

CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF BRIGHTON
COUNCIL MEETING
August 10, 2009 at 8:00 p.m.

The Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Brighton met on the above date at 8:00 p.m. at the King Edward Community Centre, Brighton, Ontario.

Members Present: Mayor Chris Herrington, Councillors Dave Cutler, Craig Kerr, Brian Ostrander, Emily Rowley, Mike Vandertoorn and Chuck Ward

Staff Members: Gayle Frost, CAO; Jim Phillips, Director of Public Works; Ken Hurford, Director of Planning; Dale Wales, Fire Chief and Vicki Kimmett, Deputy Clerk

1 CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m.

2 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Resolution No. 2009-368

Moved by Councillor Dave Cutler, seconded by Councillor Chuck Ward,
That the Municipality of Brighton Council approves the Agenda for the August 10th, 2009 Council Meeting.

Carried

3 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS & THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None were declared

4 STATUTORY PUBLIC MEETING UNDER THE PLANNING ACT

Resolution No. 2009-369

Moved by Councillor Chuck Ward, seconded by Councillor Dave Cutler
That Council now moves into the statutory public portion of this meeting pursuant to the Planning Act.

Carried

- I. Application to amend the Official Plan of the former Township of Brighton and the Brighton Comprehensive Zoning By-Law, as amended – St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada) - Part of Lots 32, 33 and 34, Concession 6, comprising approximately 105 hectares (259 acres)

Representatives from St. Marys Cement Inc. were in attendance to answer questions and listen to the concerns of citizens.

The following deputations appeared before Council:

1. Frank Vaughn, 455 Loomis Road spoke in opposition and gave an oral presentation of a written report detailing the reasons for his opposition, including: methods of CBM; impact on artesian wells and the water table; clean air violations; animal habitat; and many other environmental concerns.
2. Roger Green, 18 Bayshore Road spoke in opposition, asking for a full environmental impact assessment to be done.
3. Rob Taylor, 1059 Hwy. #30 was opposed, citing concerns about the rehabilitation of the land and the safety of children in the area as primary.
4. David Gladwell, 555 County Road 30, spoke in opposition about the effects on water as being a key factor. He wants a full environmental impact study done to protect fish and wildlife, as well as people. He is also concerned about the gravel wash and other CBM by-products making their way to Murray Marsh.
5. Dana Petrillo, 40 Prince Edward Street, was opposed and does not believe the land will be rehabilitated.
6. Sloan White, 448 Old Wooler Road was opposed and expressed concerns for wildlife and fish habitat, effects on the water and the dust level from a gravel pit.
7. Hans Huitema, 601 Old Wooler Road, was opposed and expressed a concern that not enough studies have been done to protect the water supply.
8. Brenda Tuck, 504 Old Wooler Road, was opposed. She expressed worry about the water supply and safety issues due to increased number of trucks on the road at the same time as children are waiting for school buses. She also found the studies vague and incomplete.
9. Gary Murphy, 2321 County Road 30, was opposed. He found the way the land was purchased by CBM to be deceitful and secretive. He wants to know how lands at other gravel pits has been rehabilitated.

