

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Written Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
Pierre Villeneuve 3267 Governors Road, RR 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of accessory buildings, I have storage of 12' x 16' (with approved permit) on the side of the house and small storage of just under 108 sq. ft. behind house</li> <li>• I hope the regulations for these did not change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4.8.2 of Draft General Provisions addresses location of new accessory structures in the A1 and A2 Zones</li> <li>• Existing approved buildings or structures are permitted by virtue of the proposed vacuum clause (Section 4.12 d)</li> </ul>
Francine Kell 2323 Woodburn Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am mostly concerned if wind turbines are going to be allowed as 5 were built on the Niagara side of Westover Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft zoning by-law does not address renewable energy facilities such as wind turbine facilities</li> <li>• These types of proposals are subject to provincial approval process</li> </ul>
Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates On behalf of Gulliver's Lake Resort Park, 792 Safari Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are the planning consultants representing Gulliver's Lake Resort Park Inc.</li> <li>• We attended the Draft Zoning Drop-in Session and spoke to staff on November 25, 2014</li> <li>• A Seasonal Campground has recently been added as a permitted use in the P4 Zone</li> <li>• Portions of the subject property are currently zoned 'O3' under the Flamborough Zoning By-law</li> <li>• We object to the changes as they do not maintain the as of right permissions that currently exist</li> <li>• Should be zoned to incorporate existing permissions or have special provision to recognize</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping revised so that extent of the proposed "P4" Zone on this property is now in keeping with the current 'O3' Zone boundary under the Flamborough Zoning By-law</li> <li>• The definition of a Seasonal Campground has been amended to provide clarity by listing some additional uses that would be considered accessory</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>current conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking clarification respecting accessory uses to seasonal campgrounds</li> <li>• Day to day functions of seasonal campgrounds include wider range of accessory uses and want to make sure those uses would be considered accessory</li> </ul>	
<p>Multi-Area Developments Inc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-Area Developments Inc. are the owners of the following parcels of land which currently are being proposed for changes to Rural Zones: 80-100 Hendershot Road, 100 Hwy No. 20 E, 138 First Rd E, 0 Fletcher Road (PN 251890113070000), 0 Hwy No. 53 (PN 251890113035601 and 251890113034900) and 0 Hwy No. 53 (PN 251890113037201)</li> <li>• Our lands are within the Elfrida node and are subject to an appeal of the Rural and Urban Official Plans</li> <li>• We strongly feel that not appropriate for City to propose zoning on lands that are currently under appeal</li> <li>• We feel it is important to maintain flexibility to allow Elfrida appeal process to take due course</li> <li>• We suggest special holding zone be established for Elfrida node subject to decision by OMB regarding OP status of Elfrida</li> <li>• Should the City choose to move forward with proposed by-law for our lands, we strongly prefer to have all our lands zoned in the Rural (A2) Zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At this point, the lands remain in the Rural area and subject to the Rural OP. It is appropriate to include these lands within the Rural zoning.. If the lands become urban, there is an extensive Secondary Plan and zoning work required prior to any development.</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifically with regard to 80-100 Hendershot Road on which P7 proposed, this land has been returned to agriculture since purchased and P7 Zone is not appropriate</li> <li>• Lands proposed to be zoned P7 at 0 Hwy 53 on east side of Fletcher, south of Hydro Corridor would be more appropriately zoned at such time as suitable studies have been carried out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments in Appendix "G2"</li> </ul>
<p>Pamela Friedl PO Box 986 Mount Holly, NC 28120</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After reviewing the proposed rural zoning I am hopeful that the council will accept the proposal and vote affirmative as this will allow me better opportunity to sell my Westbrook Road property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
<p>Peter Fletcher PO Box 175 2081 Upper James Mount Hope LOR 1W0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am 5<sup>th</sup> generation to reside and farm 60 acres on the south side of hydro corridor, east of Upper James</li> <li>• Flooding has increased with development upstream and has cut off access between the two parcels</li> <li>• Believe hydro corridor should be the urban/rural boundary</li> <li>• After telling me I would not be charged, City assessed me \$56,439 in 1991 telling me in increased the value of my property. Seems unfair to deny my the use of this sewer which I understand would happen if urban/rural boundary left as Twenty Road</li> <li>• The hydro corridor is the historic southern boundary of the City. In the 1960's the corridor defined southern boundary of Golemba</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment not related to Zoning</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>Survey (Mother Street). In 2003, it defined southern boundary of Country Ridge Estates Subdivision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on existing developments, services in place and charged for and lack of agricultural viability, urban boundary established at Country Ridge Estates and Golemba Survey should be extended to Upper James</li> </ul>	
