



August 4, 2021

Sanjay Coelho  
Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks - Environmental Policy Branch  
40 St Clair Avenue West, Floor 10  
Toronto, ON M4V1M2  
[mecp.landpolicy@ontario.ca](mailto:mecp.landpolicy@ontario.ca)

**RE: ERO 019-2785**

Dear Mr. Coelho

The following is the submission from Gravel Watch Ontario (GWO; [gravelwatch.org](http://gravelwatch.org)) in response to the request for comments on the Proposed Land Use Compatibility Guideline, Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (March 2021) ERO 019-2785.

**About Gravel Watch Ontario**

Gravel Watch Ontario is a province-wide coalition of citizen groups and individuals that acts in the interests of residents and communities to protect the health, safety, quality of life of Ontarians and the natural environment in matters that relate to aggregate resources.

GWO recognizes the obligation to protect agricultural lands, water resources and the natural environment, all of which are essential for building a climate-resilient Ontario for future generations. GWO works with and on behalf of our members and communities throughout the province to advocate that policies regulating aggregate extraction not result in permanent loss of farmland or rural landscape amenities and do not damage the integrity of the water resources supplied by the rural landscape. Gravel Watch Ontario has commented on government planning and aggregate policies for over 15 years.

We understand that ERO notice 019-2785 links to four separate compliance initiatives. GWO's submission focuses on aggregate resources as it pertains to these draft Land Use Compatibility Guidelines. In general, GWO found the information regarding aggregate to be scattered throughout various sections of the document, often unclear or contradictory, making it particularly onerous on the reviewer to sift through and sort out the intent and nature of land use compatibility as it relates to aggregate operations. The ensuing discussion has *italicized and indented* the instructions identified in the Guideline with GWO's comments following thereafter for ease of reference.

## 1. INTRODUCTION & CONTEXT

### 1.1 Overview

#### GWO Concern/Issue – Preferential Treatment of Aggregate Class 3 Major Facilities over Sensitive Land Uses

*The objective of the current EPA D-6 Guideline is to “prevent or minimize the encroachment of sensitive land use upon industrial land and **vice versa**, as these two types of land uses are normally incompatible due to possible adverse effects on sensitive land use created by industrial operations.”*

*The overview of the Land Use Compatibility Guideline states that “the Guideline is to be applied to achieve and maintain land use compatibility between major facilities and sensitive land uses when a planning approval under the Planning Act is needed in the following circumstances:*

- *A new or expanding sensitive land use is proposed near an existing or planned major facility, **or***
- *A new or expanding major facility is proposed near an existing or planned sensitive land use.”*

Although the Compatibility Guideline requires equal application by both a major facility and a sensitive land use, they are not treated equally throughout the document. For example, Section 2.8 of the Guideline, demonstration of need is to be carried out by proponents of sensitive land uses only. In Appendix D, the Area of Influence (AOI) and the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) for are not applicable to land use decisions for new or expanding aggregate operations.

The Guideline also identifies aggregates as a sector which has had a history of ongoing and frequent complaints. Situating aggregate operations near sensitive land uses under exempted and exclusive rules does not achieve compatibility.

#### GWO Recommendation #1

- Apply the Guideline in the same manner for new or expanding aggregate operations as for sensitive land uses.

### 1.2 General Approach to Planning for Land Use Compatibility

#### GWO Concern/Issue -- Co-existence and Compatibility Not Conceptually Related

*“Land Use compatibility is achieved when major facilities and sensitive land uses can co-exist and thrive for the long-term within a community through planning that recognizes the locational needs of both.”*

The terms compatibility and co-existence are not conceptually the same. Compatibility denotes relations that are well-suited, friendly and harmonious. Co-existence, on the other hand, denotes tolerance and forbearance. Inferring these terms are correlated sets the stage for further conflict, lengthy appeals and increased costs for all parties.

In Section 3.8, the concept of co-existence as meaning tolerance is confirmed.

