

NEC Meeting – May 9, 2019

5:35 – Welcome – Doug Measures

5:36 – Nancy Mott from NEC

- Overview
- Herd copies of the technical information available at the Thornbury NEC office and on the NEC website
- Welcome comments/questions at the end of PowerPoint Presentation
- In her report, comments will be summarized and info will be confidential
- Commented on process

Presentation

Questions:

Richard Young

- How long will this process take?

Nancy Mott

- Will have report completed September to November and submit to NEC
- Depending on appointment of NEC members
- Best case, Fall 2019.
- Worst case, Winter 2020
- Once NEC completes proceeds to Environmental Review Tribunal

Richard Young

- Expand on alternatives (Not closing CR 91)
- How is it possible to separate this issue (SR 26/27) from others (CR 91)

Nancy Mott

- Not a reconsideration
- Only looking at the items relating to 26/27

Barry Barker

- Alternatives would be to turn down application and 91 should stay open

Nancy Mott

- Will only consider 26/27 as the only option on the table and the Environmental Assessment and application as submitted

Unknown

- How is the Class A acceptable and why is a Class C not necessary?
- This application is should not be considered routine

Nancy Mott

- The issue regarding the Class A EA has already been reviewed and decisions have already been made to accept the Class A by the Ministry of the Environment Conservation and Parks

Unknown

- Why is the NEC involved? Is it typical for the NEC to review road plans?

Nancy Mott

- Yes, this is typical. Required as part of applying for a permit and plan amendment within the NEC
- Caledon, Winston Churchill Blvd. is another example where the NEC has reviewed

Unknown

- NEC only here for environmental consideration?

Nancy Mott

- No. NEC considers all aspects of this application

Unknown

- Was MOE involved with these documents

Nancy Mott

- We send the entire application to all relevant agencies for comment, including the MOECP

5:59 – Michael Wynia

- Burnside/Skelton Brumwell explanation
- Presentation

Questions:

Unknown

- The top portion on 26/27 is by far the nicest
- The bottom portion is impassable
- This decision is based on business only
- Trees will be killed
- 66ft wide road and mostly in wet land
- Living things will not be improved by “improving the road”

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Clarification – Road will not occupy all 66ft. This is just the allowance.

Dick Corner – Red River Trail

- What is the cost of this project?
- Who will pay?

STEVE SAGE

- Agreement with Walkers/County/Clearview will pay bulk of it
- Tax payer and gas tax to cover the rest

Gary Form

- What is the upgrading? Traffic?

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Traffic has increased
- 91 has traffic concerns that need to be addressed
- 26/27 need to be addressed – it's a safety hazard

Gary Form

- 91 is closing?

MICHAEL WYNIA

- As per the agreement at the hearing

Gary Form

- Has township done traffic counts?

STEVE SAGE

- Yes, during hearing

Gary Form

- Traffic studies are from 2005-2006
- Larger amount at this time
- We've asked for more studies, none have been done

Doug Dingeldein

- 91 is to be closed?

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Decision was made by a tribunal

Doug Dingeldein

- Can 26/27 be turned down?

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Yes

Mr. Powell

- Disagree with the alternatives
- Why is 91 closing?

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Difference of opinion

Don Ker, Collingwood, Blue Mountain Watershed Trust

- Read statement from 2011
 - o Lack legitimacy, not valid
 - o Sale of 91 is not valid

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Difference of opinion
- Municipality has the authority on roads
- Applicant and municipality did not provide this idea, County initiated

Don Ker, Collingwood, Blue Mountain Watershed Trust

- More to this story

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Difference of opinion
- Nothing ominous happening here, following required protocol

Bill French, 10th Line/91

- 91 is dangerous
- Can't wait for it to close
- Traffic is horrendous

Unknown

- What is the steepest degree of incline on 26/27

Don McNalty

- 14% existing
- 11.8% (not confirmed) on proposed
- Still steep, but an improvement on the existing
- 91 is 11% at present

Unknown

- Is 26/27 to be paved?
- Environmental impact of sanded and salted

Don McNalty

- Swales and management to mitigate the impact

Unknown

- More traffic means more litter. What will be done?