<p>Helen Bruno 345 Freelton Road Puslinch</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to rezone Greenbelt</li> <li>RV and Snowmobiling ruining 60 acres of hay, accident prone</li> <li>Keep us informed in expansion or change in zoning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern not related to Zoning</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<p>Kenn Lendrum 26 Woodend Drive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great graphics with wonderful detail</li> <li>Very knowledgeable, friendly staff able to answer all questions – thank you</li> <li>It would have taken a very long time on my own to figure everything out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<p>No Author Indicated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Farming and Food Production Protection Act 1998, Section 6.1 shows that no by-law applies to restrict a normal farm practice on an agricultural operation</li> <li>Why is the City trying to impose by-laws easily ignored under the Farm Practice Board?</li> <li>See also Sather vs Middlesex 2001 for limits of Acts on private property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Planning Act provides the authority for the City to establish zoning</li> </ul>
<p>Jan Whitelaw 15 Timberrun</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>My husband and I are owners of lots 7 and 8 in the Timberrun subdivision</li> <li>Our home is built on lot 8</li> <li>While we do not have immediate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As property fabric in draft zoning maps based on tax roll numbers, lots 7 and 8 show as being one However lots are under</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>plans to sell or build on lot 7, we want to ensure that nothing in zoning changes merges the lots or precludes residential on lot 7 in future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should we be listing lot 7 as 13 Timberrun and reflecting same in tax rolls or what is appropriate way via zoning to ensure that the two lots considered separately for zoning purposes</li> </ul>	<p>separate PINS and plan of subdivision shows them as separate lots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SE 211 applied to the property to clarify that SDD is permitted on lot 7</li> </ul>
<p>Robert Wilkins Oak Gables Golf Course</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing Open Space zoning has certain uses such as "trailer Park : which are not listed on the P4 zoning ---private clubs is not listed or agricultural uses --there is no provision for one detached dwelling --Game and Fish Preserves are eliminated</li> <li>I'm not sure what the difference is between "recreational Uses " in the old bylaw and "Recreation " in the new bylaw</li> <li>Furthermore much of the zoning of my land which was previously OS or agriculture is now P6 or P7 which is more restrictive</li> <li>Finally I am concerned that if the mapping of the new P4 stays as it is that a large part of the golf course would be legal non-conforming --if one wants to redesign the layout of the holes on this property is that possible --I believe that the existing course as laid out in the bylaw and site-plan should all be P4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scope of uses permitted under the P4 Zone is informed by the Open Space designation of the Official Plan</li> <li>See comments within Appendix "G2"</li> </ul>
<p>Jason Small Flamborough Chamber of Commerce</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our firm belief that Hamilton facing very significant fiscal challenges</li> <li>We urge extremely disciplined fiscal restraint and renewed</li> </ul>	<p>The RHOP only allows institutional uses within Rural Settlement Areas</p>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>efficiencies at all levels of government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our firm belief that residential taxpayers maxed out and even further threats on horizon with fragile local and global economy</li> <li>• We believe that major part of answer to Hamilton's fiscal challenges is increased commercial/industrial taxes</li> <li>• Concept of Planning summit emerged when Jason Thorne met with Flamborough Chamber of Commerce (FCC)</li> <li>• Planning Summit entails the FCC organizing and hosting private meeting where local business owners than endured 'red tape horrors' could share their experiences</li> <li>• Mr. Thorne saw merit in concept and agreed to participate along with FCC members and Councilors Pasuta and Partridge</li> <li>• 'red tape horror stories' shared included: several participants complained that they promised building permits in 6-8 weeks but spent 2 years before got final approval, farm equipment dealership wanted to build new 'pole barn' storage shed and told 70 parking spots required, small rural restaurant wanted to add few new seats and has spent \$100,000 on application and because of cost of serving requirements has decided to abandon expansion dream, long established rural nursery required expansion and thanks to direct involvement of Councillor Pasuta application process took 6 months however permit required that he</li> </ul>	<p>(RSA's) or on lands designated Rural, subject to conditions. A Zoning By-law amendment is required to ensure that the church serves the rural community, there is adequate servicing, parking, and as little land as possible is used for the church</p>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>pave first 10 metres of rural gravel driveway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After Planning Summit, Mr. Thorne suggested another where Rural Zoning By-law could be presented and discussed and the meeting that took place left attendees incredulous</li> <li>• Most negative reaction was to proposal that landscapers in rural area must be ancillary to a nursery and have no more than three employees</li> <li>• Such proposal ludicrous as dozens and dozens of landscapers in rural areas of new Hamilton that are not ancillary to nursery and have more than three employees</li> <li>• These rural landscape businesses, along with their commercial taxes and employees will probably move to more business friendly environment in neighboring jurisdictions</li> <li>• Hamilton's Economic Development Department would confirm that over 80% of new employment opportunities are created by exiting businesses and that makes business retention so important</li> <li>• They would also confirm that even higher percentage of new jobs created by small and medium sized enterprises</li> <li>• Much progress has been made regarding "Open For Business", but we urge Council to create a more business friendly environment at City Hall</li> <li>• One size does not fit every situation and what may work in downtown Hamilton may not necessarily work in Hamilton's rural areas</li> </ul>	

