

# Schedule F1: SUPPLEMENTARY AGGREGATE RESOURCES POLICY STUDY - COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

Num	Received By	Date	Commentor	Affiliation	Comment	Response
1	Email	May 5, 2024	David Sylvester	Working Group	<p>Provided list of Comments &amp; Suggestions on Policy Options Report:</p> <p>It's evident that many, many hours were spent writing this document and in providing the suggestions and ideas that are contained within. Thank you to everybody who contributed.</p> <p>This report had been referred to as "The Policy Options Report" and accordingly, I assumed these policy options would be crafted using the multiple suggestions and input of the ARCWG public members. The first list of 63 policy options covers significant issues but fails to address the myriad health risks created by aggregate mining impacts. Also, policy suggestions to manage the multiple environmental issues remain largely unresolved.</p> <p>The following suggestions and questions is a preliminary list based on my first reading of the document:</p> <p>Summary of Policy Options for the OP.</p> <p>Paragraphs 1. &amp; 2. – I believe these two statements are based on the D-Series Guidelines, which provide no planning rationale to justify the non-reciprocal application of setback distances. If they are "guidelines" and not policy, why would we entrench these in our OP?</p> <p>Paragraph 3.-"Caledon should adopt Guidelines and Standards...." The list of contents in paragraph 4–25 is essential and enormously influential for processing aggregate applications and until this list is fully administered and complete, applications will not be subject to proper scrutiny. Paragraph 4–26 suggests this list "should be a future project for the Town to undertake.....". To kick this can down the road would appear to be an abandonment of responsibility. These technical issues should have been considered and dealt with over the past 15 months.</p> <p>Also, will these Guidelines and Standards be applied consistently by councillors and planners over the coming decades? What happens when an aggregate application is in pre-consultation or the consultation process and Caledon does not have an aggregate planner and/or an environmental planner on staff? It would seem, the application of these Guidelines and Standards cannot be left to chance or unqualified opinion.</p> <p>Paragraph 6. Contains typos? Could be a terrific policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 10. This is a terrific policy. Presumably, it could be implemented even without paragraphs 11 and 13. In that case, it would at least serve to achieve a clear standard during the initial application process.</p> <p>Paragraph 12. Does the vague wording here (avoid, minimize) render this policy ineffective?</p> <p>Paragraph 25. This is a terrific policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 26. Contains typos?</p> <p>Paragraph 31. Seeps and springs, significant recharge areas and vulnerable aquifers are environmentally significant areas. When identified in close proximity or occurring together, it would seem logical that such areas should be protected from development. Section 13.5.4 and 13.6.12 in the new OP simply provide for 30 m separation from development. Permitting an aggregate strip mine to excavate within 30 m of such areas is unacceptable. This was made clear by the hydrologist who addressed our sub meeting. Our aggregate policies need to address this scenario which presumably will require input from qualified experts.</p> <p>Paragraph 52. The concept of implementing AMP's into an aggregate license is disturbing, given the facts contained in the December Auditor general report on aggregate mining. Members of the ARC group have reiterated this concern clearly at our meetings.</p> <p>Summary Of Non-official Plan Options And Solutions</p>	<p>COMMENT: A meeting with the Aggregate Resources Working Group (ARCWG) was held to discuss the Policy Options Report, including in-depth policy comments, in July.</p>

					<p>With few exceptions, virtually all 22 of these policy options appear terrific. Why are they deemed non-official?</p> <p>Main Section of Document</p> <p>Paragraph 1–13. The first sentence here is confusing? Typos?</p> <p>Paragraph 2–5. The joint peel/Caledon Study refined the provincial resource areas.” The Region has indicated the town still has an opportunity (and obligation?) to review mapping further to apply local constraints. This could include the identification of seeps and springs, vulnerable aquifers and significant recharge areas. This should have been completed.</p> <p>Question 2.5: YES</p> <p>Question 2.9: yes – why not?</p> <p>Paragraph 3 – 1. Two issues here: Who decided a 30 m buffer was adequate? It is not. Additionally, the statement “... Caledon’s required environmental assessment study will establish whether there are further constraints.” In theory, this might be effective but who knows? What if there are no qualified environmental planners on staff at that time?</p> <p>Paragraph 3–3. As stated above, further mapping refinement by Caledon staff is required.</p> <p>Question 3.5 – Threshold policies: the suggested policy of Ian Sinclair regarding a pre-application acceptable water management strategy for below-water-table aggregate mines is sensible, logical and beneficial to both the town and the applicant. Why would this not be adopted?</p> <p>Paragraph 3–11. See comment above. Unless a Threshold policy is clearly articulated in our OP, it won’t be applied consistently. Again, what happens to an application when there are no qualified aggregate planners on staff at the time of submission?</p>	
2	Email	March 14, 2023	David Sylvester	Working Group	<p>Hello Antonietta,</p> <p>Our group invites you to participate in an upcoming public information meeting to provide an overview of the ICBL process and project timetable for the next 18 months. Meanwhile, could you address a few questions?</p> <p>Is there a project timetable or schedule of critical timelines with planned milestones, considering the hard deadline in October 2024?</p> <p>Is there a project coordinator assigned to this process?</p> <p>Will the new aggregate policies include:</p> <p>Land Use Compatibility with a 500-1000 m reciprocal setback for new aggregate mines?</p> <p>Cumulative effects principles?</p> <p>Environmental assessments for large-scale extraction proposals?</p> <p>Additionally, I've included a link to Nicola Ross's article, "Pit by Pit," which I recommend for all Caledon Planning staff.</p>	COMMENT: Project update was provided, this was pre-Working Group and David Sylvester ended up being selected to the Working Group. This was too early in the process to respond to the specific policy questions, but these issues were noted for future Working Group discussion.
3	Email	June 1, 2024	David Sylvester	Working Group	<p>Air Quality Policy Proposals:</p> <p>1.1.1 An Official Plan Amendment application to designate lands as Aggregate Resource Lands for a new extraction operation or expansion to an existing extraction operation shall require the following:</p> <p>a) Air Quality Assessments:</p> <p>i) The submission of a two phase air quality assessment, completed by a qualified professional.</p> <p>ii) The Phase 1 Air Quality Assessment shall include a determination of the existing PM 2.5 levels in the vicinity of the lands proposed to be redesignated. The Phase 1 Air Quality Assessment shall be conducted in accordance with the Town of Caledon approved terms of reference for Air Quality Assessments and shall be based on a minimum of three sampling locations for ambient air monitoring, one located upwind and two downwind of the proposed operation. The downwind samples are to be located in or near existing sensitive receptors, such as residential areas.</p> <p>iii) Applications where the findings of the Phase 1 Air Quality Assessment indicate a PM 2.5 level in excess of an annual average of 5.0 µg/m3 will not be supported for approval.</p> <p>iv) Applications where the findings of the Phase 1 Air Quality Assessment indicate a PM 2.5 level less than an annual average of 5.0 µg/m3 will require a completion of a Phase 2 Air Quality Assessment. Page -3-Allan Ramsay Planning Associates Inc.,</p> <p>v) The Phase 2 Air Quality Assessment shall be conducted in accordance with the Town of Caledon approved terms of reference for Air Quality Assessments and shall be based on a dispersion model that permits a maximum 75% mitigation rate in order to achieve the ambient air quality objective of an annual average of less than 5.0 µg/m3</p> <p>vi) Applications where the findings of the Phase 2 Air Quality Assessment indicate a mitigation rate of more than 75% is required to achieve a PM 2.5 level an annual average of less than 5.0 µg/m3 will not be supported for approval.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Section 20.5.9 of Chapter 20 in the Official Plan contains air quality policies, including a policy that incorporates World Health Organization standards for PM 2.5 and PM 10.

