

## Proposed Milton Quarry East Extension JART COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE – Visual Impact

Please accept the following as feedback from the Milton Quarry Joint Agency Review Team (JART). Fully addressing each comment below will help expedite the potential for resolutions of the consolidated JART objections and individual agency objections. **Additional, new comments may be provided once a response has been prepared to the comments raised below and additional information provided.**

	JART Comments (August, 2022)	Reference	Source of Comment	Applicant Response	JART Response
<b>Report/Date: Visual Impact Assessment November 2021</b>					
1.	<p>Viewpoints/Photos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is some distortion evident in the 180-degree panoramic photos which makes straight roads appear bent at the photo edges. These photos are satisfactory for the purposes of documenting the viewshed and surrounding landscape context but it should be noted that they are not an exact replication of what the viewer would see in the field.</li> <li>b. There is no indication as to where the proposed extraction site is situated within each of the photos. In some photos, the extraction site is off-centre (see Photos 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 19, 27) and, in one photo, in particular, the extraction site was cropped out (see Photo 1). Please indicate the extraction site location/extents on each photo for the purposes of evaluating visual access and/or visual barriers.</li> <li>c. Add viewpoint: There is an existing view across a low wet area beside the road, over the existing quarry lake to forested hills in the background. This viewpoint is located approximately 430-440 metres north of viewpoint 9. Will there be any change to this view resulting from the expanded extraction area?</li> <li>d. Revise viewpoint 13: At viewpoint 13 the camera is poorly positioned. There is a clearer view to the proposed extraction area from the south side of the driveway opening looking across to the northeast corner of the quarry lake and the forested hills beyond. Will there be any change to this view resulting from the expanded extraction area?</li> <li>e. Revise viewpoint 1: The photo is not oriented towards the proposed extraction area (which would be to the right of the dwelling). A new photo is required to properly document visual conditions.</li> </ul>		Niagara Escarpment Commission		

2.	<p>Figures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is a discrepancy between Figure 1 and Figure 4 regarding the placement of the 1-, 3- and 5-km radius lines. Please revise figures to ensure consistency between figures.</li> <li>b. The NEPOSS park overlay is hard to see on Figure 2. Please provide a hatched overlay for improved readability.</li> <li>c. Some of the roads described in the report are not labelled on any map (i.e. Nassagaweya-Esquesing Town Line and Dublin Line). For reference purposes, please ensure that Figure 4 includes all relevant road labels.</li> </ul>		Niagara Escarpment Commission		
3.	<p>Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is a reference to the elevation, location and height of houses in the methodology (Section 3.0). Please address the relevance of this information, how it was used (if at all), and if any findings were drawn from that information (if any).</li> <li>b. <i>Open landscape character</i> is defined in the NEP but has not been specifically addressed in the report. Is Section 5.0 intended to address this? If so, please use NEP terminology directly and discuss if and how <i>open landscape character</i> will be impacted.</li> <li>c. There is reference to the Landscape Evaluation Study in Section 5.4 Land Use. The scenic ranking of the area does not relate to the Niagara Escarpment Plan Land Use Designations. This section is not clear.</li> <li>d. The term “duration” was used regarding views of the existing quarry from the Dufferin Bridge/trail (see Section 7.3). For future reference, “length” of the road/trail where visual access is possible is a better measurement than duration (time) in visual assessment. No edits are necessary to this report.</li> <li>e. There appears to be an error in Table 1 Summary of Visual Impacts (Section 7.4) regarding recommended mitigation measures for Photo 1. Please clarify.</li> <li>f. There are some gaps in the policy analysis (Section 7.5) relating to visual impact assessment and scenic resources policies that were mentioned in Section 2.0. How have the NEP Purpose, Objectives 4-6, 1.5.1.1, 1.9.2, 2.9.3.c, 2.9.3.j, 2.9.5, 2.9.6.f been satisfied? Revise report to make direct reference to the relevant NEP Purpose, Objectives, and policies by number when describing how the proposal conforms.</li> <li>g. Varying terminology is used throughout the report such as “study area”, “site”, “subject lands”, “extension lands”, “subject landscapes”. Please clarify if/how these terms relate to the extraction limit, license boundary, Dufferin landholdings, area</li> </ul>		Niagara Escarpment Commission		

	investigated in the VIA, etc. Ensure consistent use of terms throughout this report.				
--	--	--	--	--	--