



**Sorensen Gravely Lowes**  
P l a n n i n g   A s s o c i a t e s   I n c .

509 Davenport Road  
Toronto, Ontario M4V 1B8  
Telephone (416) 923-6630  
Facsimile (416) 923-6916

Principals: Warren Sorensen, P.Eng, MCIP, RPP  
Catherine Gravely, MES, MCIP, RPP  
Paul Lowes, MES, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Associate: Carol-Anne Munroe, MCIP, RPP

**PEER REVIEW of *Planning and Justification Report*, MHBC, July 2008**

In support of its proposed Rockfort Quarry in the Town of Caledon, James Dick Construction Limited submitted a series of reports by consultants in various fields. The July 2008 *Planning and Justification Report* by MHBC makes reference to a number of the reports of other consultants for James Dick Construction Limited and the findings of those consultants.

This peer review commentary is focused primarily on the discussion of land use and policy planning matters, as set out in the MHBC report. In some instances, where the MHBC report makes mention of the findings of other consultants and derives support from those findings for its planning opinions, I may also offer comment. Those comments, however, are directed towards the sufficiency of the referenced findings to support the stated planning opinions, rather than to the referenced findings themselves.

1. Although the MHBC report identifies the applicability of the 1997 *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)* and references Policy 1.1.3 g), it does not refer to the definitions of “adverse effects” and “sensitive land uses”, which in my opinion require a more comprehensive evaluation of adverse effects and compatibility implications arising from the degree of change that the quarry operation will cause, in the area of the quarry and along the haul route, in terms of traffic, noise, air quality and other adverse effects.
2. The MHBC report offers the following explanation (page 97): “The stated focus of the Planning Justification is potential impacts on the broader community. Impacts on the local community (i.e. residences closer to the site) are addressed through the various site specific studies ...”. A Social Impact Study is not among the studies undertaken for this proposal. Even if a full complement of individual studies had been undertaken, it is my opinion from a planning and policy perspective that a fully comprehensive, cumulative planning evaluation is required to justify the proposed quarry at this location and satisfy the requirements of the *PPS* and good planning practice.
3. The MHBC report cites the findings of several other consulting reports in support of its planning conclusions that the proposed quarry will not result in land use incompatibility. In some of these instances, the referenced findings are, in my opinion, insufficient to support the planning conclusions.

4. With respect to haul route noise impacts, the MHBC report references an Aercoustics Engineering Limited finding as “predicted noise levels are within the range of what would reasonably be expected for pit and quarry haul routes in a rural area”. In my opinion, this simply begs the question. The subject proposal, its location and its haul routes must be evaluated on the basis of the adverse effects that will result from the proposal, and with respect to haul route noise, the specific changes that will result from the introduction of quarry haulage on a road (Olde Baseline) that the MHBC report describes as “not heavily travelled in its current condition”. The evaluation and comparison must be to the existing situation, not to a situation along some other already existing “pit and quarry haul routes”.
5. The MHBC report states that the proposed quarry is “well-situated relative to ... the proposed new Highway 413 (GTA West Corridor)”. In my opinion, given the very early stage of study on this potential highway and the very wide study area identified, it is not a meaningful factor affecting the suitability of the proposed quarry location and does not constitute a transportation advantage.
6. In support of the proposal to use Olde Baseline Road as a haul route, the MHBC report frequently refers to findings that there is “no practical alternative” (e.g., page 106) and that this is “the route with the least impact” (e.g., page 107). However, those findings address neither the fundamental acceptability of the proposed haul route, nor the appropriateness of a proposed quarry location that relies on that haul route.
7. In addition, the report refers to the Official Plan identification of Olde Baseline Road as a “Medium Capacity Arterial Road”, subject to policies “which anticipate moderate volumes of traffic and permit truck use” (page 101). However, the traffic impact report submitted in support of the proposed quarry shows that this “not heavily travelled road” would have to accommodate a many-fold increase in the number of heavy trucks, and that a particular concentration of truck traffic would be experienced in the morning hours.
8. The concerns expressed by affected parties in the area of the proposed quarry and along the proposed haul route are summarized in various parts of the MHBC report. These include many legitimate and important matters that affect the amenity of these areas for the existing uses and users. With respect to Olde Baseline Road haul route concerns, for example, the report acknowledges nearby residences, equestrian operations, school bus stops and other factors and that residents “walk, bike and ride horses along the road” (page 55). Later (page 93), the report appears to disparage these concerns, referring to “a list of concerns demonstrating that aggregate extraction is not a popular land use.” In my opinion, this is not an appropriate or satisfactory way to address the questions of land use compatibility these concerns represent.



Warren Sorensen, P.Eng, MCIP, RPP