*“.....after a major facility has obtained its necessary planning approvals to be located in an area that may be close to a sensitive land use (e.g. a residential development), or vice versa..... the tools available to the Ministry (MECP) to deal with contaminants from the facility as well as technical solutions may be limited..... which may result in a situation where the sensitive land use has to co-exist with ‘minor impacts’ from the major facility over the long term..... and subsequent complaints about adverse affects (noise, dust and odour) may be directed to the municipality”.*

Minor impacts are not defined but the sensitive land use is expected to tolerate the resulting adverse effects for the long term. Long term consequences can result in societal costs associated with health and safety or environmental degradation. It’s an unfair practice to expect the public to tolerate long term consequences.

Use of the term co-existence does not align with federal international agreements regarding sustainable development and climate change which strive for a balance between the various sectors of society. This balance is also reflected in Ontario’s environment, climate change and planning frameworks.

**GWO Recommendation #2:**

- Maintain the conceptual distinction between compatibility and co-existence.
- Distinguish between minor and major impacts.
- Ensure the MECP Guideline aligns with national and international agreements as well as the provinces’ social, environmental and climate change responsibilities.

**1.3 Guiding Hierarchy for Land Use Compatibility Planning**

**GWO Concerns/Issues – The PPS not being read in its’ entirety.**

*“Separation of incompatible land uses is the preferred approach to avoiding land use compatibility issues. The Guideline state that this approach is consistent with PPS 1.1.5.6”*

The PPS speaks to the incompatibility of sensitive residential land use with existing aggregate operations. GWO believes that the reverse is also true as per Case Law - Capital Paving v Wellington (County) 2010 Carswell Ont. Paragraph 6....

*“it is fair to say the PPS speaks to incompatibility of sensitive residential use with earlier operations, and the reverse is also true, that a proposed pit may be incompatible with prior residential use”.*

Although the Guideline in Section 1.7.1 generally supports fulfillment of provincial interests identified in the PPS, missing throughout the document is identification to the pertinent PPS clauses which direct consideration for development to (1) consider social and environmental impacts, and (2) only permit development once potential impacts have been addressed.

**GWO Recommendation #3:**

- Apply the same requirement for new or expanding major facilities near established and planned sensitive land uses as for sensitive land uses being proposed near major facilities.
- Consistently apply all relevant PPS clauses.

**GWO Concern/Issue – Ambiguous Terminology and Lack of Meaningful Public Involvement**

*“When avoidance (i.e. separation) alone is not possible, minimizing and mitigating potential impacts may provide a basis for a proposal. If minimization is not viable, the proposed incompatible land use should not be enabled, and related planning or development applications should not be approved”*

GWO supports this Guideline. The term ‘should’, however, is indefinite and subject to interpretation and ambiguity.

**GWO Recommendation #4:**

- Change the word ‘should’ to ‘shall’ to provide clear direction to ensure incompatible uses are not enabled nor approved.

*“Planning authorities, proponents and the surrounding communities ‘should work together’ to achieve land use compatibility”.*

Working together is a viable approach to achieving compatibility. ‘Should work together’ implies relationship building, collaboration and compromise. Appendix C, however, outlines best practices for relationship building as merely communicating with members of the public. Communication relates to the informing stage of planning engagement conventions as depicted on Step 3 of the Arnstein’s Ladder of Public Participation (<https://www.citizenshandbook.org/arnsteinsladder.html>.) ‘Informing’ is generally a one-way communication strategy that rarely results in even minor adjustments. Informing does not denote, nor reflect the concept of ‘working together’. Society’s legal and institutional framework that sanctions planning decisions has increasingly recognized the benefit of various engagement measures for practical deliberations that include various perspectives and encourages dialogue to promote understanding among stakeholders’ values and interests. The role of the public to bring forth community values is critical. It is also critical to consider the concept of ‘working together’ as relationship building and collaboration in regards to the Duty to Consult with Indigenous Peoples.

**GWO Recommendation #5:**

- Change ‘should work together’ to ‘shall work together’.
- Enable collaboration to achieve the desired outcome of compatibility.
- Clearly identify the government’s responsibility for the Duty to Consult with Indigenous Peoples and ensure it is implemented at the outset of development when changes in land use are being considered.

