rehabilitation of the proposed pit?
- ♣ Concerns for the amount and quality of the town's water supply.
- ♣ What happens if a truck rolls over and spills diesel? Who pays for the rehabilitation and where would the spill cleanup materials be dumped?
- ♣ Who is going to pay for and replace Town or landowner water supply if it is polluted or diverted?
- ♣ As a ratepayer, we are involuntarily being asked to invest in a project with a possible negative rate of return. The Township should act as a private investor would in this case and refuse this 'investment / pit'.
- ♣ Will clean fill be used by the proponent on-site?
- ♣ Out of the 18 pits in the Chatsworth area, how many trucks go through a hamlet?
- ♣ Why turn down a severance on agricultural land but allow for a pit instead?
- ♣ Happy to see representatives from the Township and the County in attendance.
- ♣ Where is the market for this aggregate?
- ♣ Will details concerning noise and hours of operation be handled through a site plan agreement?
- ♣ Has financial costing showing revenues and expenses been done?
- ♣ Will there be another Public Meeting?
- ♣ Is there a guarantee that the land will return to agricultural use?
- ♣ What power will the County and Township have if they go below the water table?

- ♣ There should be a lot assessment analysis prepared that shows the difference between aggregates vs. farming of the lands; to show the rate increase and tax loss.
- ♣ There is a lot of money being spent on this application including a lot of staff time.
- ♣ How much money does the Township receive per year for all 18 pits?
- ♣ Are all the 18 pits operating at capacity and how many have been rehabilitated?
- ♣ Concern that the Traffic Study was not performed at an appropriate time. Summer holiday weekend traffic needs to be included in the assessment.
- ♣ Statement that there has been speed limit changes, is that in anticipation of the pit?
- ♣ The children who cannot speak for themselves need to be considered in this process.
- ♣ Many concerns for safety on the roads. Township roads are not very wide and in some spots there is a 6 foot drop with no shoulder. There are school buses making many stops at the end of driveways, people walking dogs, families pushing strollers, horseback riding, turtles crossing, cycling, etc. all of which could be impacted by the trucks and this pit.
- ♣ Concern that in looking at the Gamsby and Mannerow documents, it shows the existing ground profile as 405 above mean sea level (AMSL) and once backfilled with topsoil would be rehabilitated to 398.9 AMSL.

*Summary of comments and answers back to the public:*

- ♣ Proponent clarified that they have lived on their property since 1978 and would be continuing to live on their property during the pit operation, until there is a smooth transition over to a new owner.
- ♣ The Township stated they have been considering this application carefully and that a peer review is in process with respect to the roads. Township Council are not yet in a position to determine who will pay for the road improvements as of yet, should the pit be approved. The Township commented that the proponent's consultants have prepared reports on behalf of the proposed pit. A consulting group, Lea Consultants, is currently working on a Peer Review for the Township. The reports and addendum reports are available on the County website for public viewing. The Township will send any questions off to the peer review consultant for further review. Road upgrades and who will pay for them will be a key issue in the review and any Council decision.
- ♣ The Township clarified that this pit would have to abide by the pre-established haul route in the development agreement. There would only be one controlled

haul route for outgoing and return traffic. The Township would draw up an agreement that will address the issue of trucks lining up early and have a set time that trucks must leave the area.

- ♣ The Township responded that there is currently approximately \$30,000 received per year from all the pits in the Township in total. Even beyond this \$30,000, there is still a cost to the Township for road maintenance as a result of pits.
- ♣ The Township noted that they are unsure if property values would change as a result of this application.
- ♣ The Township noted that there are two or three pits that are at capacity and two or three other pits that have been closed and have been rehabilitated. We cannot consider other pits and their capacity with this new application. The PPS is clear about aggregates being a Provincial resource and need not being a test which can be considered.
- ♣ The County Planner stated that as part of the planning process in Ontario, Planners cannot consider property value changes in their recommendations on planning applications. Mr. Taylor acknowledged that this is often a primary concern of landowners, but not directly considered as part of Ontario's planning process.
- ♣ The Township mentioned that we need to wait until MPAC does their assessment in January 2016 and if concerned, public would need to talk to MPAC directly.
- ♣ The Township reminded everyone that we may be a long way off from making the final decision. There are many things to consider with this ongoing process.
- ♣ The County Planner commented that they consider all planning applications brought forward. All technical reports, studies, and comments submitted are reviewed and considered before making the recommendation to support or refuse any applications. Within the process there is a need to balance public / private resources and interests. The process is meant to be open and transparent for all parties involved.
- ♣ The County assured everyone that all minutes from meetings go to the Planning and Community Development Committee, before being sent onto County Council.
- ♣ Matt Nelson, hydrogeologist for the proponent, clarified that the pit extraction is to remain above the water table and there is no pumping or diversion of water. There is no reason to expect an impact on the local water supply. There is never guarantee on water quality, but there are protections under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA).
- ♣ Matt Nelson stated if there were a truck rollover, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) who would be heavily involved, and the spill

would be reported. If water contamination occurs, the owner is responsible. There is also separate legislation that protects drinking water.

