



IBI Group
379 Queen Street South
Kitchener ON N2G 1W6 Canada
tel 519 745 9455
fax 519 745 7647

July 15, 2010

Mr. Jeremy Vink
Planner
Township of Woolwich
24 Church Street West
PO Box 158
Elmira, Ontario
N3B 2Z6

Dear Mr. Vink:

**PROPOSED JIGS HOLLOW PIT
KUNTZ TOPSOIL, SAND & GRAVEL LTD.**

Further to your letter of June 28, 2010, please accept the following as our reply.

1.0 Planning Report

- i) Under Section 4.3 Aggregate Resource Quantity, you are correct; a more refined breakdown of the resource is always possible. In reviewing the testpits and observing where the ground water was measured and providing a 1.5 metre buffer, the following are the results:

Testpit Number	Approximate Depth of Available Deposit
1	3.6
2	nominal
3	nominal
4	3.3
5	1.8
6	3.6
7	3.1
8	2.2
9	2.2
10	2.5
11	1.2

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

Given their proximity and similar depth of resource, the testpits could be combined in the following configuration:

Testpits Area	Average Depth			Volume		Conversion	Volume
	(sq. m)	(m)		(cu. m.)		(tonnes/m)	(tonnes)
1, 6, 7	63,800	x 3.4	=	217,000	x	1.919	= 416,400
2, 3, 5	28,600	x 1.4	=	40,000	x	1.919	= 76,800
4	25,200	x 3.3	=	83,200	x	1.919	= 160,000
8, 9, 10	57,100	x 2.2	=	125,600	x	1.919	= <u>241,000</u>
Total							894,200

Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that the volumes calculated must be considered approximate because we are dealing with an underlying naturally occurring deposit. As such, the volume might range from 840,000 to 900,000 tonnes.

- ii) Under Section 6.2, Township of Woolwich Official Plan, you are correct inasmuch that the header of the table did not correctly reference the Township of Woolwich.
- iii) Under Section 6.3, Township of Woolwich Zoning By-Law, the Report specifies the restrictions where asphalt can be stockpiled as being 2.0 metres above the water table. Therefore, there are only two possible scenarios which could present themselves being;
 - i) The pit floor is retained at 2.0 metres above the water table, or,
 - ii) The pit floor is extracted to 1.5 metres of the water table and then subsequently backfilled/compacted to 2.0 metres of the water table.

Given that the wording of the applicable Site Plan note for the Jigs Hollow Pit (Note 19) is the precise MNR Policy 5.00.15 wording, we trust that MNR understands how to interpret and enforce their own Policy and the Jigs Hollow operational restriction (Note 19) to ensure that the 2.0 metre buffer is retained.

19. *Recycling: Recycling of asphalt and concrete will be permitted on this site.*

- o *Recyclable asphalt materials will not be stockpiled within:*
 - o *30.0 metres of any water body or man-made pond; or*
 - o **2.0 metres of the surface of the established water table.**

We note the Region raised the same issue, and at this time we are contacting the Region to more fully understand the concern.

- iv) As an over-arching statement, it should be explained that aggregate deposits are not a warehouse of homogeneous material ready for shipment that will meet all the specifications for the construction and building markets. Although the on-site material may meet general 'pit run' specifications, in order to maximize the resource and to facilitate market requirements, the operator would need to have numerous product stockpiles of different material specifications available, and these stockpiles will occupy a sizeable portion of the site.

However, in an effort to ensure that progressive rehabilitation is an ongoing activity, we have revised the Site Plans (revised Site Plans attached), to identify a more

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

defined 'Processing Area', which the operator believes will be still sufficiently large enough for numerous stockpiles to be erected.

- v) Under Section 7.5, Surrendering the Licence, we acknowledge that once the pit is fully extracted and rehabilitated that the licensee would request MNR to surrender the licence. Under current legislation, once the licence is surrendered the lands could not be used for extraction so we are unsure as to the Township's concern.

Second, we would draw to your attention that Rehabilitation Note 12 specifies that the lands will be returned to an agricultural use.

Third, we note that under the current Township Extractive (E) zoning, the only two permitted uses are; (25.2.1) pit and (25.2.2) farming. Therefore, once the licence is surrendered and the pit use no longer applies, the only permitted use will be farming.

- vi) You have raised two separate questions regarding Section 8.2, Traffic Operational Review. First, the number of employee vehicles entering and exiting the pit daily must be deemed as inconsequential as there might be 2 or 3 people working at the pit at any one time which would arrive in the morning and leave at the end of the day.