## 1.6 Roles and Responsibilities

### 1.6.1 Planning Authorities

*Planning authorities must not approve development proposals where there are irreconcilable incompatibilities (i.e. adverse effects with no feasible required mitigation measures). Land use planning decisions that result in incompatibility may create ongoing issues for all parties, including municipalities to address noise and odour complaints and other impacts.*

**GWO supports the above guideline.**

#### **GWO Concern/Issue – Increased responsibility on the planning authorities**

*Planning authorities also undertake planning exercises which must address land use compatibility, such as comprehensive reviews of OPs, development of secondary plans and reviews of zoning by-laws. To address land use compatibility, OP policies and land use designations....must be up-to-date and in accordance with this Guideline.*

Updating OPs and zoning by-laws is a daunting task which puts pressure on planning authorities' capacity requirements and ultimately for increasing property taxes. Although mandated under the same Planning Act as municipalities, Local Planning Authorities in rural and unorganized territories do not have the corresponding human and financial resources to carry out basic planning functions, let alone up-dates to OPs and zoning by-laws in regards to this Guideline.

#### **GWO Recommendation #6:**

- Do no overburden planning authorities' capacity and planning budgets.
- Review the viability and effectiveness of Local Planning Boards to carry out high level planning functions.

## **2. TOOLS TO ASSESS LAND USE COMPATIBILITY**

### **2.1.1-3 Areas of Influence and Minimum Set Back Distances**

#### **GWO Concern/Issue – Preferential Treatment Given to Aggregate Operations**

An influence area approach to minimize land use conflicts for aggregate resource extraction has long been recognized. The 1986 Guideline on Implementation of the Mineral Aggregate Resources Policy Statement (Ministry of Natural Resources) states that:

*“An influence area is the area surrounding a pit or quarry where the impacts of the operation may be felt on the environment, nearby residents and land uses. The influence area concept is intended to protect existing or designated sensitive land uses from proposed pits or quarries and existing or designated pits or quarries from encroachment by sensitive uses ...”*

Guideline Section 1.2 recognizes that sensitive land uses located too close to a major facility could experience environmental impacts as well as risks to public health and safety. Similarly, Section 2.1.3 states that:

*“proposals should not result in sensitive land uses being located in MSDs as adverse effects are highly likely to occur.”*

While a planning authority may determine that an Area of Influence may be smaller (based on supporting studies), it must never be smaller than the MSD in the Guideline. However, while recognizing that some above-ground equipment such as crushers, ready-mix concrete plants and asphalt plants may require ECA's, the Guideline states:

*The AOI and MSD in the Guideline are not applicable to land use decisions for new or expanding aggregate operations proposed near sensitive land use.*

And, Section 2.2 states:

*Aggregate Operations (Aggregate extraction, Resource Extraction, Other mineral quarries) identified as Class 3 (AOI 1,000 m/MSD 500 m) AOI and MSD only applies to new or expanding sensitive land use proposals near major facility aggregate operations.*

In addition, the Aggregate Resources Ontario Provincial Standards (AROPS) refers to measurement of separation as the distances to sensitive receptors, not to the property boundary of a sensitive land use as recommended in Section 2.4 and in relation to Section 3.3 “At-receptor mitigation is not recognized by the Ministry to mitigate odour and dust impacts” and in Appendix B.1 “the Ministry-developed AOIs in this Guideline should address both noise and vibration...separation distances for noise are larger than vibration so covering noise impacts will cover vibration impacts” which fails to account for any future expansions of the aggregate operation or changes to the site plan.

Although Guideline Section 4 recommends planning mechanisms to assist in the implementation of land use compatibility, Section 66 of the ARA is highly restrictive of municipal authority such as municipal site plan controls and development permits. Both the PPS (Section 2.5.2.4) as well as the ARA (Section 12.1 (1.1) prohibit municipalities from issuing zoning by-laws to restrict the depth of extraction while Guideline Section 4.1 recommends adverse impacts on sensitive land uses to be considered at the Official Plan (OP) and zoning stage. Section 13 of the ARA, however, allows the Minister, at any time, to rescind or vary a condition of a licence, amend a licence or require a licensee to amend the site plan. A licensee may also make the same requests of the Minister at any time. These unknown operational impacts cannot be adequately assessed or determined at the planning/approval stage. The question then becomes...how can a planning authority be responsible for approvals of an industrial extractive zoning when site plans can be changed at the licensing stage and throughout the life of the license for which the planning authority has no control?