4	Email	February 21, 2024	David Sylvester	Working Group	<p>Hello everyone,</p> <p>There are a number of fundamental principles that should guide the formulation of our new aggregate policies. These include, but are not limited to; air quality, hydrogeology, hydrology, natural heritage, social impacts, traffic impacts, and noise impacts. The health and safety of Caledon's residents must take priority over the extraction of nonrenewable resources.</p> <p>Attached is a preliminary list of aggregate policy principles and ideas that have been formulated with input from technical experts and legal council. The majority of these suggestions can be supported by evidence-based science and thus, will be defensible at an OLT hearing. We can advise that additional suggestions will be forthcoming, including policies focussed on the protection of wetlands.</p> <p>Hopefully this list can be included for discussion at the meeting tomorrow evening.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>David Sylvester</p> <p>RECOMMENDED POLICY PRINCIPLES &amp; IDEAS</p> <p>The health and safety of residents comes first. Prior to submission of any aggregate extraction application, the proponent shall submit an air quality assessment plan for approval. This plan shall include proposed locations for a minimum of 3 electronic air quality monitors designated in areas to the satisfaction of the Town's peer reviewer, which monitors around the proposed site/site extension and the study shall be for a period of at least one year.</p> <p>Cumulative impact air quality assessment is a mandatory component of the aggregate air quality assessment plan.</p> <p>The aggregate air quality assessment plan study shall indicate the level of mitigation required to protect public health, using the highest defensible standard e.g. the World Health Organization's ("WHO") standards for PM2.5 and PM 10. The projected mitigation success rate must not</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Section 20.5.9 of Chapter 20 in the Official Plan contains air quality policies, including a policy that incorporates World Health Organization standards for PM 2.5 and PM 10.</p>
5	Email	August 9, 2023	David Sylvester	Working Group	<p>Hello Mark and Nathan,</p> <p>Please see the attached letter, submitted on behalf of the public members of the ARC Working Group. The contents don't represent all of our policy concerns and as you'd expect, we look forward to making further submissions.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>David Sylvester</p> <p>August 8, 2023</p> <p>Hello Mark,</p> <p>Thank you for your comprehensive SARP Study Background Review, providing valuable context on aggregate issues in Caledon. This is a significant step toward improving our aggregate policies.</p> <p>Given the SARP Study progress, it's clear Caledon's aggregate policies won't be finalized by the October 18th ICBL deadline. We suggest council approve an amendment to extend the bylaw for another year.</p> <p>Below are the policy priorities from the ARC Working Group for your consideration:</p> <p>1. Transportation:</p> <p>Review haul routes and establish a Haul Route Network before approving new/expanded aggregate operations. Propose a bypass around Caledon Village before new operations are approved. Evaluate new licenses for road capacity and require necessary road improvements at no additional cost to the Town.</p> <p>2. Water Resources:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Section 20.5.9 of Chapter 20 in the Official Plan contains air quality policies, and Section 20.5.11 contains policies pertaining to transportation, including haul routes.</p>

6	Email	February 26, 2024	David Sylvester	Working Group	<p>Good morning Joe,</p> <p>Further to the productive discussions we had at our last meeting, I'd like to point out a few additional details for future consideration. The Terms of Reference for the Supplementaries Study (approved March, 2023) included a comprehensive evaluation of existing Town aggregate policies. This was not done. There are multiple gaps and weaknesses in our existing policies. As an example, the Town's policies for evaluating new applications is based largely on the requirement that applicants "demonstrate that the proposal will not have any unacceptable impacts". There are 68 references to "unacceptable impacts" in the existing policies with few references to what represents an "acceptable" or "unacceptable" impact.</p> <p>As Glenn Pothier astutely pointed out, the public members have repeatedly referred to five fundamental topics that impact the health and well-being of Caledon's residents. These topics should be included in our examination of existing and proposed aggregate policies and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-hydrology/hydrogeology</li> <li>-air quality</li> <li>-traffic impacts</li> <li>-natural heritage impacts</li> <li>-social impacts</li> </ul> <p>There was agreement at the meeting that each of these topics could be the focus of a dedicated meeting in the coming weeks. Additionally, the concept of cumulative impacts could be applied to any of the above issues.</p> <p>Thanks for your attention to these matters.</p> <p>With best regards,</p> <p>David Sylvester</p>	<p>members took part in smaller group meetings were concentrated on specific topics regarding aggregate operations. Topics meetings typically involve an expert in the relevant field to deliver a presentation. Following the presentation, the ARCWG engages in discussions to address areas of concern and formulate policy ideas. There have been 10 small group meetings to date, with the focussed topics listed in chronological order below:</p> <p>Mapping of High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas</p> <p>Credit Valley Conservation's "Pits to Parks" initiative and Jim Tovey Lakeview Conservation Area (Excess Soil)</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>Valley and Stream Corridor Mapping</p> <p>Land use compatibility</p> <p>Blasting and fly rock</p> <p>Hydrology and hydrogeology</p>
7	Email	May 27, 2024	Jane Thompson	Working Group	<p>Attached please find the following documents submitted for consideration as part of the Town's Aggregate Policy Review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework - Caledon Official Plan Chapter 20</li> <li>2. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework Appendix 4 – Air Quality</li> <li>3. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework Appendix 6 - Recycling</li> <li>4. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework Appendix 10 Provincial Highway Network</li> <li>5. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework Appendix 11 – Study Areas for CHPMARA Update</li> <li>6. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework Caledon Official Plan Chapter 20 – General Submission</li> <li>7. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework Transportation Submission</li> <li>8. ARCWG Proposed Policy Framework Submission on Buffers and Minimum Distance Separation</li> </ol> <p>These documents have been circulated amongst the community members of the Aggregate Resources Community Working Group for input and comment. They are a compilation and synthesis of the proposals put forward by the members of the Working Group over the course of our investigations and discussions, together with submissions detailing the rationale and policy justification for the proposed policies.</p> <p>Additional background material will be provided by separate e mail.</p> <p>We look forward to working with Town Staff and Council in the development of policy options and draft Official Plan policies over the coming weeks.</p> <p>Jane Thompson Member ARCWG</p>	<p>Received for information, thank you.</p>

8	Email	April 3, 2024	Jane Thompson	Working Group	<p>The attached memo outlines a method for approaching the update of CHPMARA as part of the Supplementary Aggregate Policy Study. Joe, could you and I get together with Jeff Hignett and any others you think appropriate to produce this base map which we could take to the next WG meeting for discussion purposes?</p> <p>Thanks, Jane</p> <p>Context:</p> <p>The CCRS and OPA 161 processes were comprehensive studies aligning with the Greenbelt Plan, with no significant changes identified in Provincial Plans or Policies that would necessitate a complete reanalysis of CHPMARA (Caledon High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Area).</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Update over Reanalysis: The Town should update the existing CHPMARA using recent data rather than start a new analysis from scratch.</p> <p>Resource Identification: The CCRS/OPA 161 identified resources, applied constraints, and went through public and agency input, resulting in Schedule L and OPA 161. Replicating this is unnecessary; focus should be on newly identified areas and those marked for removal by the Province or Region.</p> <p>Process:</p> <p>Base Map Creation:</p> <p>Start with existing CHPMARA. Include potential new resource areas (NRAs) from 2020 Provincial mapping. Overlay Region of Peel's additions and deletions from Appendix XIII. Identify areas both brown (new from 2020) and green (Region additions) as Potential New Resource Areas (PNRAs). Color-code PNRAs and add to CHPMARA; remove red-hatched areas (to be deleted).</p> <p>Local Constraint Analysis:</p> <p>Use the updated base map for local constraint analysis.</p>	Received for information, thank you.
9	Email	September 29, 2023	Jane Thompson	Working Group	<p>See the excerpt below from my earlier e mail in which the correspondence I am looking for is identified. For now, please give me copies, digital or otherwise, of the two comment letters referred to in my e mail on Sept 7:</p> <p>"Please provide me with the comments from the CVC dated January 10, 1999 and the NEC dated February 18, 1999 referred to in the CCRS Phase 3 report. I would like to request disclosure of this documentation on behalf of the Working Group. This request is part of our review of relevant background information that was not included in Mr. Dorfman's report and is important to our input on potential policies. It would seem that a review of the CCRS / OPA 161 process should be part of the background information for the current review."</p> <p>From Marion Plaunt's correspondence on August 31 requesting this correspondence:</p> <p>"The CCRS Phase 3 report identifies that comments were received from CVC dated January 10, 1999 and the NEC dated February 18, 1999. However the comments were not appended to the report.</p> <p>Would it be possible for you the check the digital file (perhaps the 4th document you felt was not applicable) to see if these comments are contained therein and forward them to me.</p> <p>If not in the 4th document, there should be a record at the Town in the comments received filed in reponse to both the CCRS Phase 3 report or through the responses to OPA 161.</p> <p>It would be most helpful to access these documents in order to demonstrate the application of the exclusionary criteria and ensure that the methodology described in the Methodology Report as quoted below is honoured.</p> <p>"High Priority Mineral Resource Areas: Methodology Peel 2051 Discussion Paper"(Draft May 2023) (Methodology Discussion Paper): "For the purposes of updating the HPMARA, mapping criteria that were established in the CCRS and OPA 161 are proposed to be retained, with updates as noted below, to ensure consistency with the previous resolution of aggregates policies for the Region including: ... The consideration of local constraints where mapping data is available." (pages 13 and 14)</p>	Received for information, thank you.