Second, the importation of material will not result in any significant level of additional trucks being generated because the primary technique for importing such materials is via back-haul. To illustrate this, when sand/gravel from the pit is delivered to a road construction project, that truck is then available to be re-loaded with concrete (i.e., broken curb) or asphalt (i.e., road surface material), or stripped topsoil, and then trucked back to the pit for eventual processing. Much of the asphalt and concrete can be blended into the virgin sand/gravel (at levels permitted by Provincial Specifications).

- vii) We continue to stress that the importation of recycled material will not result in any significant level of additional trucks being generated. In almost all instances, a pit operator will only accept recycled material as a condition of selling the pit material. Therefore, notwithstanding your insistence to calculate the number of stand-alone trucks that would be required to import materials for recycling, as an industry norm, this just does not happen. However, to accommodate your academic calculations, please note the following:

150,000 tonnes of extractable material
+30,000 tonnes of imported material

180,000 tonnes/year
 ÷ 195 operating days/year
 = 923 tonnes per day

÷ 12 operating hours per day
 = 77 tonnes/hour

There is an existing range of truck sizes typically used in the Region of Waterloo, and which will utilize this pit to haul aggregate, varying from 23 tonnes to 35 tonnes, and therefore, a 30 tonne truck has been considered the average.

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

$$\begin{array}{r} 77 \text{ tonnes/hour} \\ \div 30 \text{ tonnes/load} \\ = 2.5 \text{ trucks per hour} \end{array}$$

If only smaller trucks were used (25 tonne), the result would be:

$$\begin{array}{r} 77 \text{ tonnes/hour} \\ \div 25 \text{ tonnes/load} \\ = 3 \text{ trucks per hour} \end{array}$$

However, given that the pit is not anticipated to be operated at the maximum level for any sustained period of time during the pit life, the typical traffic volumes will be less than those noted above.

- viii) Notwithstanding the comment in the Planning Summary Report, "about 2 per hour", the Traffic Operational and Safety Review did base their report on 2 ½ trucks per hour, but if 'only' 25 tonne trucks were used, the increase would be marginal from 2 ½ to 3 trucks per hour and it would not alter any recommendations proposed by the Traffic Study. Second, the Region of Waterloo's overall review of cumulative traffic impact used a higher count of 3 trucks per hour and did not conclude impacts to the road network system.
- ix) Under Section 8.5, Haul Route Recommendations, the report recommends that 2167534 Ontario Inc. enter into an agreement with the Township regarding the ongoing maintenance of those portions of Peel Street and Jigs Hollow Road. A draft agreement is being prepared and will be forwarded to the Township as soon as it is available.
- x) Under Section 9.1, Acoustical Modeling, given that a peer review of the Acoustical Study has been undertaken, we are surprised that the Township is still commenting on such issues. However, for your information, the existing house was not included in the mitigation calculations as the house is intended to be used by the licensee for a pit office.
- xi) We confirm that Township staff confirmed prior to our submission that a Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment was not required.
- xii) Under Section 14.1.1 – Groundwater and Section 15.1 Summary of Land Use Compatibility Recommendations, we note that we have made changes to the Site Plan Notes to accommodate your requests (revised Site Plans attached) as follows:

Hydrogeological Recommendation

2. Groundwater samples shall be obtained from the wells yearly and analyzed for general water quality parameters, and major cations and anions as well as geochemical sampling bi-annually in accordance with the Region of Waterloo's guidelines. An annual summary report will be submitted to the Region's Manager of Hydrology and Source Water and the Township of Woolwich's Director of Engineering and Planning.

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

Noise Recommendations

8. That twice annually the pit operator must monitor the noise levels at all the receiver locations to ensure noise levels are kept within the established criteria. All monitoring must be conducted by a qualified acoustical Engineer and shall follow the guidelines and specifications outlined in NPC 233 "information to be submitted for approval of stationary sources of sound". An annual report must be made available to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and submitted to the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Township of Woolwich.

10. If the licensee receives any noise complaints from the public (verbal or written), they will inform the Township of Woolwich, including any remedial action if required.

If any amendments are undertaken to the Site Plans to accommodate noise issues or any other issue, it is the responsibility of MNR under the ARA to circulate those to the local Municipality.