**GWO Recommendation #7:**

- For new or expanding aggregate operations:
  - Apply the prescribed AOI and MSD required for Class 3 Major Industrial Facilities proposed near Sensitive Land Uses,
  - Measure separation distances (AOI and MSD) from the property boundary of the proposed aggregate operation (Class 3 Major facility) and from the property boundary of the existing sensitive land use to accommodate future expansions of the major facility,

- Adhere to the Guideline for a Class 3 Major Facility (as identified in Section 2.2 Table 1) with the understanding that some aggregate operations may cause adverse effects beyond the MSD of 500 M and in some cases, beyond the AOI of 1000 M
- Be subject to the steps in Section 2.5 for a proposed or expanding major facility that is within the AOI or MSD of an existing or planned sensitive land use.
- Recognize Section 2.9 of the Decision Tree for Land Use Compatibility that may result in a proposed Major Facility not going ahead if expected adverse effects cannot be minimized and/or mitigated to the level of no adverse effects.

## 2.8 Demonstration of Need

### GWO Concern/Issue – Preferential Treatment Given to Aggregate Producers – no balance

*The demonstration of need.....is only required by proponents of sensitive land uses.*

*When considering new sensitive land uses near mineral aggregate areas, planning authorities must consider active aggregate operations, zoning which permits future aggregate operations and, where provincial information is available, deposits of mineral aggregate resources.*

The concern in this Section is the nature and regional distribution of aggregate since there are areas throughout the province where distribution of aggregate is ubiquitous. “Freezing” land has the potential to restrict settlement to narrow confines. This situation does not take into consideration future generations, which is antithetical to the United Nations concepts and definitions pertaining to ‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the needs of future generations’<sup>1</sup>. Freezing land also creates the risk for mega-quarry development that can lead to long term and irreversible impacts. There is little data available regarding aggregate reserves yet the focus is to open up new lands closer to market as a means to reduce transportation costs for the producer. Lands nearest to market are also lands nearest or adjacent to residential or farm lands which places the risk of long term and irreversible impacts onto the sensitive land use.

An unbalanced approach to demonstration of need will perpetuate conflict, constrained relations, and more appeals, thereby increasing costs for government, the proponent and the general public which is contradictory to the stated purpose of this Guideline.

### GWO Recommendation #8

- Apply the same requirement for Demonstration of Need in the same manner to new or expanding major facilities as for sensitive land uses being proposed near major facilities.
- Ensure compatibility is a two way process.

The Guideline further states:

*Compatibility studies should be prepared by the proponent.....the planning authority is responsible to review compatibility....If in house expertise is not available, the planning authority should consider having a peer review of studies at the expense of the proponent.*

---

<sup>1</sup> World Commission on Environment and Development. Our Common Future, Oxford, UK. Oxford. University Press. 1987.

### **GWO Recommendation #9**

- Should a planning authority conduct a review of a proponent's compatibility study with in-house expertise, the expense should be borne by the proponent.

### **3. COMPLIANCE**

#### **GWO Concern/Issue – The public is expected to tolerate impacts for the long term Increased municipal responsibility to deal with complaints**

*“Per its compliance framework, the Ministry may refer incidents related to compatibility issues that stem from planning decision to a more appropriate level of government or agency (e.g. municipality).....after a major facility has obtained its necessary planning approvals to be located in an area that may be close to a sensitive land use (e.g. a residential development), or vice versa..... the tools available to the Ministry (MECP) to deal with contaminants from the facility as well as technical solutions may be limited..... may result in a situation where the sensitive land use has to co-exist with ‘minor impacts’ from the major facility over the long term..... and subsequent complaints about adverse affects (noise, dust and odour) may be directed to the municipality”.*

Conceptual alignment regarding co-existence as being compatible is applicable here. Refer to Section 1 regarding terminology. Co-existence and compatibility are not conceptually the same and compatibility is a two-way process.

Refer to page 3 regarding the discussion pertaining to Section 1.2 and the lack of distinction between minor and major impacts. Shifting EPA compliance to the planning authority puts pressure on municipal capacity requirements which ultimately puts pressure on increasing municipal property taxes thereby shifting the financial responsibility to the public. In areas outside municipal boundaries, the role of Local Planning Boards is not mentioned and the public in these areas have no avenue available to have their concerns or complaints dealt with appropriately given the capacity limitations of Planning Boards. Similar to Section 2, how can planning authorities be responsible for compliance issues when site plans can be changed at the licensing stage and throughout the life of the aggregate operations which is outside the planning authorities' jurisdiction?