- ♣ Ms. Bumstead stated:
  - They have a letter of support from Donald Curry of Sharedon Farms Ltd. who fully supports their pit proposal. He currently leases rehabilitated pit land elsewhere and operates a farm on those lands.
  - They have had the aggregate tested and over 97% is usable.
  - There was a pit in Tara that has been rehabilitated and currently crops grow on that land.
  - They have a letter of support from Laverne Rogers of Rogers Enterprises who has operated a construction company for many years. He supports the pit application, stating there is a demand for quality aggregate in our area and since we are running low, we will soon need to import aggregate from elsewhere.
  - In response to the 60 Sideroad sinkhole comment, the road was closed due to replacement of a culvert.
- ♣ The Township commented that through the license there will be regulations that any fill material first be tested to MOECC standards, before being brought on site.
- ♣ The Township Planner explained that the PPS places heavy emphasis on preserving sand and gravel resources, for potential future extraction. The County Official Plan does not allow for non-farm lot creation within aggregate resource areas. Gravel extraction does take priority over residential lot severances in rural Ontario.
- ♣ The County Planner commented:
  - In 2004 the County prepared (along with many stakeholders) an Aggregate Resource Inventory Master Plan (ARIMP), which showed where the aggregate resource is located and where there are existing constraints on the resource. Within the ARIMP, which looked forward 20 years, the prediction was that within that 20 year timeframe it would not be financially viable to ship aggregate to the GTA (i.e. the costs of shipping and availability of resource closer to the GTA did not warrant materials from Grey County being shipped there).
  - Mr. Taylor noted that anecdotally most local pit operators say their market for aggregate is Grey, Bruce, Simcoe and Northern Wellington Counties. There has however been a recent quarry approval in eastern Grey County, who has noted their target market as the GTA.
- ♣ The Township Planner stated that the Site Plans under the Aggregate Resources Act would cover noise, hours of operation, phasing, and rehabilitation of the pit.

Road upgrades as well as any other offsite issues would be addressed by a development agreement between the Township and the proponent.

- ♣ The Township said there has not been a financial impact analysis prepared and they are trying to balance all interests.
- ♣ Ms. Bumstead confirmed there is a signed contract in place for the rehabilitated land to be farmed again.
- ♣ The Township confirmed that if the pit operator went below the water table, the MNRF would be responsible to address that issue through the license. MNRF monitors license compliance, and could shut down the operation, or lay possible charges for any non-compliance.
- ♣ Ms. Scott and Mr. Nelson clarified the Traffic Study was done on a Friday of a long weekend in July as per the Peer Review request. There was a straight pressure counter and a pressure counter that assesses vehicle types used. The reports are available online for anyone interested.
- ♣ Township staff confirmed the change in speed limits had nothing to do with the pit application, rather with road safety in general. The sharp 'S' bend needed to be reduced in speed. Township staff make the best recommendations for the Township to ensure the safest speeds possible while maintaining Ministry standards.
- ♣ Ms. Scott noted the concern regarding busier traffic on long weekends, but reminded everyone that the pit would only operate 7:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. on Saturdays. It would be closed all Sundays, holidays and also the Saturday on long weekends.
- ♣ County Planner reminded everyone that all information is on the County website ([www.grey.ca](http://www.grey.ca)). Any further addendums and information will be posted there. At any time feel free to contact Scott Taylor, County Planner with any questions.
- ♣ Mr. Taylor noted that the next steps in the process are as follows:
  - To receive any further public, agency, or peer review comments.
  - Once any further comments have been received, the County Planner would take a report to the County Planning and Community Development Committee with a final recommendation on this Official Plan Amendment application. The report will be available for the public to view approximately one week prior to the meeting. The minutes from the Committee meeting, as well as a possible by-law for the Official Plan Amendment (if recommended for approval), would proceed to County Council.
  - Following a decision by the County, the Township Planner would take a report to Township Council on the Zoning By-law Amendment.
  - It is possible that either Council may decide they need further information prior to making a decision to approve or refuse.



- Should the pit be refused, the proponent can appeal the decision to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).
  - Should the pit be approved, anyone can appeal the decision to the OMB.
  - The license for the pit operation through the MNRF can also be referred to the OMB.
  - All three applications, the license, the Official Plan Amendment and the Zoning By-law Amendment, need to be approved before the pit could proceed.
- ♣ The minimum standard, under the Planning Act, for Public Meetings, is one meeting but if there are significant changes to the application, there could be a second Public Meeting.

Chair Wright thanked everyone for coming and closed the meeting with the following comments:

Any further questions, please contact Scott Taylor at Grey County or Ron Davidson at the Township of Chatsworth.

Meeting adjourned at 10:01p.m.