- xiii) Under Section 15.1 d) - Summary of Land Use Compatibility Recommendations, you are correct that the reference to Phase 2 should have been Phase 1; however we note that the Site Plans remain correct.
- xiv) Under Section 15.1 e) - Summary of Land Use Compatibility Recommendations, the wording used is directly from MNR Policy A.R. 5.00.15 and your concern is that the MNR Aggregate Technical Specialist will incorrectly interpret their own Policy of timing related to Site Plan Note 19, 5th bullet which states:
 - *Once final rehabilitation has been completed and approved in accordance with the site plan, all recycling operations must cease.*

In an effort to accommodate Township staff, we have modified this MNR Policy (revised Site Plans attached) to state:

- ***Once final rehabilitation has been completed and approved, extraction of Phase 2 has been completed and final rehabilitation has been initiated in accordance with the site plan, all recycling operations must cease.***
- xv) It is our interpretation that under the Planning Act under Section 34 (2), that the applicant is not required to provide any such justification as to the duration of this pit since pits and quarries are deemed as a land use. The Act states:

Pits and quarries

"34 (2) The making, establishment or operation of a pit or quarry shall be deemed to be a use of land for the purposes of paragraph 1 of subsection (1). R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, s. 34 (2)."

Furthermore, the adopted Regional Official Plan (2009) states under Policy 9.B.1.

"...Area Municipalities will establish policies in their official plans to protect these operations from new development that would preclude or hinder their expansion or continued use, or which would be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety or environmental concerns."

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

Therefore, whether the pit is operated at maximum capacity for the minimum duration of 6 years, or more likely at a reduced rate reflective of market conditions, all required land use mitigation features will remain in place for the full duration of the pit life.

2.0 Environmental

No Township issues.

3.0 Traffic Study

- i) Under Section 4.1, Background Growth Rate, you are correct that the requested tonnage limit is 150,000 tonnes. Once again, we note that the enforceable components of the Site Plans are correct, as noted in General Operational Note 1:
 1. *Tonnage limit: It is a condition of this licence that no more than 150,000 tonnes of material shall be removed from this licensed property annually and the extraction of aggregate shall not occur within 1.5 metres of the high water table.*
- ii) Under Section 4.1, Background Growth Rate, please note that the Traffic Operations and Safety Review did examine the worst-case scenario by assuming that the trucks generated by the pit reflected the maximum extraction rate.

Second, and as Township staff are fully aware, the life expectancy of any licensed pit is dictated by market conditions and that most pits are typically operated at a level less than their maximum production rate for the majority of the pit life. As such, Township staff can expect the pit life will exceed 6 years.

Third, it is clearly our understanding that MNR will not place any form of sunset clause upon a licence, and this applicant will not agree to one.
- iii) We find your request to update the 2008 Traffic Operational and Safety Review to account for cumulative impact to reflect changes to another application (Hunder) to be redundant. First, you are in receipt of a revised traffic report prepared by Hunder which reflects changes in their data but with also addressed the cumulative impact of the proposed Jigs Hollow Pit and Letson Pit. Therefore, why would the Township request the same data replicated by Kuntz which will obviously result in the precise same conclusions?

Second, the Township is in receipt of the recent work undertaken by the Region which assimilated all the traffic data for all three pits to determine the cumulative impact, and their conclusions did not highlight any such concerns related to their Regional Roads.
- iv) We note that the Traffic Operational and Safety Review did not make any reference to the pit operating days. However, the Planning Summary Report did reference 220 days as it factored in the assumption of operating Saturday mornings, which will not occur as stipulated by Noise Note 3.
- v) Regarding typical truck sizes and operational pit days, refer to our reply under Planning Report vii).

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

- vi) Regarding the right-turn lane, we fail to understand your comment. The Traffic Operational and Safety Review made a recommendation that a deceleration lane be constructed on Northfield Drive, (Regional Road 22) to accommodate the proposed north-bound haul trucks returning to the pit. Any road upgrades required within the Regional Road right-of-way must be designed at Kuntz expense and subsequently reviewed and approved by the Region. Upon Kuntz providing the applicable Letter of Credit to the Region for the construction costs, the Region will arrange for the construction of same.
- vii) Regarding timing and responsibilities for any ongoing road upgrades and dust control, please refer to Planning Report ix), regarding the draft Agreement.

Regarding traffic safety, we would refer you to Operational Note 8. In terms of ongoing reminders, we would highlight the track record of Kuntz Topsoil, Sand & Gravel Ltd. who are responsible citizens of the community and are equally concerned regarding public safety as is the Township, and as such, the operator will closely monitor all drivers which access his properties and take any necessary actions.