### **GWO Recommendation #10**

- Ensure compatibility goes both ways.
- Do not overburden planning authorities with EPA compliance issues.
- Review the viability and effectiveness of Local Planning Boards to deal with EPA complaints and compliance issues.



## **4.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND PLANNING TOOLS**

### **4.3.1 Municipal By-laws**

#### **GWO Concern/Issue**

- **Increased workload for planning authorities and risk of increasing property tax burden**
- **Lack of reference to fly rock as a contaminant**

*Onus is on the municipality to enforce by-laws that would prevent and respond to land use compatibility issues.*

Development and enforcement of by-laws regarding EPA compatibility issues puts further pressure on planning authorities' capacity requirements and risk of increase to local property taxes. As stated above, once the license has been approved, the planning authorities' oversight is limited by the PPS and the ARA. In addition, Local Planning Boards do not have the capacity for by-law enforcement. The public in these areas must rely on the good will of the self-reporting aggregate producers to comply with compatibility issues.

#### **GWO Recommendation #11:**

- Do not overburden planning authorities' capacity and planning budgets.
- The province needs to review the viability and effectiveness of Local Planning Boards to not only develop by-laws but to carry out their enforcement.

#### **GWO Recommendation #12:**

- MECP to take responsibility for monitoring and compliance regarding their mandate for the environment as it relates to major facilities.

## **APPENDIX - D – SECTOR SPECIFIC RELATED TO AGGREGATES**

#### **GWO Concern/Issue**

- **Preferential Treatment of Aggregate Industry**
- **PPS not being referred to in its entirety**
- **Recognition of the differences between planning and licensing stages**

Overall, aggregate operations are depicted as having priority over sensitive land uses. This imbalance includes the following:

- AOIs and MSDs are not applicable to land use decisions for new or expanding aggregate operations proposed near sensitive land uses,
- Not requiring demonstration of need,
- PPS clauses are not being applied consistently, and
- Grey areas exist between the planning and licensing functions.

The PPS favours a balanced approach regarding the potential for social and environmental impacts. Pertinent PPS clauses that consider the EPA state that development is to only be permitted when public health & safety, air quality and climate change have been addressed. Incompatibility in terms of noise, air, contaminants and vibration relate to public health and safety or environmental degradation and

although they are potential impacts of aggregate operations, they are not fully addressed by this Guideline.

Within this section, the planning authority is to consider compatibility as per the PPS and the ARA.

*Planning authorities....should also take into consideration that through the licensing process under the Aggregate Resource Act (ARA), MNRF also has requirements to assess potential impacts on existing nearby land uses and whether it is feasible to mitigate potential impacts through that process.*

The ARA is not a feasible mechanism to address compatibility because it is proponent driven. Although addressing public concerns regarding potential impacts from operations are the proponent's responsibility under the ARA, the purposes of the ARA are to manage, control and regulate aggregate resources and operations to "minimize" the adverse impact on the environment. Compatibility between land uses is a government planning function and a responsibility that relates to public interest and community well-being. As a business, the proponent's corporate responsibility is to their shareholders and business profitability. The ARA and accompanying AROPS are not planning but operational documents and focus on the merits of the proposed pit's operations.

#### **GWO Recommendation #13**

- Be explicit regarding all compatibility requirements.
- Clearly identify that the PPS is to be read in its' entirety.
- Aggregate operations should not take precedence over municipal planning.
- Recognize the difference between the planning and licensing functions.

#### **GWO Concern/Issue – Preferential Treatment of Aggregate Operations**

*"Planning authorities must consider the potential for adverse effects from aggregate operations (including existing, planned and potential future operation), such as traffic to and from the facilities, and noise and dust from blasting, crushing or other operations, for proposals that require a planning approval."*

The Guideline also requires planning authorities to consider impacts for future aggregate operations where zoning is approved, deposits of mineral aggregate resources where provincial information is available, as well as dormant, licenced pits and quarries and un-rehabilitated "legacy" sites. Although the surficial geology maps identify location and extent of aggregates, quality is not always well defined, only the range and nature of the deposit. Determining quality requires further testing through bore holes and analysis of the material. Under this Guideline aggregate operations can freeze land for potential (not predicted) development even though the operation may not be permitted or even feasible given the quality or quantity of the material in particular locations. Freezing land would be detrimental to a cohesive society, compatible relations and future generations.