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FCC intends to fully participate when Rural Zoning By-law comes to Planning Committee and Council</li> <li>• We hope you will give our concerns and constructive suggestions every consideration</li> </ul>	
<p>Darlene Presley, Lehman &amp; Associates On behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Limited</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TransCanada reviews all proposed development within 200 metres of TransCanada’s pipelines to ensure it does not affect the safety and integrity of our facilities</li> <li>• TransCanada’s main goal is for landowners and developers to be aware of their facilities and know when they are required to contact TransCanada</li> <li>• It is important for developers to consult with us during the conceptual stage of development to ensure that any new development near the pipeline meets the National Energy Board’s and TransCanada’s requirements.</li> <li>• The following is standard wording based on adopted policies in other Ontario municipalities. It is suggested for use in Zoning By-laws and is provided for your consideration.</li> <li>• “TransCanada is regulated by the National Energy Board which, in addition to TransCanada, has a number of requirements regulating development in proximity to the pipelines. This includes approval requirements for activities on or within 30 metres of the right-of-way such as excavation, blasting and any movement of heavy equipment. New development can result in increasing the population density in the area that may result in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the City’s standard practice to circulate TransCanada Pipelines with development applications in proximity to pipeline right-of-ways</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>TransCanada being required to replace its pipeline to comply with the CSA Code Z662. Therefore, the City shall require early consultation with TransCanada or its designated representative for any development proposals within 200 metres of its facilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “No permanent building or structure may be located within 7 metres of the pipeline right-of-way. Accessory structures shall have a minimum setback of at least 3 metres from the limit of the right-of-way.”</li> <li>• In addition, we request the Zoning By-law show TransCanada facilities on its Schedules.</li> <li>• We would appreciate being advised in what manner our policies will be incorporated into the City’s Rural</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum building and structure setback requirements are already included for TransCanada Pipelines under General Provision 4.23 – Special Setbacks of Zoning By-law 05-200</li> </ul>
<p>Jordan Erasmus Infrastructure Ontario</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FOTENN Consultants Inc., on behalf of Infrastructure Ontario (IO) and Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI), has reviewed the City of Hamilton Draft Rural Zoning By-law Update that was released on July 3, 2014</li> <li>• Infrastructure Ontario is the strategic manager of the provincial government’s real property, which includes hydro corridor lands, and has a mandate of maintaining and optimizing value of the portfolio</li> <li>• This letter identifies issues and recommendations related to the Draft Zoning By-law in order to ensure the protection of hydro corridor lands for their primary intended use, the transmission and distribution of electricity, while facilitating appropriate secondary land uses</li> </ul>	

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISSUES - 1. Terminology We are requesting a consistent approach to defining and zoning hydro corridors throughout the province. Accordingly, it is requested that the following language be considered for use throughout the Rural Zoning By-law</li> <li>• All reference to corridors used for the transmission and distribution of electricity should be referred to as “hydro corridors”; and</li> <li>• All reference to electricity infrastructure and facilities should be referred to as “electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems”.</li> <li>• 2. Permitted Uses The Draft Rural Zoning By-law Update proposes the following wording for Section 4.4- Public Uses Permitted in All Zones: “Notwithstanding anything else in this By-law, a utility company, ... and any agency of the Federal or Provincial Government, including Hydro One, may, for the purposes of the public service, use any land or erect or use any building in any zone subject to the use or building being in compliance with the most restrictive regulations contained in such zone for any use and the parking requirements of Section 5 of this By-law, for such use...”