

## 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 (October 2022)	JART Response (January 2023)
<b>Report/Date: Visual Impact Assessment November 2021</b>					
1.	<p>Viewpoints/Photos:</p> <ol 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> </ol>		Niagara Escarpment Commission	<p>A) Comment noted</p> <p>B) A red marker has been placed on each photo indicating the direction of the Subject Lands.</p> <p>C) Viewpoint has been added and is marked as Viewpoint 31. This has also been added to the Summary of Visual impacts table.</p> <p>D) New photo has been taken for viewpoint 13</p> <p>E) New photo has been taken for viewpoint 1</p> <p>The date of this visit is listed in section 6.0.</p>	<p>The updated VIA has addressed all of the NEC comments as outlined in the JART Comment Summary Table – Visual Impact.</p> <p>The VIA is complete, the assessment methodology is consistent with the NEC Technical Criteria for Visual Impact Assessment, and no further study required.</p> <p>The VIA findings demonstrate that NEP policies relating to scenic resources have been met. The study concluded that there will be an impact to open landscape character, however, the area to be impacted is currently not visible from the public realm, and proposed rehabilitation is expected to restore a natural character to the site, over time, from a scenic resources perspective.</p> <p>Existing landform and vegetation screens views to the extraction site, and, as a result, there will be no impact to the scenic resources of the Escarpment and no change to the scenic ranking of the Speyside Wood landscape unit or adjacent Scotch Block Edge or Scotch Block Apron landscape units.</p>
2.	<p>Figures:</p> <ol 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> </ol>		Niagara Escarpment Commission	<p>Discrepancy for area radius has been corrected.</p> <p>Hatch has been added for NEPOSS area</p> <p>Street names have been added to Figure 4</p>	
3.	<p>Report:</p> <ol 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</li> </ol>		Niagara Escarpment Commission	<p>a) The report does state the potential impact on nearby residences (of which there are none). The reason for stating the height of the home being either one or two storeys is to also cover possible views from a 2<sup>nd</sup> storey room. This info has been added to the end of section 3.0.</p> <p>b) Section 7.4 has been added to the report to address how the open landscape character of</p>	

	<p><i>open landscape character</i> will be impacted.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 investigated in the VIA, etc. Ensure consistent use of terms throughout this report.</p>			<p>the subject lands will be impacted.</p> <p>c) It is acknowledged that the Scenic Ranking Evaluation Study does not specifically pertain to land use designations. This was added as a means of further providing land use context. That being said the reference has been removed.</p> <p>d) Comment noted.</p> <p>e) We do not believe there to be an error in the recommendation that no mitigation measures are required at this location. As described in the notes section, there are no view of the Subject Lands due to the dense forest between the photo location and proposed extraction area. In addition, varying topography between the two locations also aids in providing visual screening from this location.</p> <p>f) Section now under 7.6. Additional language has been added to each section to provide further context as to how the VIA and proposal responds to the aforementioned policies.</p> <p>g) The “study area” is the 3.0 km radius from the proposed quarry extension (Subject Lands) that was analyzed for potential views and visual impact. This is defined in Section 1.0.</p> <p>The “Subject Lands” is defined as the license boundary area as shown on Figure 1. This is detailed in section 1.2 of the report. The reference to extension lands has been replaced by “Subject Lands”</p> <p>In the context of the report and relation to referencing a specific location, the usage of the term “site” has been replaced with “Subject Lands”. The term remains when referring to general policies pertaining to geographic locations or as a term to describe work being conducted or physical features present “on-site” as opposed to being observed or existing by other means.</p> <p>The term subject landscapes has be re-worded and replaced to refer to the landscape of the Subject Lands.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	--