10. Al England, 370 Old Wooler Road, was opposed. He found that the hydrological reports did not take into account the existence of many artesian wells that will be affected and people may lose their water supply. He can't get information from CBM about this.
11. Angus Francis, 976 County Road 27, was opposed. He wanted to know if CBM would guarantee that his lifestyle would not change with a gravel pit in the area.
12. Shannon Seath, 483 Old Wooler Road, was opposed. She is concerned about the water supply since they have already had a second well drilled. Also, that if the pit goes in, from her living room window she will see the lights 24 hours a day. Also, that with best practice, CBM should have notified the people most affected and they did not.
13. Tina England, 370 Old Wooler Road spoke in opposition. She has a horse farm and the increased dust and noise levels will have a very bad effect on the horses, along with potential for a decreased water supply.
14. Skip Shand, North half Lot 32, Concession 6, was opposed. He spoke about having to take environmental stewardship for lands that contain many birds that are threatened, and wildlife that must be protected.
15. Brian Tuck, 504 Wooler Road, was opposed and said that he wants a solution to this and wants council to work with citizens to find alternatives.
16. Stan Grizzel, Cramhe Township stated that he hoped that Council would pay attention to residents concerns.
17. Cheryl Storey, 3006 Hwy. #30, was opposed and questioned the science used by CBM. She also was concerned that CBM seemed to just dismiss citizens concerns and displayed questionable ethics throughout the process. She also has real concerns about noise levels.
18. Kim Kanellos, 110 Towerline Road, was opposed and stated she shared all of the concerns that had been expressed by others.
19. Vasillios Kallikragas, 514 Old Wooler Road voiced his opposition.
20. Devon Pim, 120 Orchard Crescent, was opposed and expressed concerns about loss of a road allowance that would leave him land locked.
21. Mrs. Jocelyn Pim, P.O. Box 584, was opposed and asked who gained from this, that it certainly as not the citizens. She had wanted to leave an unspoiled land to her children and grandchildren to enjoy and CBM ruined that.
22. Colin Griffiths, 9 Shewman Road was opposed and pointed out that nobody had spoken in favour of the proposal and that the proposal is very shortsighted.
23. Candace Gunter, 232 Aranda Way spoke in opposition. She wanted to know why a gravel pit was proposed on top of a water table and what would happen to the travel corridor of wildlife. She stated that a peer review should be done and that she does not believe that agricultural land uprooted for a gravel pit can be rehabilitated and returned to agricultural land.
24. Olga Kallikragas, 515 Old Wooler Road was opposed and expressed her concern about water supply and quality.
25. Craig Gervis, 526 Old Wooler Road was opposed and very concerned about the effect on traffic.
26. Stasha Connolly, 167 Bayshore was opposed and wanted to know more about a meeting CBM had a year ago and why more citizens weren't involved.
27. Andrew Larcombe, 256 Gazley Road, Wooler, wanted to know if ambulances and services would be increased when truck levels increased.
28. Cheryl Storey (from point 17) asked how citizens could address County Council.
29. Jim Parnell, 424 Hwy #30 was opposed and concerned about what kind of environment we leave our children with resources running out.
30. Ross Shepard, 2919 Hwy. #30, stated his opposition.
31. Joe Dibbits, 15322 County Road 2 stated he had a different point of view than others. He was happy that Council was considering this and asked people who had new homes, driveways, sand on the roads etc. and pointed out that this is only part of what aggregate is needed for. He also stated that he can appreciate the concerns of others at the same time.

Resolution No. 2009-370

Moved by Councillor Brian Ostrander, seconded by Councillor Mike Vandertoorn
That Council extend this meeting beyond 3 hours to its natural conclusion.

Carried

Resolution No. 2009-371

Moved by Councillor Brian Ostrander, seconded by Councillor Chuck Ward,
That Council now closes the statutory public portion of this meeting pursuant to the
Planning Act and move into regular business.

Carried

5. STAFF UPDATES

1. Planning & Development Services – Ken Hurford

- a) St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada) Application for a Licence under the Aggregate Resources Act, Part of Lots 32, 33 & 34, Concession 6, Brighton

Resolution No. 2009-372

Moved by Councillor Mike Vandertoorn, seconded by Councillor Craig Kerr,
That the Municipality of Brighton authorize staff to respond to St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada) and to the Ministry of Natural Resources, prior to August 24th, 2009 stating that:

1. *The Municipality of Brighton is in the process of reviewing applications pursuant to the Planning Act, submitted by St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada) that request an amendment to the Official Plan of the former Township of Brighton and the Brighton Comprehensive Zoning By-law to permit the establishment of a pit on the subject lands.*
2. *Numerous concerns and objections have been submitted to the Municipality by the citizens of Brighton.*
3. *The Council of the Municipality of Brighton will be making no decision on the planning applications until the applicants have had to opportunity to address concerns and issues raised by the citizens and Council.*
4. *The Council will respond to the applicant and the Ministry of Natural Resources with formal comments when it makes a decision on the planning applications.*

Carried

Resolution No. 2009-373

Moved by Councillor Mike Vandertoorn, seconded by Councillor Craig Kerr,
That the motion, Resolution No. 2009-372 be amended to add that the Ministry of Natural Resources be copied on the response from the Municipality of Brighton.

Carried

6 QUESTION PERIOD

7 CONFIRMATORY BY-LAW NO. 041- 2009

Resolution No. 2009-374

Moved by Councillor Emily Rowley, seconded by Councillor Mike Vandertoorn,
That the Municipality of Brighton Council gives By-Law No 041-2009 its first, second and third reading and finally passed this date:

Being a By-Law to Confirm the Proceedings of the Council Of The Municipality of Brighton Meeting held on August 10, 2009.

Carried

8 ADJOURNMENT

Resolution No. 2009-375

Moved by Councillor Craig Kerr, seconded by Councillor Emily Rowley,
That the meeting be adjourned at 11:10 p.m. Council to meet again on August 24th, 2009 or at the call of the Mayor.

Carried

Christine Herrington, Mayor

Gayle J. Frost, CAO/Clerk