</li> <li>• Recommendation Draft Section 4.4 is of concern to IO and HONI due to the fact that new electricity transmission and distribution-related facilities, such as a transmission towers, transformer stations, and switching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City of Hamilton’s new Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200 came into effect on May 25, 2005, and is being implemented in stages. The next phase being brought forward to be incorporated into Zoning By-law No. 05-200 is the new Rural Zones</li> <li>• Section 4.4 – Public Uses Permitted in All Zones, currently exists as part of Zoning By-law 05-200</li> <li>• As Section 4.4 currently exists as part of 05-200, the amended wording being proposed through this Section is technical in nature as it is to simply make reference to the “Settlement Residential (S1) Zone” which is being brought forward as part of the Rural Zoning</li> <li>• The addition of a regulation that excludes electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems from being subject to the most</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>stations may not comply with the most restrictive regulations contained in each zone, including lot coverage, setback and yard requirements. We request that a regulation be added immediately following Section 4.4 which states that:</p> <p>“Electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems are not subject to the most restrictive regulations contained in such zone but are subject to any regulatory requirements for the utility involved”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further, it is requested that a regulation be added following Section 4.4 which states that secondary uses in transmission and distribution corridors will be permitted where they are compatible with surrounding land uses and approved by the appropriate utility provider. This policy should emphasize the supremacy of the primary electricity transmission and distribution function of the corridor. We propose the following wording: “Secondary uses, such as active and passive recreation, agriculture, community gardens, other utilities and uses such as parking lots and outdoor storage that are accessory to adjacent land uses, are encouraged on hydro corridor lands, where compatible with surrounding land uses. However, a proponent should be aware of the primacy of the electricity transmission and distribution facilities and that secondary uses require technical approval from</li> </ul>	<p>restrictive regulations of the zone which they are located in, would be contrary to the intent of Section 4.4 (i.e. all public uses all being subject to same requirements)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The secondary uses that you are suggesting on hydro corridor lands would be more appropriately defined through the Zone applied to a property, rather than to be included as a general provision as the uses would then be permitted in any 05-200 Zone</li> <li>• In addition, please note that there is no Utility Zone under the 05-200 By-law</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>Hydro One Networks Inc."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would request that this letter be included as part of the record of submission on the Zoning By-law Review and that we be notified of any decisions regarding these matters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<p>Kim Peters Niagara Escarpment Commission</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff of the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) has reviewed the City of Hamilton's May 2014 revisions to the proposed Rural Zones in the City's Comprehensive Zoning By-law</li> <li>NEC Staff notes that clause 4.30 of the General Provisions section clarifies that the City of Hamilton's Zoning By-law has no effect in areas of NEC Development Control</li> <li>This lessens staff's previous concern that having a zoning underlay in Development Control Areas creates confusion in interpreting both the By-law and NEC policies. Therefore, staff supports the addition of this clause</li> <li>In the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP), NEC staff finds that it is helpful to have lot coverage and minimum cultivated area policies to provide guidance when assessing proposals for wineries or cideries. For example, the NEP requires that the minimum lot size for establishing a winery be four hectares, that a minimum of two hectares be committed to the production of fruit, and that the maximum size of the winery be no more than 1.5 percent of the lot area, up to a maximum of 232 m<sup>2</sup> (25,000 square feet)</li> <li>These restrictions help to ensure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>See comments within Appendix "G1"</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>that the winery remains accessory to the primary agricultural use of the property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff notes that the By-law definition for Agricultural Cidery/Winery specifically excludes overnight accommodation. This is more restrictive than the NEP, but the City may be more restrictive provided that the Zoning By-law does not conflict with the NEP. However, City staff may wish to consider allowing bed and breakfast accommodations (limited to three guestrooms) as a means of providing additional sources of on-farm diversification of income. The definition for "home business" should also be reviewed since it is not clear if a bed and breakfast would be considered a home business. City may also want to place a limit on the number of home businesses that can locate on one lot. The NEP limits home businesses to one per lot</li> </ul>	
<p>Georgina Beattie 1375-1381 Highway 8 Winona, ON</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We wish our family's land located at 1375 - 1381 Highway 8, Winona ON to remain subject to Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92, zoned Highway Commercial "HC" with the removal of the Transport Terminal use</li> <li>• Should the lands known as 1375-1381 Highway 8 be taken out of the Greenbelt, we would like a City of Hamilton Council Directive via Resolution to recognize the Highway Commercial Zone (without the Transport Terminal designation)</li> <li>• We wish our lands to be recognized in a Commercial Zone with the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting and subsequent discussions/correspondence, advising that property at 1375-1381 Highway 8, will not be included in rural zoning by-law and will remain subject to Stoney Creek By-law 3692-92</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>range of uses outlined in the June 2010 Planning Staff email, with the range of uses that mirror the Stoney Creek Zoning By-law 3692-92</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We anticipate that the Planning Department will continue to keep in touch with us as the Rural Zoning Process proceeds</li> <li>• Please be aware that, as the sole owner of 1375 Highway 8, Winona ON, I did not receive the Draft Rural Zoning Drop-in Information Session (Nov. 25, 27, 2014) postcard that was mailed out, addressed to my Husband at P.O. Box 10002 and to Occupant, 1381 Highway 8</li> <li>• How many other property owners were not notified of these sessions?