10	Email	October 4, 2023	Jane Thompson	Working Group	<p>I will hold the afternoon of Oct 26.</p> <p>In the meantime I hope you can locate the NEC February 18, 1999 and CVC January 10, 1999 CCRS comment letters.</p> <p>These comment letters relate to a stream shown on Schedule A-1 to the ROP starting just south of Grange Sideroad and east of Creditview Rd. The stream winds its way south and goes directly into the Credit River just north of Cheltenham. These letters should show the drainage area of this feature. As a tributary it qualifies as Core Greenlands. It also drains more than 125 ha. for purposes of the Town OP and the Region's proposed constraint mapping. I am proposing that the drainage area be deleted from HPMARA and should be added to the appropriate schedules.</p> <p>This is also an example of the mapping that I am asking be done to update HPMARA and the Greenlands and EPA schedules. Hopefully we can have these documents available before our meeting.</p> <p>Regards, Jane</p>	Received for information, thank you.
11	Email	February 29, 2024	Jane Thompson	Working Group	<p>Hi Steve, Jeff</p> <p>At the meeting on Feb 22 you indicated we could get together to discuss the approach I am proposing for updating Schedule L of the Official Plan. Is there a time next week when you would be available to meet on that? My time is pretty flexible from Tuesday on.</p> <p>I would like to work with the GIS layers in the Region's Methodology to show new resource areas (brown), identify the Region's unconstrained additions and deletions (red and green) within those areas and add the resulting net areas to existing Schedule L as a base map for any further local refinements.</p> <p>Ian is interested in this meeting and would be helpful given his background in the development of Schedule L. Please let us know when we could meet.</p> <p>Regards, Jane</p>	<p>Hi Jane,</p> <p>Yes, we would like to have this meeting soon, involving you, Ian, Joe, Jeff but I'm not sure if next week will work in terms of availability of staff etc. I also think it may be good to have Peel staff present (Marsha Paley).</p> <p>Joe, I will leave it to you to arrange this meeting when possible. Thanks.</p>
12	Email	July 10, 2023	Jane Thompson	Working Group	<p>Team</p> <p>Please find attached some very relevant Technical Information for our Team, the Provincial Aggregate Resources Act (note - it even includes Wayside Aggregate Sources), that I tried to explain to Mark Dorfman at the June 23rd Meeting of the Aggregate Resources Community Working Group; but he was too busy talking about preparing his Background Report to listen. Sorry for the information overload - will take a holiday on this for a while.</p> <p>Kind personal regards John</p> <p>Attached: Aggregate Resources Act</p>	Received for information, thank you.
13	Email - Have Your Say	June 11, 2024	Sunshine		<p>I hope the town has strict protocols and procedures and companies adhere to the rules as well as the town enforcing them. As it seems now the town struggles with fireworks ban and improper land use and events. Not a lot of confidence</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and participation in the Study. Enforcement regarding aggregate operations is within Provincial jurisdiction, and the Study recommends that Town Council advocates for the Province to appoint Provincial Offences Officers for the purposes of enforcing the Aggregate Resources Act or enable municipalities to provide this service. ACTION: In the interim, the Town can provide information to residents on how to access the enforcement branch of the Ministry of Natural Resources.</p>

14	Email	December 5, 2023	Marion Plaunt	<p>Background: Marion Plaunt has not received feedback from Jeff regarding the application of the exclusionary Drainage Area Criterion on the OPA 161 "comments received." Marion has conducted further research to assist.</p> <p>Key Points:</p> <p>Valley and Stream Corridor Drainage Area Criterion:</p> <p>The Town is committed to the criterion but lacked specific mapping tools during the CCRS. A sophisticated mapping tool from the Oak Ridges Moraine Groundwater Program is now available. This tool maps drainage catchment areas and converts them to hectares, aiding in consistent application of the criterion. The Region of Peel did not use this tool in its aggregate policy review despite its availability and usefulness. The tool should be used to map and remove areas within HPMARA that drain more than 125 ha, protecting water resources.</p> <p>Regional and Conservation Authority Involvement:</p> <p>The Region of Peel and Conservation Authorities should provide access to the Oak Ridges Moraine Groundwater Program's tool. Engaging staff from Drinking Water Source Protection and Hydrogeology will ensure proper application of the criterion. The tool will help protect streams and their catchment areas, critical for maintaining surface and groundwater resources.</p> <p>Provincial Drinking Water Source Protection Program:</p> <p>The Clean Water Act's Provincial Drinking Water Source Protection Program identifies Groundwater Vulnerability areas. Recent SPA Assessment Reports and Protection Plans from the Credit Valley and Toronto Region Conservation authorities are valuable resources. These reports should be considered in the Town's aggregate review process.</p> <p>CVC and MTR Tier 2 Water Budget and Background Reports:</p> <p>The CVC Tier 2 Water Budget Study (2009) and MTRCA background reports provide essential data on water resources. These reports cover water quality, land use impact on water budgets, water demand analyses, integrated water budgets, and stress assessments.</p>	<p>Hi Marion,</p> <p>The CCRS files are old and big so will be sending over the next 4 emails. Here's number 1.</p> <p>-Jeff</p> <p>Hi Marion,</p> <p>Here is my email – will look for the CCRS report and send it as well. Please do send me any details for what you're looking for – notably it sounds like you want to see the criteria the Conservation Authority used to map the 125 ha drainage area.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>-Jeff</p> <p>Hi Marion,</p> <p>The Region sent the attached letter, which I think addresses much of what you were looking for.</p> <p>I did review a few shelves of old files and folders and discovered comments received on OPA 161 that seemed to show this area did not meet the</p>
15	Email	October 17, 2023	Marion Plaunt	<p>Good morning Jeff:</p> <p>I am following up on my email below from August 31 regarding the NEC and CVC comments that resulted in the application of the Exclusionary Criteria for "valley and stream corridors with a drainage area of 125 ha."</p> <p>As I indicated below, the criteria did not appear to be applied in the CCRS study but did result in the removal of resource area 9a above Olde Base Line, east and west of Creditview Road with the approval of OPA 161.</p> <p>Based on this, I suggest you that may find the correspondence in the Record of Comments Received during the OPA 161 process.</p> <p>This is a key criterion that should be applied consistently throughout the Town as part of this current review. Please note that the stream fabric identified in the approved Region of Peel OP (Schedule 1A ) attached is an excellent starting point to apply the valley and stream corridors with drainage areas of 125 ha in an objective and consistent approach throughout the Town of Caledon.</p> <p>I am sure the CVC can assist with the defining of the 125 ha drainage areas as previously done.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you on this issue. Peel Region Schedule 1 A Approved-schedules.pdf</p> <p>Warm regards, Marion Plaunt</p>	<p>Hi Marion,</p> <p>We are looking into this – I've gone through roughly half the folders in our records (there are about 5 shelves worth...) and did find related correspondence from the NEC (almost all from you) regarding resource area 9a, but not much yet from the CVC. We're meeting internally and with Jane Thompson next week so I will have this summarized and completed by then.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>-Jeff</p>