Visual

- i) Please note that as a result of the more sensitive modeling undertaken through the revised Noise Study that the Peel Street berm has been reduced to 6.0 metres in height and it will be vegetated with a tree/shrub screen to accommodate recommendations of the dust report. Second, please note that throughout the ARA process and the Township zoning process, the home owners at 110 and 114 Peel Street have not raised any verbal or written concerns.

Second, in terms of the stockpiles, please refer to the attached cross-sections which illustrate that: i) residents of 110 and 114 Peel Street will not see any portion of a 20.0 m high stockpile and ii) that east-bound users of Peel Street will temporary see most of the processing area regardless of the stockpile heights.

Noise

- i) The requirement to monitor noise twice annually is identified as Noise Note 8. Please note that the monitoring is to be undertaken by a qualified acoustical engineer, and as such the monitoring will be conducted using MOE standards, which includes doing the readings at peak operational times. However, given the fact that crushing may occur at the pit infrequently, it is possible that during some monitoring periods that peak operational noise levels (crusher) may not occur.
- ii) As already requested above, under Planning Report x), we have revised Noise Note 8 to include the Township in the circulation of the annual report findings and added Note 10 whereby any noise complaint (written/verbal) that is reported to the licensee is provided to the Township.
- iii) We are puzzled that Township staff is commenting on issues that have already been peer reviewed and at this time, Kuntz is not prepared to undertake any further changes to the Noise Report.

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

- iv) The identified berm is required to enclose the crusher. As noted above in Planning Report iv), the Site Plans have been revised to define the limits of the Processing Area, (revised Site Plans attached).
- v) We are unclear as to what additional comments might be forthcoming as we are in receipt of the comments provided by the Township's peer review consultant.

Hydrogeological

- i)
 - a) We have located the surrounding domestic wells on the Site Plans (revised Site Plans attached).
 - b) Since this pit application will remain 1.5 metres above the water table and there will be no water taking permit requested, the hydrogeological reports has concluded that no impact to the groundwater levels or adjacent domestic water wells will occur. If domestic well interference did occur due to the pit operations, the requirements of MOE through the Water Resources Act will be enacted and will be strictly enforced whether they are noted on the Site Plans or not. Second, if the licensee were to specify all the Federal and Provincial legislation that applies to the operator (e.g., Ministry of Labour, Gasoline Handling Act, Occupational Health and Safety Standards, Weights and Measures, etc.) numerous additional sheets would be necessary to accompany the Site Plans.
- ii) At this time we are in receipt of the Region's comments (July 12, 2010) and a full response will be provided to their remaining issues.

Second, as noted above under Planning Report x) the Township will be circulated with the annual report.

Third, related to your key concerns, please note that these are similar to those raised by the Region and we are currently seeking clarification as to the concern.
- i) The dust study utilized maximum processing rates for the crushing and screening equipment and therefore this would include all imported material as well as the on-site material. Second, the trigger mechanism for dust mitigation is not based on processing rates or truck movement numbers, but rather when dust is visible. Therefore, if visible dust is created when topsoil is being screened due to climatic conditions, suitable mitigation will be triggered.
- ii) We are unclear as to what additional comments might be forthcoming as we are in receipt of all the comments provided by the Township's peer review consultant.

Aggregate Resource Inventory

- i) Please note that Hydrogeology Note 1 states that water levels will be undertaken on a quarterly basis and the Site Plans prohibit extraction within 1.5 metres of the water table. Based on these two limitations, we are unsure what the Township concerns are.

However, attached hereto are current readings (December, 2009) from the monitoring well:

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

<u>Monitoring Well</u>	<u>Depth to Water</u>
MW1	4.98
MW2	5.05
MW3	2.90

Proposed Zoning

- i) We are unclear as to what further details regarding a Temporary Use By-Law that Township staff are requesting, but for your files, we are attaching a draft Zoning By-Law. Second, as you are aware, the Planning Act provides for temporary use By-Laws and this is the same strategy used for previous applications through this Municipality (i.e., Kuntz - Bridge Street Pit).

In terms of justification, please note that the current facility used by Kuntz Topsoil Sand and Gravel (Bridge Street Pit) is itself temporary and its duration is strictly tied to the life expectancy of the Bridge Street Pit life. Therefore, as specified in the Planning Report, in order this portion of the business to continue, the intent is to undertake this process at this proposed site. To date, we are not aware of any issues, complaints (e.g., dust, noise, traffic, etc.) related to the ongoing operation at the Bridge Street Pit. Lastly, and for clarification, this site will not be used or advertised as a do-it-yourself retail location for the sale of any products.