</li> <li>• Would be happy to discuss this and other problematic aspects of the Sessions with staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post cards were mailed out to all property owners within the Rural area of Hamilton advising them of the drop-in sessions</li> <li>• The drop-in sessions were advertised in the community newspapers</li> <li>• Email notification was also sent to anyone that had provided an email address as part of previous Open Houses or staff had previous email correspondence with</li> </ul>
<p>Mal Wensierski Lafarge Canada</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Authority Regulated Areas should not be shown on lands which are subject to existing ARA licenses of the Lafarge North and South Quarries</li> <li>• Please ensure the entire North Quarry Extension lands are accurately zoned</li> <li>• Please clarify that accessory uses are included in special exception 218</li> <li>• The requirement for a 90 m setback from street line is not required in the ARA standards – this requirement should be reduced to 30 m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulated Area has been removed from mapping of licensed North and South quarries</li> <li>• The North Quarry Extension has been updated and zoned accurately</li> <li>• SE 218 has been revised to include accessory uses</li> <li>• Agreed, this requirement has been reduced to 30m</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement for a landscaped berm with a minimum height of 3.0 m around the licensed boundary is impractical, particularly if a tree screen already exists</li> <li>• Clarify that the setback and screening requirements do not apply if Mineral Aggregate Operations are adjacent to one another</li> <li>• Please clarify that a bed and breakfast establishment is only permitted within a principal residence</li> <li>• What does the H5 Holding provision on lands at 801 Concession 4 W refer to?</li> <li>• Please remove the Conservation Authority Regulated Area from the zoning maps of the proposed South Quarry Extension lands</li> <li>• Please remove the blue waterbodies and streams from the lands of the North and South Quarries and the processing area, and remove the streams from the proposed South Quarry Extension lands</li> <li>• Please clarify that the processing or recycling of mineral aggregate products includes recycling of asphalt products</li> <li>• Please provide additional mapping and sections from the By-law for review</li> <li>• How will the lands subject to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening of aggregate operation is required in RHOP and in existing by-laws. Regulation has been modified to require a 6m planting strip, which may include a berm</li> <li>• Noted, regulation has been added to state that setback and screening requirements not required if adjacent to another licensed operation</li> <li>• A bed and breakfast establishment is permitted only in principal residence</li> <li>• H5 was proposed on lots under 1.25 acres to ensure sustainable servicing (now been removed)</li> <li>• Regulated area is not being shown on zoning schedules for proposed South Quarry Extension</li> <li>• Waterbodies and streams have been removed from zoning maps of noted lands</li> <li>• Clarified that recycling of asphalt products permitted</li> <li>• Additional information provided for review</li> <li>• Proposed South Quarry</li> </ul>

**Summary of Written Comments Received Since Rural Zoning June 2014  
Information Report to Planning Committee**

**OTHER COMMENTS**

Submitted by	Written Comments	Response
	<p>South Quarry Extension application be impacted by the new By-law?</p>	<p>Extension lands are not being zoned as part of this process</p>
<p>Katelyn Cummings Dufferin Aggregates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please remove Conservation Authority Regulated Area and streams from zoning maps of Flamborough Quarry lands</li> <li>• SE 219 permits concrete and asphalt mix manufacturing – clarify that applies to entire Flamborough Quarry lands as per existing ARA licenses</li> <li>• Please clarify that the processing or recycling of mineral aggregate products includes recycling of asphalt products</li> <li>• The requirement for a 90 m setback from street line is not required in the ARA standards – this requirement should be reduced to 30 m</li> <li>• The requirement for a landscaped berm with a minimum height of 3.0 m around the licensed boundary is impractical, particularly if a tree screen already exists</li> <li>• Clarify that the setback and screening requirements do not apply if Mineral Aggregate Operations are adjacent to one another</li> <li>• Please provide additional information on Vulnerable areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulated areas and streams are not being shown on zoning maps for Flamborough Quarry lands</li> <li>• Amended maps to apply SE 219 to entire Flamborough Quarry lands</li> <li>• Clarified that recycling of asphalt products permitted</li> <li>• Agreed, this requirement has been reduced to 30m</li> <li>• Screening of aggregate operation is required in RHOP and in existing by-laws. Regulation has been modified to require a 6m planting strip, which may include a berm</li> <li>• Noted, regulation has been added to state that setback and screening requirements not required if adjacent to another licensed operation</li> <li>• Additional information was provided</li> </ul>