16	Email	?	Bob Shapton		<p>RE: details of the upcoming report to Council on June 18, public open house on June 19, and plans for a second public open house in July.</p>	<p>Hi Bob,</p> <p>Here are some details:</p> <p>June 18th Planning and Development Committee – Council Chambers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The agenda and report, when available, will be posted online the Council and Committee Meeting Information webpage beforehand.</li> </ul> <p>June 19th Public Open House – Caledon East Community Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Open House to solicit feedback from the public on the Draft Policy Options Report, will be held the next day, June 19th, from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm at the Caledon East Community Centre (right next to Town Hall). You can find the notice here.</li> </ul> <p>The Town has a webpage set up for the Supplementary Aggregate Resource Policy Study, which gives further details, updates, and background reports.</p> <p>If you have any other inquiries, please let us know!</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
17	Email	March 10, 2024	Tony Sevelka		<p>Mr. Nethery, RPP, MCIP, it is my understanding that you have been retained by the Town of Caledon to update the Aggregate Extraction Policies in the Official Plan, and as part of that process seek input from the Caledon Aggregate Resources Community Group and the residents it represents.</p> <p>This is first of two emails, which identify some of my concerns (and those of area residents) with respect to the Votorantim Cimentos (St Marys/CBM) application for a blasting mega quarry and processing plant, and with Aggregate Extraction in general.</p> <p>The information is intended to assist you in your task of updating the Official Plan with Aggregate Extraction Land Use Policies, bearing in mind that a Licence to permit aggregate extraction in Ontario has no expiry date, thereby, warranting the treatment (classification) of Aggregate Extraction as a permanent rather than an “interim” use of land in the Official Plan. Accordingly, Aggregate Extraction should be restricted to locations within Caledon that prevent present and future adverse effects for 100 years (taking into account the projected increase in population from about 80,000 in 2023 to 300,000 in 2051):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•to the environment, including its inhabitants, human and non-human;</li> <li>•from interfering with existing or proposed Settlement areas or Rural Clusters (e.g. Cataract, Alton, Green Lakes, Caledon Village, Coulterville, Belfountain);</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of public and private property;</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of the anticipated increase in work-from-home employment and home occupations/businesses post COVID-19 (In 2016, 2,960 people in Caledon worked from home, and during COVID-19 that number ballooned to 10,700 people in 2021, equal to 28%% (10,700/38,335) of the total work force of 38,335, and there are at least 6,000 home-based businesses or 25% of the total dwellings of 23,699;</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of ground water resources, Credit River, Caledon Lake, Green Lake and Cataract Falls, etc.;</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of our green spaces (e.g. Forks-of-the Credit-Park, conversion and rehabilitation of Flaherty Pit [18.4 ha or 45.5 acres] and Pinchin Pit [61.2 ha or 151 acres] Pits-to-Parks-Restoration-Project-Context-Map2.pdf (cvc.ca), (It will cost CVC and taxpayers millions of dollars to make these so-called “rehabilitated” Pits suitable for recreational use.);</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of converted Brampton-Orangeville rail corridor to a new 51-kilometre recreational trail acquired by Peel Region at a cost of \$5.8 million (The recreational trail will connect Orangeville, Caledon, Brampton and Mississauga, and will offer residents of the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area [GTHA] a car-free way to explore a long route through the region. The 2022 GTA population of 7.2 million is expected to grow to over 10.5 million by 2046.) <a href="https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-population-projections">https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-population-projections</a>) <a href="https://thenarwhal.ca/peel-region-orangeville-trail/#:~:text=But%20that%20deficit%20is%20now,were%20parked%20for%20%2424.25%20million;">https://thenarwhal.ca/peel-region-orangeville-trail/#:~:text=But%20that%20deficit%20is%20now,were%20parked%20for%20%2424.25%20million</a>;</li> </ul> <p>from interfering with the use and enjoyment of existing and planned cycling or school routes (e.g. along Mississauga Road, Main Street, Cataract Road)</p>	<p>Received for information, thank you.</p>



18	Email	October 25, 2023	Tony Sevelka	<p>Mr. Hyde, CAO, Town of Caledon</p> <p>As noted in the content of this email, it is within the jurisdiction of the Town of Caledon to enact policies and pass bylaws with respect to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Mandatory minimum setbacks imposed on the offending use (i.e., owner of the proposed quarry site)</li> <li>•Mandatory minimum separation distances between the lot boundaries of the offending use (i.e., owner of the proposed quarry site) and sensitive land uses (i.e., Credit River Watershed, Cataract Falls, Forks-of-the-Credit Provincial Park, Settlement Areas, Rural Clusters, Bruce Trail, Elora-Cataract Trailway, historic/heritage structures and buildings, farmland (agricultural and livestock) school bus and bicycle routes, etc.)</li> <li>•Pass bylaws under the Municipal Act that precludes the offending use (i.e., owner of the proposed quarry site) from discharging noise, vibrations, toxic fumes and flyrock on adjoining public and private property</li> <li>•Pass bylaws under the Municipal Act to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public, including preservation of third-party property values (i.e., home-owner equity and business investment)</li> </ul> <p>What initiatives, if any, has the Town of Caledon undertaken to protect the Environment, the Town of Caledon and its economic interests, and the health, safety and welfare of present and future generations of Caledonians, and the visitors and tourists from the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) who frequent Caledon's many recreational and tourist attractions, from the adverse effects of aggregate extraction, including blasting quarry operations?</p> <p>As for the Aggregate Resources Community Working Group, which consists of the following members, it is difficult to take this Town of Caledon initiative seriously given the superfluous requirements to sit on a Working Group reviewing aggregate resource policies, and given that the Working Group operates outside of public view and without public participation and input, with no ability for anyone to contact the Working Group or to make submissions to the Working Group – There is no website, no email address, no phone number or any other method of contacting the Aggregate Resources Community Working Group for the residents of Caledon to express their views and concerns regarding the adverse effects associated with aggregate extraction, one of the most noxious, toxic and destructive land uses, and a use which is incompatible with virtually every known land use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•David Sylvester;</li> <li>•Martin Bamford;</li> <li>•John Emery;</li> </ul>	Received for information, thank you.
19	Email	March 17, 2024	Tony Sevelka	<p>Mr. Nethery, RPP, MCIP</p> <p>The Credit Valley Trail is an important and unique 100-kilometre pathway extending through the Town of Caledon, which respects the rights of Indigenous peoples to these lands, and their willingness to make the lands available for the use and enjoyment in perpetuity by millions of people in Ontario and beyond. Caledon's updated Official Plan must include policies that protect the 100-kilometre pathway, the Credit River Watershed which it passes through, and the millions of people, including future generations, from the deleterious impacts associated with Aggregate Extraction on the environment. Accordingly, it is recommended that the updated Official Plan polices on Aggregate Extraction include policies to the following effect to protect both the Credit Valley Trail and the Credit River:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Aggregate Extraction be restricted to locations farther than 2 kilometres from the Credit Valley Trail in the Town of Caledon</li> <li>•Aggregate Extraction be restricted to locations farther than 2 kilometres from the Credit River in the Town of Caledon</li> </ul> <p>The proponent-driven studies prepared on behalf of Votorantim Cimentos (St Marys/CBM)'s application seeking rezoning and Official Plan amendments to permit an 800-acre blasting mega quarry, dewatering perpetually below the water table, near the Credit Valley Trail and Credit River, do not mention the Credit Valley Trail, and the millions of people (i.e. human targets) using the trail who would be adversely impacted by noise, dust, toxic fumes, vibrations and the potentially deadly consequences of flyrock, an inevitable by-product of blasting (detonation of explosives) to break rock.</p> <p><b>CREDIT VALLEY TRAIL – A 100-KILOMETRE PATHWAY CONNECTING THE FUTURE WITH THE PAST</b>  A once in a lifetime project, the Credit Valley Trail (CVT), a 100-kilometre pathway through the Credit River Valley from the hills of the headwaters in Orangeville to Lake Ontario, now connected to a new 2-kilometre trail between Armstrong Avenue and Upper Canada Court, Georgetown, which was completed in Fall 2023.[1]</p> <p>The 100-kilometre Credit Valley Trail (CVT) will span the Credit River Watershed – from the hills of the headwaters in Orangeville to the mouth of the Credit River in Mississauga. The entire Credit River Watershed is situated on the Treaty Lands and Territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN) and the traditional territory of the Huron-Wendat and Haudenosaunee. As such, empowering Indigenous peoples is central to the CVT vision.</p> <p>Accompanying the collective goal to connect the Credit Valley Trail route, Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) and CVT partners are committed to developing</p>	Thank you for your comment and participation in the Study. Section 20.5 Applications for New Mineral Aggregate Extraction in the Official Plan Amendment addresses policies related to environmental protection, including water protection policies.