Don McNalty

- Currently attracts large items of illicit dumping (couch and many bags of trash)

Unknown

- Do you know the environmental impact of salt

Don McNalty

- Study on the salt impact included on the stream itself

Brian Zeman, MHBC – Planning for Walkers

- Read Joint Board excerpt

Doug Dingeldein

- Read own excerpt-if permits are not obtained for 26/27, 91 cannot close

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Difference of opinion
- We are looking at 26/27 only at this time

Don McNalty

- At the time of the hearing, did not need an NEC Permit

Mike Selby, Singhampton

- We need to accept that 91 is going to close.
- Let's focus on getting the best possible result for 26/27
- Has trust issues with Township and engineers
- Will put trust with the Ministries that have availability to comment

Michael Wynia

- Planning system creates issues
- Matter of opinion
- We do have agencies looking at this application

- Township is trying to do the best thing with the circumstances that we have

Unknown, Lives 1km west of the Duntroon lights

- Who lives on 91? (3 people)
- Traffic has increased substantially
- Fast rate of speed, not just big trucks
- The safe solution is to break up traffic and dividing traffic flow

Ed Vought

- Everyone drives fast, this is not isolated to 91
- Ambulance dispatch will take longer

Audience

- Where are your statistics on this statement?

Jim Campbell, 10th Line

- 26/27 will not be "local only" traffic
- Have observed traffic taking the 10th line going onto Blue Mountain
- GPS sends people down this local road
- Little consideration to traffic increase, should this be paved it will become a primary travel route to Blue Mountain
- We should close the lower portion of 26/27 and let nature take over. This would be the best environmental solution
- The reduction in spawning is in line with the loss of wildlife in the area

Unknown (Architect)

- This is the perfect, imperfect solution
- Let's move on

Donna Baylis

- Taxpayers will have to pay for the maintenance of 26/27 and 10
- If 91 is not closed, does Walkers get their money they paid for the road back?

STEVE SAGE

- Clarification – 91 is owned by Clearview and has not been sold
- Close-up and transfer is within the authority of Council and no maintenance will occur once closed
- How many of you in this room, are from Grey Highlands? (In my opinion, most of the room)

Unknown

- Were the business owners of Clearview consulted? Those from Grey Highlands do business in Stayner

Unknown

- Seems that the Brook Trout are being given more consideration than the we are

Ed Vought

- Why was Grey Highlands no consulted during this process

STEVE SAGE

- They were. A member of your Council sat on a committee that reviewed and approved the closure of 91

Neil Hands

- Prior to County, Clearview and Walkers agreement, there was no public consultation
- Money is taking over this project
- EA was not done or considered before the "deal" took place

MICHAEL WYNIA

- The Township has followed the correct process during this process
- The agreement was in place before public consultation as per the proper process.

Unknown

- This new Council does not have to uphold previous Council's decisions

Herold Elston

-

David, Owns property by the stream

- 91 is a real issue, traffic and trucks
- The T intersection is unsafe, will the brow on the 10th Concession been considered
- Can we not just close the road (26/27)

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Township has an obligation to deal with 26/27
- Must be improved or closed
- Closing 91

Mark Bell

- Is 26/27 going to be prohibited to truck traffic?

MICHAEL WYNIA

- 26/27 is not intended to be a haul route

STEVE SAGE

- Quarries in Grey must use south only
- Up to the MNR to enforce

Mark Bell

- What if they are not using 26/27 as intended?

STEVE SAGE

- Call municipality we will make the MNR aware of the issue

Mark Bell

- How long will this process, for permits to be obtained, take?
- Is there a statutory limit
- Why are comments being accepted beyond the end of May as outlined by the NEC

Nancy Mott

- No statutory limit on time to make decision
- Since I am still waiting on the agencies to comment, I will still accept public input, though not unlimited timeline
- Statutory commenting period is 60 days and is up at the end of May
- NEC, unlike Planning Act, does not have a statutory time to make its decisions
- I will prepare my report and submit it in Fall 2019. A hearing date will be set after submission of my report.
 - o Hearing is not bound by a timeline
 - o Suspect a hearing will be held in 2020

STEVE SAGE

- Hearing date on Plan Amendment only
- No hearing date on Development Permit as it has already happened
- The Township will proceed immediately once granted Plan Amendment

Unknown

- There was no interest in upgrading 26/27 before Walkers
- Grey Highlands matched road realignments to match Simcoe County
- Closing 91 is not in public interest
- Money and profit is the real reason 91 is being closed, to accommodate Walkers only

MICHAEL WYNIA

- The process of closing 91 was initiated by the County of Simcoe
 - o To decrease truck traffic
 - o To avoid costly upgrades to achieve County Road standards
 - o To address truck traffic and haul route issues

Unknown

- Walkers paid for Clearview lawyers during the hearing process Steve Sage

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Yes, as part of the agreement. This is not an uncommon practice as Walker is the applicant in this case.

Unknown

- Closing 91 and opening 26/27 will not deal with traffic issues, too much traffic on 91

MICHAEL WYNIA

- Traffic splitting will help mitigate traffic traveling on 26/27