Haul Route

- i) An Entrance Permit will be provided to the Township with the applicable design information as requested.
- ii) Kuntz has agreed to relocate the pit entrance to Jigs Hollow Road, and based on our meeting with yourself (and D. Kennaley) on July 6, 2010, we understand that the Township staff request for a 4.0 metre road widening along Peel Street and a day-lighting triangle would no longer be required.
- iii) As noted previously, a draft Agreement regarding the off-site haul road will be forthcoming. Second, if the Township has had previous issues with other applicants (aggregate or otherwise), we trust that this current process will allow all parties to find ways to improve on the accountability of each. However, we are not aware of any past delinquencies with regard to Kuntz Topsoil, Sand and Gravel Ltd. and their relationship with the Township and as such, Kuntz Topsoil Sand & Gravel Ltd. requests that a continued level of respect be extended to their corporate name.

Rehabilitation

- i) The Progressive and Final Rehabilitation Plan does illustrate that "internal haul roads, fuel storage, weigh scale and signage" are not present upon the final rehabilitation. However, to accommodate Township staff, we have added an additional note, (revised Site Plans attached) which states:

14. Once final rehabilitation of the Processing Area has begun, the licensee will ensure the removal of all internal roads, including culverts, the weigh scale, fuel storage, truck entrance and signage.

- ii) The triangle area is within the GRCA regulatory area and no extraction is permitted within the applicable 15 and 30 metre setback areas. Please find attached

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

correspondence from the Ministry of Agriculture which confirms that agricultural activities are sustainable on 3:1 slopes. Therefore, the agricultural production of the site will continue on the undisturbed lands as well as on the former pit floor and side slopes.

- iii) Note 6 of the Rehabilitation Plan of the Site Plans has been revised, (revised Site Plans attached) to more closely reflect the test pit depths. However, the notation "generally equal to the depth removed" will confirm that what is removed will be replaced.

6. Topsoil Replacement: The depth of topsoil and subsoil that is re-applied is to be generally equal to the depth removed which will be a depth of topsoil being +/- 30 cm and a depth of subsoil being +/- 30 – 40cm. This activity will occur by use of earth scrapers and other earth moving equipment.

- iv) Regarding the 'decommissioning of the scale house and truck entrance", please refer Rehabilitation i) above.

General Comments

- i) Since Kuntz has agreed to relocate the pit entrance to Jigs Hollow Road, and based on our meeting with yourself (and D. Kennaley) on July 6, 2010, we understand that Township staff no longer have concerns related to the Grand Valley Trail.
- ii) We are unsure as to your comment related to off-site test-pits. Any test-pits undertaken outside the subject site have no impact or relationship to this application, and it has been acknowledged that the initial test-pits were undertaken by another local aggregate operator (Preston Sand & Gravel Company Ltd.).
- iii) You are correct and the Site Plans shall be revised (revised Site Plans attached) to reflect the applicants new address being:

136 Water Street
St. Jacobs, Ontario
N0B 2N0
- iv) Please refer to the initial ARA application circulated to the Township on December 15, 2008 and/or Planning Summary Report which was attached thereto, whereby Kuntz Topsoil, Sand & Gravel Ltd. applied for a Category 3 (pit above water), and therefore this pit will be restricted to extraction 1.5 metres above the water table.
- v) Refer to Visual i) above.
- vi) As per your comments, Site Plan Note 18 already does state:

18. *Aggregate Washing: There will be no wash ponds associated with this licence or aggregate washing.*
- vii) The issue you have raised regarding recycling operations has already been addressed above under Planning Report xii).
- viii) Note 20 specifies that scrap will be stored within the processing area and removed from the site annually. Like any business (e.g., farming, aggregate, etc.) scrap can

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

accumulate and the intent of the note is that if there is any scrap, that it be contained in one location and at least once a year that it be removed. Scrap may include used metal screens from the screening plant or worn belts from stockpile stackers, etc. This note is quite typical for pit licenses.