20	Email	March 11, 2024	Tony Sevelka	<p>Mr. Nethery, RRP, MCIP</p> <p>RE: A De FACTO TAKING OF HOMOWNERS' PROPERTY WITHOUT COMPENSATION</p> <p>Poor Official Plan municipal (and provincial) land use policies, and without a long-term view, resulted in the unintended consequence of preventing homeowners' within 300 metres of the boundary limits of a zombie 128.8-acre Pit and Quarry site from maximizing the use and value of their property by being precluded from creating a 7-acre building lot severance from its 17.3-acre property. At the time of the homeowners' severance application, the zombie Pit and Quarry site had not been operational for 7 years, but unbeknownst to both the homeowners and the general public a licence to extract aggregate in Ontario has no expiry date, which means that a Pit or Quarry can remain operational indefinitely. In effect, the municipality's poor land use policies (intentionally or unintentionally) permitted the owner of the Pit and Quarry site to externalize the costs of its operation on the backs of innocent nearby third-party property owners (e.g., homeowners), who do not share in the profits of a private for-profit Pit and Quarry operation.</p> <p>The following excerpts are from the abridged article, Sterilization of Homeowners' Land a De Facto Taking Without Compensation, published in the March/April 2024 issue of IRWA Magazine (see attached):</p> <p>Imposing a 300-metre buffer (setback) on the homeowners' property is the equivalent of an easement with an indeterminate term, depriving the homeowners of the use and enjoyment of their property (diminished utility and property value) without compensation for as long as the adjoining pit and quarry remains licensed.</p> <p>The case study involving the denial of the severance application to permit a new 7-acre lot is a classic example of a de facto taking of land without compensation. The Township of Assinack should be held financially responsible (or more appropriately the owner of the pit and quarry abutting the homeowners' land) for sterilizing the use and enjoyment and reducing the value of the homeowners' property.</p> <p>Updating of the Aggregate Extraction land use policies in the Town of Caledon Official Plan must ensure that innocent owners of third-party property (e.g., homes, farms, commercial/home-based businesses, etc.) are not financially burdened or have the use and enjoyment of their properties negatively impacted (now and in the future) by Aggregate Extraction operations.</p>	Received for information, thank you.
21	Email	March 14, 2024	Tony Sevelka	<p>Mr. Nethery, RRP, MCIP</p> <p>Poor Planning Policies can negatively impact some residents' quality of life, use and enjoyment of indoor and outdoor amenity space, and the value of their properties in a manner that is inequitable with the community at large. (Antrim Truck Centre Ltd. v. Ontario (Transportation), 2013 SCC 13 (CanLII), [2013] 1 SCR 594, &lt;<a href="https://canlii.ca/t/fwdn1">https://canlii.ca/t/fwdn1</a>&gt;)</p> <p>"A nuisance may merely be a right thing in the wrong place, -- like a pig in the parlor instead of the barnyard." -Justice George Sutherland, Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co., 272 U.S. 365, 388 (1926)</p> <p>Many Land Use Planners are unaware of the founding principles of Planning and Zoning due to the diverse nature of their academic credentials, and the lack of a unified body of knowledge. The two founding Planning and Zoning Principles are Preservation of Property Values and Separation of Incompatible Land Uses, as detailed in the following excerpts from Chapter 2 of Environmental, Legal and Social Implications of Aggregate Extraction (Mining) Operations, which can be downloaded free of charge at: <a href="https://grassrootsinstitute.ca/books/enr104.php">https://grassrootsinstitute.ca/books/enr104.php</a></p> <p>4. PLANNING AND ZONING: PRESERVATION OF PROPERTY VALUES AND SEPARATION OF INCOMPATIBLE LAND USES</p> <p>It was through the land use theories advanced by Olmsted (1870)[1] and Howard (1902)[2] that zoning and city planning could produce wealth, health, and prosperity. In 1916, New York City adopted the first zoning resolution in the United States.[3] The following statement reflects the broad objectives of municipal planning:</p> <p>"Property owners and land developers realized Olmstead's predictions in their broader sense and urged city politicians to protect and enhance the value of their assets by separating uses, and regulating the density, shape, and size of buildings in order to secure higher land values and to preserve the local tax base. Areas with good access to public amenities not only gain better land value,[4] but also attract a larger portion of new development.[5] It has also been established that high environmental standards and good access to facilities and services have a direct, positive impact on quality of life."</p> <p>Municipalities enjoy broad powers to implement land use controls in response to undesirable encroachments on the quality of life.[6] The following</p>	Received for information, thank you.

22	Email	March 10, 2024	Tony Sevelka	<p>Mr. Nethery, RPP, MCIP, it is my understanding that you have been retained by the Town of Caledon to update the Aggregate Extraction Policies in the Official Plan, and as part of that process seek input from the Caledon Aggregate Resources Community Group and the residents it represents.</p> <p>This is first of two emails, which identify some of my concerns (and those of area residents) with respect to the Votorantim Cimentos (St Marys/CBM) application for a blasting mega quarry and processing plant, and with Aggregate Extraction in general. (Research papers to be emailed separately)</p> <p>The information is intended to assist you in your task of updating the Official Plan with Aggregate Extraction Land Use Policies, bearing in mind that a Licence to permit aggregate extraction in Ontario has no expiry date, thereby, warranting the treatment (classification) of Aggregate Extraction as a permanent rather than an “interim” use of land in the Official Plan. Accordingly, Aggregate Extraction should be restricted to locations within Caledon that prevent present and future adverse effects for 100 years (taking into account the projected increase in population from about 80,000 in 2023 to 300,000 in 2051):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•to the environment, including its inhabitants, human and non-human;</li> <li>•from interfering with existing or proposed Settlement areas or Rural Clusters (e.g. Cataract, Alton, Green Lakes, Caledon Village, Coulterville, Belfountain);</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of public and private property;</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of the anticipated increase in work-from-home employment and home occupations/businesses post COVID-19 (In 2016, 2,960 people in Caledon worked from home, and during COVID-19 that number ballooned to 10,700 people in 2021, equal to 28%% (10,700/38,335) of the total work force of 38,335, and there are at least 6,000 home-based businesses or 25% of the total dwellings of 23,699;</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of ground water resources, Credit River, Caledon Lake, Green Lake and Cataract Falls, etc.;</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of our green spaces (e.g. Forks-of-the Credit-Park, conversion and rehabilitation of Flaherty Pit [18.4 ha or 45.5 acres] and Pinchin Pit [61.2 ha or 151 acres] Pits-to-Parks-Restoration-Project-Context-Map2.pdf (cvc.ca), (It will cost CVC and taxpayers millions of dollars to make these so-called “rehabilitated” Pits suitable for recreational use.);</li> <li>•from interfering with the use and enjoyment of converted Brampton-Orangeville rail corridor to a new 51-kilometre recreational trail acquired by Peel Region at a cost of \$5.8 million (The recreational trail will connect Orangeville, Caledon, Brampton and Mississauga, and will offer residents of the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area [GTHA] a car-free way to explore a long route through the region. The 2022 GTA population of 7.2 million is expected to grow to over 10.5 million by 2046.) <a href="https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-population-projections">https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-population-projections</a>) <a href="https://thenarwhal.ca/peel-region-orangeville-trail/#:~:text=But%20that%20deficit%20is%20now,were%20parked%20for%20%2424.25%20million;">https://thenarwhal.ca/peel-region-orangeville-trail/#:~:text=But%20that%20deficit%20is%20now,were%20parked%20for%20%2424.25%20million</a>;</li> </ul> <p>from interfering with the use and enjoyment of existing and planned cycling or school routes (e.g. along Mississauga Road, Main Street, Cataract Road)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and participation in the Study. Section 20.5 Applications for New Mineral Aggregate Extraction in the Official Plan Amendment addresses policies related to environmental protection, including water protection policies.</p>
23	Email	August 16, 2023	Tony Sevelka	<p>Ms. Michino, Chief Planner, Director of Planning,</p> <p>Here are three simple, but effective land use policies, that the Town of Caledon can implement (pass by-laws under the Planning Act and/or Municipal Act) to protect the Town of Caledon, the environment and communities within the Town of Caledon from many of the adverse effects of aggregate extraction operations, including the potentially deadly consequences of blasting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•500-metre permanent minimum onsite setback (excavation limit) for a pit or quarry site (prevent sterilization and free use of adjoining property; loss of use and enjoyment of property; and loss of property value)</li> <li>•1,000-metre minimum separation distance between the boundary limits of a pit or quarry site and sensitive land uses (See Algonquin Highlands Official Plan, section 4.3.8.10)</li> <li>•Pass a Noise and Nuisance By-law (See Burlington By-law No. 19-2003), and add provision restricting placement of testing or monitoring equipment such as noise metres and seismographs to the perimeter of the site, as noise and vibrations are not to leave the site.)</li> </ul> <p>Note: The three suggested land use policies (and health and safety provisions) do not require Provincial Approval.</p> <p>As the scale of aggregate extraction operations is becoming increasing larger, their operations, especially quarries accompanied by blasting below the water table, are having profound adverse and cumulative effects on the environment and its habitants in impacted municipalities all across Canada. Municipalities are responsible for the health, safety and welfare of its citizens.</p> <p>Most municipalities have failed to enact and implement land use policies and by-laws that shield the environment and the people who live, work and play in their communities from the adverse and cumulative effects associated with aggregate extraction operations. Three simple remedies available to a municipality that would either eliminate or substantially reduce the impact of blasting quarry operations are listed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Mandatory permanent minimum setback (extraction limit) of 500 metres measured inward along the entire perimeter of an existing or proposed quarry site. (Without this internal safeguard, quarry operations are permitted to extract aggregate and blast anywhere onsite, regardless of their proximity to sensitive and vulnerable land uses, including areas of human and non-human activity).</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Currently the Town has no ability to require separation distances between mineral aggregate operations and other uses. The Study recommends that Council requests that the Province mandate setbacks and buffers from communities and other sensitive land uses.</p>