#### **GWO Recommendation #14:**

- Consider equity and the balance of land uses and opportunities for future generations.

Appendix D does not consider other potential adverse effects from aggregate operations such as the potential for groundwater and surface water contamination. Since these adverse effects on sensitive

land uses are not specified in the Guidelines, there may be confusion for planning authorities when considering approvals for rezoning of aggregate operations.

**GWO Recommendation #15:**

- Clearly indicate that MECP Guidelines relate to noise, dust, odour and vibrations only.
- Clearly indicate that planning authorities need to consider all adverse effects when considering planning proposals.

**WHAT'S MISSING IN THE GUIDELINES**

**1. Fly Rock**

The Guideline does not include fly rock as a discharge from quarry blasting and the adverse effect on sensitive land uses. Ontario Regulation 244/97 under the ARA which pertains to fly rock was approved on November 2020 and should be addressed in the Guideline.

**2. Cumulative Effects**

Aggregate extraction is often described as a temporary or interim use even though aggregate licenses are granted with no end date (in perpetuity) and gravel pits and quarries can lie dormant for decades. It is the local property owners, residents and communities which are in the location for the long term and will have to live with the consequences. MNRF's siloed approach to assessing aggregate operations and pit licenses is maladaptive to deal with the long term consequences that can result from the expansion of aggregate operations. A project specific lens is not adequate to determine the incremental effects from past, present and future human actions. It is misleading to not consider the full potential of social and environmental impacts from all development occurring in a region, not merely from one operation but how that operation relates within the locational context.

**GWO Recommendation #16:**

- Include land use compatibility provisions to protect sensitive land uses and the environment from the adverse impacts of fly rock.
- Consider the cumulative effects of past, current and future developments before there are unsightly and irreversible effects.

**CONCLUSION**

The long standing recognition of the inherent incompatibility between sensitive land uses and industrial lands goes back in history to when land use activities that generated noise, smell, unsanitary or hazardous conditions were walled off from civic activities and living spaces as a means to regulate compatibility. Whether a sensitive land use proposes to expand near an existing aggregate operation, or whether an aggregate operation proposes to expand near an existing sensitive land use, the effects will be the same. Planning was and is the mechanism to provide guidance to reduce the risk for social and environmental impacts and/or conflicts associated with land use decisions.

Compatibility is a two-way process and must be reflected throughout the document. Aggregate extraction, by its very nature, is not a renewable resource and therefore cannot be considered a

sustainable resource. The Guideline should align with global concepts of sustainable development and the underlying tenants of corporate social responsibility and adherence to good planning. The Guideline should be applied by the municipality when considering planning applications for new and expanding pits and quarries near sensitive land uses where the effects on and of climate change and the health and safety of communities and future generations can be considered. The ARA proponent-driven, site-specific studies of the aggregate licencing process should not be substituted for good planning. Unless the Guideline is applied to aggregate operations as Class III industrial facilities without exemption, and planning authorities are given the tools and human and financial resources to carry out the expectations in this Guideline, land use compatibility and the potential for conflict with nearby sensitive land uses cannot be resolved.

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **GWO Recommendation #1**

- Apply the Guideline in the same manner for new or expanding aggregate operations as for sensitive land uses.

### **GWO Recommendation #2:**

- Maintain the conceptual distinction between compatibility and co-existence.
- Distinguish between minor and major impacts.
- Ensure the MECP Guideline aligns with national and international agreements as well as the provinces' social, environmental and climate change responsibilities.

### **GWO Recommendation #3:**

- Apply the same requirement for new or expanding major facilities near established and planned sensitive land uses as for sensitive land uses being proposed near major facilities.
- Consistently apply all relevant PPS clauses.

### **GWO Recommendation #4:**

- Change the word 'should' to 'shall' to provide clear direction to ensure incompatible uses are not enabled nor approved.