- ix) The issue you have raised regarding the Township receiving copies of the annual noise monitoring report has already been addressed above under Planning Report xii).
 - x) In order to address the importation of topsoil, we have revised Site Plan Note 19 (revised Site Plans attached) so that it includes topsoil.
 - 19. *Importation of Materials: Recycling of asphalt and concrete **and screening of topsoil** shall be permitted within Phase 1 but the licensee shall not import an annual amount exceeding 30,000 tonnes nor stockpile a volume exceeding 30,000 tonnes.*
 - xi) As per your request, the cross-sections have been revised, (revised Site Plans attached) to illustrate the test pits and monitoring wells.
 - xii) As per your request, Site Plan Note 11 has been revised, (revised Site Plans attached) to state:
 - 11. Berms: Perimeter berms shall be constructed to the heights and locations noted on the plan and specified under the recommendations from technical reports, Noise Study – Note 2, unless adjacent residents request reduced berm heights. Berms shall be built with 3:1 side slopes and be vegetated with a grass-type legume. **Silt fencing shall be erected and maintained along the external base of the berms until the vegetation has germinated.** The external sideslopes of the berms will be maintained (cut on a regular basis) as required.
- Second, please note that no stockpiles of topsoil are proposed.
- xiii) Regarding the Township's request for the preservation of any drainage swales external to the extraction area, we note that the existing drainage swale at the toe of the slope along the western boundary of the extraction area is illustrated on the Site Plans but there are no notations in the notes that would suggest or permit any changes to this swale.
 - xiv) The issue you have raised regarding the minor change to Table 2 in Section 6.2 of the Planning Report has already been addressed above under Planning Report xii).
 - xv) Those portions of the perimeter berms which are located within the 'area to be extracted', will be extracted by a front-end loader as the berms are begin removed during the final rehabilitation process.
 - xvi) Since Kuntz has agreed to relocate the pit entrance to Jigs Hollow Road, and based on our meeting with yourself (and D. Kennelly) on July 6, 2010, we understand that the Township staff no longer has concerns related to fencing the exiting Peel Street farm entrance.

Mr. Jeremy Vink – July 15, 2010

At this time we trust that the attached responses will be sufficient for you to finalize your Planning Report and have the application proceed to the Committee of the Whole as soon as possible.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Yours truly

IBI GROUP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Sisco". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "D" and "S".

David R. Sisco, BA, MCIP, RPP
Associate, Principal – Planning

DRS/baw
Encl.

cc: Diane Schwier, MNR
Councillor M. Bauman
Ray Kuntz, Kuntz Topsoil, Sand & Gravel Ltd.

NOTICE OF PASSING

Explanatory Note Zone Change 3/2009 2167534 Ontario Inc.

A By-law to amend Zoning By-law 56-86, as amended, of the Township of Woolwich.

This By-law applies to the property located at 125 Peel Street and described as Part Lot 3, Crooks Track West of the Grand River, Township of Woolwich, (see Map 1). The property is designated as Agricultural in the Township of Woolwich Official Plan and is zoned Agriculture, (A).

The purpose of this By-law is to rezone portions of the property from Agriculture (A) to Extractive (E) with specific provisions to permit:

- on a 18.5 ha portion within the western section of the property, a notwithstanding clause prohibiting the extraction of sand and gravel.
- the creation of a gravel pit on a 17.5 ha portion within the eastern section of the property; and
- a topsoil, asphalt, and concrete processing operation within the licensed pit area as a temporary use for a maximum of three years.

The effect of the By-law will permit the extraction of aggregate on the lands identified above and site specific provisions regulating the topsoil, asphalt and concrete processing operation within the processing areas within the limits of the extraction area, as an extension to the permitted uses within the Extractive zone.

This by-law is deemed to be in compliance with the Official Plan of the Township of Woolwich.

From: Neumann, Carol (OMAFRA) [mailto:carol.neumann@ontario.ca]
Sent: March 22, 2010 11:58 AM
To: Kate Wills
Cc: David Sisco; Betty White
Subject: RE: 19672 - Hunsberger Pit - Proposed Rehabilitation Slopes

Hi Kate;

I have read your letter dated March 18, 2010. I have not received or reviewed any applications regarding the application for a Category 3, Class A, Aggregate License for Hunder Development in the Township of Woolwich. However, generally speaking, a 3:1 slope is considered to be the maximum gradient for safe side hill vehicle traffic. Slopes in the range of 3:1 to 10:1 are generally satisfactory for agricultural uses.

Carol

Carol Neumann, Rural Planner

Environmental and Land Use Policy Unit

Food Safety and Environmental Policy Branch

Policy Division

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

6484 Wellington Road 7

Elora, ON, NOB 1S0 (*new*)

Tel: (519) 846-3393

Fax: (519) 846-8178

carol.neumann@ontario.ca

www.omafra.gov.on.ca

Think Before You Print.