24	Email	February 17, 2024	Tony Sevelka	<p>Folks,</p> <p>Note below that the Township of Muskoka Lakes Official Plan (By-law 2022 – 171, adopted by Council Oct 12, 2022) precludes new Aggregate Operations from locating within 2,000 metres (6,562 feet) of a Waterfront Area designation or Urban Centre. There is nothing in the Planning Act to preclude the Town of Caledon (or any other municipality in Ontario) from adopting a similar provision in its Official Plan to protect the Credit River and Settlement Areas (e.g. Hamlets, Villages, Rural Clusters, Urban Centres). Such a measure would significantly reduce the adverse effects of aggregate extraction operations, as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement and the Environmental Protection Act, and provide for sustainable, healthy and vibrant communities, and protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.</p> <p><b>K4 APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>  New mineral aggregate operations shall not be permitted within 2,000 metres (6,561.6 feet) from the boundaries of the Waterfront Area designation or within 2,000 metres (6,561.6 feet) of an Urban Centre. In addition new mineral aggregate operations should be located in close proximity to a Provincial highway to minimize impacts on the rural area. Any application for an amendment to this Plan to establish or expand a mineral aggregate operation shall be supported by studies that are based on predictable, measurable, objective effects on people and the environment, with these studies and their scope being identified in advance and with regard to the scale of the proposed new operation or expansion....</p> <p>See attached copy of Township of Muskoka Lakes Official Plan.</p> <p>As noted in the excerpt taken from the following article, all watersheds, including the Credit River Watershed, must be protected from the deleterious impacts of aggregate extraction operations on aquatic life (i.e., fish habitat).</p> <p>Fishing club aims to inspire next generation of conservationists  Noakes is a semi-retired professional aquarist and in addition to being an IWFFC [Izaak Walton Fly Fishing Club] member, he’s on the Board of Directors for the Greg Clark chapter of Trout Unlimited Canada and is a founding member of the Coalition for the West Credit River....  “I spend most of my time designing restoration projects for brook trout habitat,” said Noakes. “Tree planting, in-stream work restoring habitat... I live outside, basically.”  Brook trout rely on a cold-water ecosystem, as they can only spawn in a certain temperature range, and Noakes said those ecosystems are increasingly at</p>	Received for information, thank you.
25	Email	March 11, 2024	Tony Sevelka	<p>Mr. Nethery, RRP, MCIP</p> <p><b>RE: A De FACTO TAKING OF HOMEOWNERS’ PROPERTY WITHOUT COMPENSATION</b></p> <p>Poor Official Plan municipal (and provincial) land use policies, and without a long-term view, resulted in the unintended consequence of preventing homeowners’ within 300 metres of the boundary limits of a zombie 128.8-acre Pit and Quarry site from maximizing the use and value of their property by being precluded from creating a 7-acre building lot severance from its 17.3-acre property. At the time of the homeowners’ severance application, the zombie Pit and Quarry site had not been operational for 7 years, but unbeknownst to both the homeowners and the general public a licence to extract aggregate in Ontario has no expiry date, which means that a Pit or Quarry can remain operational indefinitely. In effect, the municipality’s poor land use policies (intentionally or unintentionally) permitted the owner of the Pit and Quarry site to externalize the costs of its operation on the backs of innocent nearby third-party property owners (e.g., homeowners), who do not share in the profits of a private for-profit Pit and Quarry operation.</p> <p>The following excerpts are from the abridged article, Sterilization of Homeowners’ Land a De Facto Taking Without Compensation, published in the March/April 2024 issue of IRWA Magazine (see attached):</p> <p>Imposing a 300-metre buffer (setback) on the homeowners’ property is the equivalent of an easement with an indeterminate term, depriving the homeowners of the use and enjoyment of their property (diminished utility and property value) without compensation for as long as the adjoining pit and quarry remains licensed.</p> <p>The case study involving the denial of the severance application to permit a new 7-acre lot is a classic example of a de facto taking of land without compensation. The Township of Assinack should be held financially responsible (or more appropriately the owner of the pit and quarry abutting the homeowners’ land) for sterilizing the use and enjoyment and reducing the value of the homeowners’ property.</p> <p>Updating of the Aggregate Extraction land use policies in the Town of Caledon Official Plan must ensure that innocent owners of third-party property (e.g., homes, farms, commercial/home-based businesses, etc.) are not financially burdened or have the use and enjoyment of their properties negatively impacted (now and in the future) by Aggregate Extraction operations.</p>	Received for information, thank you.

26	Email	May 4, 2024	Tony Sevelka		<p>Mr. Nethery, the attached document was submitted to the Town of Caledon prior to initiation of an Interim Control By-law (ICBL) in October 2022. The document provides insight into a significant number of potential adverse effects associated with aggregate extraction, and offers suggestions for improvement of aggregate extraction policies to protect the environment, including the health, safety and welfare of the public.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Tony</p> <p>Attachment: Caledon OP Review Submission Feb 6, 2022</p>	Received for information, thank you.
27	Email	May 22, 2024	Tony Sevelka		<p>Mr. Nethery, BES, MPA, MCIP, RPP,</p> <p>This recommendation provides one (of many needed) effective mechanism to control Aggregate Extraction Operations; to protect Caledon's residents from the adverse effects from Aggregate Extraction Operations; and to ensure the health, safety and welfare of Caledon's communities from Aggregate Extraction Operations.</p> <p>CALEDON NEEDS TO IMPOSE A 1-FOOT (0.30-METRE) RESERVE ALONG THE PERIMETRE OF EVERY SITE PLAN FOR A PIT AND QUARRY</p> <p>Caledon communities have been victimized by the aggregate industry for far too long. The aggregate industry is responsible for the scarred landscape (moonscape) of lifeless water-filled craters stretching along Charleston Sideroad, east and west of Highway 10. The visually jarring and lifeless moonscape of thousands of acres of productive agricultural land laid barren by the rapacious activities of the aggregate industry are an "ecological Holocaust."</p> <p>For decades, aggregate operations have left entire sections of the town scarred, with massive mounds of extracted earth and gaping craters left unfilled by the companies, because they so often stop just before the point when they are contractually obligated to fill in these gaping cavernous holes and mitigate the damage to restore the landscape to a semblance of its former natural state. As a result, parts of Caledon look more like a moonscape than a continuation of the GTA's largest remaining greenscape untouched by human hands.[1]</p> <p>As part of the Town of Caledon's initiative to update its Aggregate Extraction Policies, it would be prudent to impose a 1-foot (0.30-metre) reserve along the entire perimeter of every Pit and Quarry Site Plan,[2] except for points of vehicular ingress and egress. This proactive and protective measure would</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•prevent owners of existing Pits and Quarries from eliminating side yard and rear yard setbacks through acquisition of abutting properties</li> <li>•prevent the domino effect occasioned by simply expanding aggregate extraction operations from one property to the next, effectively eliminating the land mass between each property</li> <li>•prevent Aggregate Extraction Operations from postponing rehabilitation or restoration indefinitely (below water table extraction has no prospect of rehabilitation to a productive use of the land)</li> <li>•require a new (fresh) application accompanied by supporting studies in assessing the merits of a request seeking amendments to the Zoning By-law and Official Plan for land not covered under an existing Licence to permit aggregate extraction</li> <li>•provide the Town of Caledon with greater oversight, input and effective control over Aggregate Extraction Operations, and the accompanying adverse effects on the surrounding communities, while enacting adequate and appropriate provisions for the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the</li> </ul>	Received for information, thank you.
28	Email	September 11, 2023	Tony Sevelka		<p>Folks, the attached written submission in response to an application to expand an existing Blasting Quarry Operation in Burlington should be of interest to the Working Aggregate Community Group (and Town of Caledon Planners) in developing appropriate Aggregate Extraction Land Use Policies in Caledon that protect the environment, including the health, safety and welfare of its residents, from the adverse effects of Aggregate Extraction Operations.</p> <p>If you have questions, I can always be reached at 519.927.9132</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Tony Sevelka, Forensic Real Estate Appraiser Caledon Resident and Concerned Citizen</p>	Received for information, thank you.

