

Meeting Minutes



ARCWG Sub-Meeting: Other Uses

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	May 2, 2024
Time:	5:30pm – 6:40pm

In Attendance

David Sylvester (DS), Joe Nethery (JN), Ian Sinclair (IS), Neil Morris (NM), Martin Bamford (MB), Melanie Horton (MH)

Agenda Items

Melanie's Presentation (5:40 p.m.)

Aggregate Recycling

- 7% of total production is recycling
- MH: MNRF policy - recycling in a licensed site, environmental risks to be addressed
 - JN: What happens with older sites that are already open?
 - MH: Ministry had a requirement for rehabilitation
- MH: Uses are supposed to cease once native resources are exhausted
 - JN: What about legacy sites or licences, is MNRF going back to reconcile those?
 - MH: MNRF trying to go back and close those up. Some still operate
- MH: Aggregate resources in an industrial zone needs a special permission
 - MB: Is there a circumstance where they are not removed
 - MH: 20,000 is the limit - intent is restrict to a small-scale use
 - MB: It says removed, what about stored?
 - MH: will clarify and provide a follow-up reply

Concrete Plants

- IS: Question about separation distance
 - MH: If you look at permits online, within a Class 2 landscape (rural), the permit will have a series of maps for the layout of each side
 - MB: Any notice?
 - MH: For ECA you need site specific zoning. ECA is on the Environmental Registry of Ontario. A Planning Act notice would get mailed.
- MB: Restrictions on dumping out concrete or emptying out trucks (unused concrete)?
 - MH: Yes. Washout system for emptying trucks. Normally a washout pond is provided for settling.
 - MB: Is there restriction on that?
 - MH: Yes, where it gets discharged

Asphalt Plants

- Similar to a concrete plant
- No discharge or sewage component
 - MB: Is odour regulated?
 - Yes. The technical study would identify a standard/limit for emissions which in turn goes into the permit. Provincial enforcement on these permits.

Recycling Site

- IS: How do you keep product hot?
 - MH: travel distance 30-40 minutes. Concrete would go up to an hour.
- IS: Clean sites, professional operators in Brampton.
 - MH: Toronto has a “concrete campus” where all the operators have clustered

Discussion

- MB: The entire region by a plant in Mississauga is always covered in dust, I don't know how Dixie gets away with that
 - MH: That's supposed to be regulated, but it's a complained base system
 - MB: Windy conditions?
 - MH: Plants have dust suppression systems. **Stockpiles are tougher.**
- NM: Give us a sense of scale of potential nuisance and risk with a recycling plant versus an operation pit or quarry
 - M: Recycling is less of a concern than asphalt or concrete because of sewage and pollution concerns. Same equipment and stockpiles

- MB: Is it worse because you're dealing with cement dust?
- MH: Either way
- IS: Concrete is no good. There are spoiling materials in it. What is concrete suitable for?
 - M: Provincial review group were focused on materials opposed to activity. A lot of buyers are not sold on durability of recycled material. They are encouraging more recycling, but the concern can be unrealistic. Depending on where you are, if you're near stone you'll see recycling
- MB: Concrete is contaminated from industrial areas, is there control on that?
 - MH: I don't know.
 - MB: All concrete was contaminated with PCB, and they had a control generator on site. As receiver there's controls on our end.
- DS: 7% annual recycling levels in ON. It is disappointing. Can you tell me, are there one or two factors holding the industry to bump that up and are there other areas that are bumped up?
 - MH: IS touched on this. In Europe, it is much higher (20%), the barrier is in where it goes after facility (quality issues, what it is used for, etc.)
 - NM: There is no incentive
- MB: What happened with the low-quality stuff and is it unusable?
 - MH: It can be used as backfill or crushed up. MNRF won't let it live on the site.
- NM: What's your take on frequency of problems with the facilities proper policies (air quality)?
 - MH: In a gravel pit, not an issue in general
 - IS: there is no record of inspections, enforcement, MNRF is captured by industry, self-governance, self-filed amendments, back trucks are a real threat. How far do you haul?
 - **Can we increase Town involvement on self-filed amendments?**
- MB: The trucks with fill are part of the operation? Like hauling aggregate?
 - MH: Likely a third party. Ministry put cap on the volume to minimize the trucking
 - MB: If a recycling operation takes on one of these uses, would it add traffic?
 - MH: Likely and increase opportunities for crossing cargo. The price of asphalt is so high that there is economic sense to use RAP
- IS: Ground asphalt is ground up it leaks into our groundwater. **Policy - we need impermeable clay surface to separate ground from the asphalt. An impervious cap needs for production on these sites**
 - MB: Who makes that decision?
 - M: Ministry of aggregate resources. That means site specific zone
 - JN: When you have an application - planner looks at the official plan. If it is on aggregate site, you are also looking at PPS.
- MB: Can we regulate the surface?

- JN: I would support a policy that says that
- MH: there is a lot of zoning for storage and outdoors
- JN: Doesn't mean that they wouldn't apply in a mineral aggregate resource. Stockpiling management & and impervious cap on reduction sites
- MH: On existing sites, they go first to the municipality. It is safe to think it starts with municipal process
- MB: They considered accessory use. Are policed all-inclusive?
- JN: I have written zoning bylaws in both ways, it depends on local culture
- MB: Is clarifying difference between pits and quarries important with these sites you mentioned?
 - MH: Either or, you need to fall within 2 meters of water.
- IS: Quarries have to operate with a dry working floor.
 - NM: 2 meters only applies to asphalt
 - IS: aggregate covers abroad area
- DS: Aggregate policy for Caledon and other uses. I would not welcome a standalone recycling plant. Location with respect to groundwater, **it is crucial that it is less than 4-5 metres above water table** (reasonable, so should add to standard).
- IS: There are concerns of the "other uses". Storage depot - not the final site, going somewhere else. There is a public need to deal with these. So, do we want that here where we drying out ground water? And then excess soil site just to get rid of it? Filling these sites with solid is becoming land use which is different from extraction.
- IS: Vac trucks are good. They don't damage anything. Back truck dumping liquid waste and letting them dry out and mixing it up and calling it aggregate is concerning. Precautionary principle- we don't want any vac trucks to dump in the pits. **Do we want those as accessory uses in pits?**
- IS: Machine storage - had 35 cement mixers parked on that side, and idled trucks drip grease and oils. Relates right back to governance. Are they free to do what they want? If there is an infraction and if they report it, is it no longer an infraction?
- IS: Enforcement is a challenge. I have no trust in MNRF
 - MH: Auditor-general's report noted enforcement challenges
 - **MB: Who can be an inspector?**
 - IS: No objection to recycling in principle. Lack of enforcement is an issue and expensive. **Town has Provincial offense officers**, why don't they go into pits?
- MB: **Why does the noise by-law start at 6am? Most municipalities start at 7am.**
 - **JN: adding to land use compatibility issues list**