### **GWO Recommendation #5:**

- Change 'should work together' to 'shall work together'.
- Enable collaboration to achieve the desired outcome of compatibility.
- Clearly identify the government's responsibility for the Duty to Consult with Indigenous Peoples and ensure it is implemented at the outset of development when changes in land use are being considered.

### **GWO Recommendation #6:**

- Do not overburden planning authorities' capacity and planning budgets.
- Review the viability and effectiveness of Local Planning Boards to carry out high level planning functions.

**GWO Recommendation #7**

- That new or expanding aggregate operations:
  - Apply the prescribed AOI and MSD required for Class 3 Major Industrial Facilities proposed near Sensitive Land Uses,
  - Measure separation distances (AOI and MSD) from the property boundary of the proposed aggregate operation (Class 3 Major facility) and from the property boundary of the existing sensitive land use to accommodate future expansions of the major facility,
  - Adhere to the Guideline for a Class 3 Major Facility (as identified in Section 2.2 Table 1) with the understanding that some aggregate operations may cause adverse effects beyond the MSD of 500 M and in some cases, beyond the AOI of 1000 M
  - Be subject to the steps in Section 2.5 for a proposed or expanding major facility that is within the AOI or MSD of an existing or planned sensitive land use.
  - Recognize Section 2.9 of the Decision Tree for Land Use Compatibility that may result in a proposed Major Facility not going ahead if expected adverse effects cannot be minimized and/or mitigated to the level of no adverse effects.

**GWO Recommendation #8**

- Apply the same requirement for Demonstration of Need in the same manner to new or expanding major facilities as for sensitive land uses being proposed near major facilities.
- Ensure compatibility is a two way process.

**GWO Recommendation #9**

- Should a planning authority conduct a review of a proponent's compatibility study with in-house expertise, the expense should be borne by the proponent.

**GWO Recommendation #10**

- Ensure compatibility goes both ways.
- Do not overburden planning authorities with EPA compliance issues.
- Review the viability and effectiveness of Local Planning Boards to deal with EPA complaints and compliance issues.

**GWO Recommendation #11:**

- Do not overburdening planning authorities' capacity and planning budgets.
- Review the viability and effectiveness of Local Planning Boards to not only develop by-laws but to carry out their enforcement.

**GWO Recommendation #12:**

- MECP to take responsibility for monitoring and compliance regarding their mandate for the environment as it relates to major facilities.

**GWO Recommendation #13**

- Be explicit regarding all compatibility requirements.
- Clearly identify that the PPS is to be read in its' entirety.
- Aggregate operations should not take precedence over municipal planning.
- Recognize the difference between the planning and licensing functions.

**GWO Recommendation #14:**

- Consider equity and the balance of land uses as well as opportunities for future generations.

**GWO Recommendation #15:**

- Clearly indicate that MECP Guidelines relate to noise, dust, odour and vibrations only.
- Clearly indicate that planning authorities need to consider all adverse effects when considering planning proposals.

**GWO Recommendation #16:**

- Include land use compatibility provisions to protect sensitive land uses and the environment from the adverse impacts of fly rock.
- Consider the cumulative effects of past, current and future developments before there are unsightly and irreversible effects.

**REFERENCES:**

Arnstein's Ladder of Public Participation, found at:

(<https://www.citizenshandbook.org/arnsteinsladder.html>.)

EPA D-Series Guidelines

- D-1 Land Use and Compatibility
- D-1-1 Land Use Compatibility: Procedure for Implementation
- D-1-2 Land Use Compatibility: Specific Applications
- D-1-3 Land Use Compatibility: Definitions
- D-6 Compatibility between Industrial Facilities
- D-6-1 Industrial Categorization Criteria
- D-6-3 Separation Distances

Government Documents:

- Aggregate Resources Act Regulations, Amendments 2020
- Aggregate Resources of Ontario Provincial Standards, Amendments 2020
- Provincial Policy Statement 2020
- Ontario Planning Act
- Mineral Aggregate Resources Policy Statement and Guideline on Implementation
- Ontario Environmental Protection Act (EPA)

World Commission on Environment and Development. Our Common Future, Oxford, UK. Oxford. University Press. 1987.