29	Email	August 14, 2024	Mal Wensierski	Lafarge Canada Inc	<p>This letter from Lafarge Canada Inc. addresses the Town of Caledon's Aggregate Resources Policy Study and comments on the Policy Options Report released on July 19, 2024. The letter highlights several key points:</p> <p>Pit 3 Extension: Lafarge seeks confirmation that their Pit 3 Extension application, submitted in 2024, will be processed according to the Town's Official Plan in place at the time of submission. They also object to certain lands being removed from designated high-potential mineral aggregate areas, arguing that these lands contain no constraints.</p> <p>Insufficient Review Time: Lafarge expresses concern that the two-week period between the release of draft policies and the decision on the Official Plan amendment is inadequate for stakeholders to properly review and provide input.</p> <p>Advocacy Items: Lafarge objects to certain advocacy recommendations in the report, such as implementing sunset clauses for operations and eliminating sections of the Aggregate Resources Act. They argue these items are not appropriate for inclusion in a planning exercise.</p> <p>Greenbelt Plan Conformity: Lafarge insists that updated aggregate policies must conform to the Greenbelt Plan and should not impose more restrictive provisions than allowed.</p> <p>Policy Directions: Lafarge questions whether a significant update to policies is necessary, arguing that many existing policies are sufficient. They also express concerns about proposed policies that could conflict with provincial legislation or overstep the Town's jurisdiction.</p> <p>Approval Authority: Lafarge seeks clarification on whether provincial approval will be required for the Official Plan Amendment and stresses the need for more time to review draft policies before they are adopted.</p> <p>In conclusion, Lafarge requests that the Town adjust its process to allow stakeholders more time for proper review and ensure the updated policies conform to provincial legislation.</p> <p>Attached: Lafarge Letter - Comments on Aggregate Policy Options Report - August 14, 2024 vF</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website  <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-</a></p>
30	Email	August 9, 2024	Neal Deruyters	on behalf of James Dick Construct	<p>The letter, written by MHBC on behalf of James Dick Construction Ltd. (JDCL), addresses concerns regarding the Town of Caledon's Aggregate Resources Policy Study and Policy Options Report. The key points include:</p> <p>Limited Time for Review: JDCL criticizes the town for providing only a two-week window to review draft amendments before final decisions, raising concerns about fairness, transparency, and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Exclusion from the Process: The letter highlights that the aggregate industry, including JDCL, was not consulted, despite prior meetings with other working groups. The lack of involvement is seen as problematic, particularly with no input from provincial entities like the Ministry of Natural Resources.</p> <p>Council Activism Concerns: JDCL objects to the inclusion of advocacy recommendations in the report, such as implementing sunset clauses for aggregate operations and enabling municipalities to enforce the Aggregate Resources Act. They argue these items are outside the scope of the planning process.</p> <p>Policy Inconsistencies: JDCL questions the appropriateness of the preliminary recommended policy directions, noting potential conflicts with provincial policies and the Aggregate Resources Act. They specifically call for maintaining the established policies from the existing Official Plan (OPA 161).</p> <p>Mapping Errors: JDCL identifies inaccuracies in the CHPMARA mapping related to their land holdings and requests discussions with the town to correct these errors.</p> <p>JDCL requests a more inclusive and fair process, with adequate time for review and accurate representation of their properties in the official mapping.</p> <p>Attached: JDCL Comments on Town of Calaedon Aggregate Policy Options Report_August 9 2024</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website  <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-</a></p>

31	Email	August 9, 2024	Sharon Armstrong	Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association	<p>The letter from the Ontario Stone Sand &amp; Gravel Association (OSSGA) is addressed to the Town of Caledon officials regarding the Town's Aggregate Resources Policy Study and Policy Options Report. The OSSGA represents over 280 members in the aggregate industry and emphasizes the crucial role of aggregates in supporting construction and infrastructure projects necessary for growth, including Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan.</p> <p>Key points from the letter include:</p> <p>Concern about Timeline: OSSGA criticizes the short two-week period provided for reviewing the draft amendment before a council decision, deeming it procedurally unfair and limiting meaningful engagement from stakeholders.</p> <p>Representation Issues: OSSGA objects to the exclusion of their industry representative from the Town's working group on this policy exercise, arguing that this leads to a biased process lacking industry expertise.</p> <p>Policy Recommendations: OSSGA questions several recommendations in the report, particularly a section on Council activism that advocates changes to provincial legislation, which OSSGA argues fall outside the Town's jurisdiction and conflict with existing provincial policies.</p> <p>Regulatory Concerns: The letter highlights concerns about proposals that override the Aggregate Resources Act, asserting that such changes are beyond the scope of the Town's regulatory authority.</p> <p>Need for Conformity: OSSGA stresses that any new policies should be consistent with provincial regulations and urges the Town to align with these rather than introducing excessive new recommendations.</p> <p>Provincial Review: Given the inadequate engagement opportunity, OSSGA states its intent to appeal to the Province to ensure compliance with the Planning Act and to provide stakeholders with sufficient time to participate in the process.</p> <p>The letter concludes by requesting further engagement and offering to provide additional comments.</p> <p>Attached: OSSGA letter Town of Caledon August 9 2024</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website  <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-</a></p>
32	Email	September 20, 2024	David Hanratty	Canadian Building Materials (CBM) Aggregates, a division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada)	<p>The letter from Canadian Building Materials (CBM) Aggregates is addressed to the Town of Caledon officials regarding the Town's Draft Aggregate policies and draft Zoning By-Law.</p> <p>Key points from the letter include:</p> <p>Concern that the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment standards and regulations for aggregate operations represent a significant conflict between municipal and provincial authority in the management of aggregate resources, particularly in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Requirements for presently Provincially licenced operations to conform to new additional Municipal policy,</li> <li>-The introduction of municipal standards for air, noise, blasting and water discharge more stringent than Provincially required,</li> <li>-Required conformity to a currently unreleased Town Aggregate Manual,</li> <li>-Official Plan and Zoning policy more restrictive than Provincial Policy,</li> <li>-Prohibitions of aggregate operations in natural heritage areas including small woodlands, linkage areas and enhancement areas,</li> <li>-Municipally revised and reduced haul routes inconsistent with those of the Peel Official Plan.</li> <li>-Removal of Official Plan references to the Provincial goal of resource availability</li> </ul> <p>Draft mapping Schedules at issue include: B4, C1, E12,  Draft Official Plan Policies at issue include: S. 20.1, 20.2.3, 20.3, 20.5.1, 20.5.2, 20.5.3, 20.5.5-20.5.13, 20.6, 20.7, 20.8.1, 20.8.2, 20.8.4, 22.2.2 j), 32.2.23  Draft Zoning By-law policies at issue include: definitions for gravel pits and quarries, Table 8.1</p> <p>Insertion of a transition clause in the proposed Official Plans is requested that would exempt the CBM lands from the proposed Official Plan Amendment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website  <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-</a></p>

33	Email	September 20, 2024	Mal Wensierski	Lafarge Canada Inc	<p>The letter from Lafarge Canada Inc. is addressed to the Town of Caledon officials, in follow up to previous correspondence (Aug 14, 2024, Comment 109) regarding the Town's draft Official Plan Amendment No. 1 and draft Zoning By-Law Amendment.</p> <p>Key points of the letter include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Processing of the on-going application at 17903 Shaws Creek Road</li> <li>-Removal of a portion of Caledon High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Area (CHPMARA) identification on the Pit 3 Extension site</li> <li>-The existing approved haul route for Pit 3 not being identified as a mineral aggregate haul route</li> <li>-Timelines for the release and adoption of the Town's Official Plan Amendment and Zoning-By-Law Amendment</li> <li>-Policies that override the provincial authority for the protection and management of mineral aggregate operations and mineral aggregate resources</li> <li>-Policies that rely on a future Town of Caledon Aggregate Manual to assist in assessing conformity with the Town of Caledon Official Plan policies creates uncertainty. The Official Plan should be clear that the Official Plan policies and provincial guidelines, standards and procedures prevail over the Aggregate Manual</li> <li>-Policies that state in the event of a conflict between provincial and town policy the more restrictive policies prevail, thereby overriding the provincial interest in the protection and availability of mineral aggregate resources</li> <li>-Policies that introduce prohibition for new or expanded mineral aggregate operations in local natural heritage areas. These policies do not conform to provincial plans and are not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement</li> <li>-The Town has removed the provincial policy from its existing Official Plan to ensure that, as much aggregate as is realistically is made available</li> <li>-The Coutlerville Special Study Area - questioning need for the study</li> <li>-Insufficient Time to review the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment</li> </ul> <p>Draft mapping Schedules at issue include: C1 E1, E12,  Draft Official Plan Policies at issue include: S.20, 20.1, 20.2.1-20.2.3, 20.3, 20.4, 20.5-20.5.16, 20.5, 20.6 iii), 20.7.1, 20.7.3, 20.7.5, 20.8.2-20.8.4, 27.2.2  Draft Zoning By-law policies at issue include: Extractive Industrial Zone Provisions 6, 10(5), 11-16 (removed).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Site-specific comments may be addressed during the active application process. Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon</p>
34	Email	September 20, 2024	Neal Deruyter	James Dick Construction Ltd.	<p>The letter from James Dick Construction Ltd. is addressed to the Town of Caledon officials regarding the Town's draft Official Plan Amendment No. 1 and draft Zoning By-Law Amendment - Aggregate Resources Policy study.</p> <p>Key points of the letter include concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policies that attempt to override or substantially alter Provincial jurisdiction over the management of aggregate resources.</li> <li>- Removing Regional roads as truck routes that are otherwise identified as such in the Region's new Official Plan.</li> <li>- Removal of the Caledon High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Area from existing aggregate operations and sites that still contain high quality aggregate resources.</li> <li>- Removal of Extractive Industrial designation and zoning from a JDCL-owned property.</li> <li>- Policies to create a specific Caledon conflict clause that directly contravene Provincial legislations and override the provincial interest in the management of aggregate resources.</li> <li>- Policies to create Town standards for noise, air quality, blasting, etc.</li> <li>- Policies that prohibit aggregate extraction in local natural heritage features and areas and concerns over attaining Provincial Plan and Provincial Policy Statement conformity</li> </ul> <p>Draft mapping Schedules at issue include: A, B4, C1, E12,  Draft Official Plan Policies at issue include: S. 20.1, 20.2.1-20.2.3, 20.3, 20.5, 20.5.2-20.5.5, 20.5.6-20.5.11, 20.5.11, 20.5.13, 20.5.16, 20.7.1, 20.7.3, 20.7.5, 20.8.3, 20.8.4, 27.2.2, 32.1.23  Draft Zoning By-law policies at issue include: Extractive Industrial Zone Provisions 6, 10(5), allow for accessory uses to mineral aggregate operations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website  <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-</a></p>



35	Email	September 20, 2024	Peter J. Smith	Heavy Construction Association of Toronto	<p>The letter from the Heavy Construction Association of Toronto is addressed to the Town of Caledon Mayor and Council regarding the Town's draft Official Plan Amendment No. 1 and draft Zoning By-Law Amendment</p> <p>Key points of the letter include concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Impacts of the proposed policies on the organizations member firms involved in heavy construction - bridges, tunnels, deep foundations for large buildings and retaining walls.</li> <li>-concerns over supply chain availability of materials and and associated impacts on transportation costs resulting from the proposed policies.</li> <li>-Letter in support of Ontario Stone, Sand &amp; Gravel Association (OSSGA) submitted comments</li> </ul> <p>No specific policies are referenced.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website  <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-</a></p>
36	Email	September 18, 2024	Charanjeev Singh		<p>Comments provided by this Town Resident include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Their position that Main Street in Alton is not a suitable for inclusion as part of the truck route for quarry operations, due to the street's layout and design, and concerns over impacts on the local community and it's amenities.</li> </ul> <p>No specific policies are referenced.</p>	Received for information, thank you.
37	Email	September 27, 2024	Charanjeev Singh		Follow up email, references additional concern over exposing children to additional traffic risks from a haul route if is goes throigh Alton	Received for information, thank you.
38	Email	September 23, 2024	Bart Kaners	Ready Mixed Concrete Association of Ontario	Variant of Comment 116	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the study.</p> <p>Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11</li> <li>-Additional policies have been introduced to to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands</li> <li>-Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies)</li> </ul> <p>For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website  <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-</a></p>

39	Email	September 23, 2024	Jeff MacDonald		The email is addressed to Town Officials regarding the Town's draft Official Plan Amendment and draft Zoning By-Law Amendment  Key points of the letter include concerns over:  -Impacts of the proposed policies on the construction and infrastructure industries in Ontario -Letter in support of Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (OSSGA) submitted comments  No specific policies are referenced.	Thank you for your comments and participation in the study. Based on comments from our industry stakeholders, the following changes have been made: -Changes to haul routes changes to haul routes in Section 20.5.11 -Additional policies have been introduced to clarify that minor variances and site plan approvals would not be considered development for the purposes of evaluating compatibility adjacent to mineral aggregate operations and CHPMARA identified lands -Removal to the "no negative impact" modified definition to instead use the definitions in Provincial plans and policies. (A note that the "change to ecological functions" component of the definition is recommended to stay, to ensure the proposal continues to fit within the parameters of conformity to the Greenbelt Plan's policy related to existing comprehensive aggregate management studies) For a full list of changes, please refer to the staff report published on the October 7th Council meeting, also found on the Have your Say Caledon website <a href="https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-aggregate-resource-policy-study">https://haveyoursaycaledon.ca/supplementary-aggregate-resource-policy-study</a>
40	Email	September 23, 2024	Michael Black		Duplicate of Comment 119	
41	Email	September 23, 2024	Travis Mitchell		Duplicate of Comment 119	
42	Email	September 23, 2024	Scott Eddy		Duplicate of Comment 119	
43	Email	September 23, 2024	Regan Cox		Duplicate of Comment 119	
44	Email	October 1, 2024	Regan Cox		Duplicate of Comment 119	
45	Email	September 23, 2024	Lesley Chefero		Duplicate of Comment 119	
46	Email	September 23, 2024	Wes Esbaugh		Duplicate of Comment 119	
47	Email	September 23, 2024	Lacey Moore		Duplicate of Comment 119	
48	Email	September 23, 2024	Tom Jones		Duplicate of Comment 119	
49	Email	September 17, 2024	Douglas Derry		Duplicate of Comment 119	
50	Email	September 23, 2024	Malcom Matheson		Duplicate of Comment 119	
51	Email	September 23, 2024	Jason O'Connor		Duplicate of Comment 119	
52	Email	September 23, 2024	Michael Andrighetti		Duplicate of Comment 119	
53	Email	September 23, 2024	Steven Crombie	Ontario Road Builders Association	Variant of Comment 116	
54	Email	September 23, 2024	John Newton		Duplicate of Comment 119	
55	Email	September 23, 2024	Rick Esbaugh		Duplicate of Comment 119	
56	Email	September 23, 2024	Matt McDonald		Duplicate of Comment 119	
57	Email	September 16, 2024	Andrew Lam	Delta Urban on behalf of Aecon Infrastructure Management Inc.	The letter from Delta Urban is addressed to the Town of Caledon project consultant regarding the Town's Supplementary Aggregate Policy Study and the Town's draft Official Plan Amendment. AECON owns and operates a mineral aggregate operation on Chrleston Side Road.  Key points of the letter include: - Preference for Special Policy Area to establish a framework for for investigating aggregated extracted lands into existing communities - intersts in aligning future studies with the vision of the Rehabilitation Master Plan  Draft mapping Schedules at issue include: B4 Draft Official Plan Policies at issue include: S. 20.5.12.d), 32.1.23	In addition, in cases where comments and requests have not been made, the following describes why: -The performance of existing and proposed operations will be entirely consistent with section 4.5.2.2. of the 2024 PPS, which requires that extraction shall be undertaken in a manner which minimizes social, economic and environmental impacts. -There will be no prohibitions on proposed or existing operations that go beyond the standards established through Provincial legislation or policy or will preclude removal of significant resources. -An Official Plan Amendment will be required for all new proposals, and proposed details of the operation will be assessed at the time of application. The Town's intent is to ensure that the above is prioritized.
58	Email	September 27, 2024	Ed Lamb	Waterford Sand & Gravel Ltd.	Duplicate of Comment 119	
59	Email	September 20, 2024	Nadia Todorova	Residential and Civil Construction Alliance of Ontario (RCCAO)	Variant of Comment 116	
60	Email	October 1, 2024	Blake Arnill		Duplicate of Comment 119	
61	Email	October 1, 2024	John MacLellan		Duplicate of Comment 119	
62	Email	October 1, 2024	Alex Caruana		Duplicate of Comment 119	
63	Email	October 1, 2024	Kevin Powers		Duplicate of Comment 119	
64	Email	October 1, 2024	Barbara Zeller		Duplicate of Comment 119	
65	Email	October 2, 2024	Vanessa Felix		Duplicate of Comment 119	
66	Email	October 2, 2024	Peter Pregel		Duplicate of Comment 119	
67	Email	October 3, 2024	Joe Capolupo		Duplicate of Comment 119	
68	Email	October 3, 2024	Scott Crowley		Duplicate of Comment 119	