



January 27, 2016

Via: Email

Ms. Kelsey Lang
Planning Associate
Township of Guelph/Eramosa
P.O. Box 700
Rockwood ON N0B 2K0

Dear Ms. Lang:

**Re: Tri City Lands Ltd. - Spencer Pit
Second Submission – Site Plans Review
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application ZBA 01/14 (Township File D14 TR)
6939 Wellington Road 124, Township of Guelph/Eramosa
Project No.: 300035544.0000**

We have completed our review of the letter from Harrington McAvan Ltd. dated January 13, 2016, received as part of the January 18, 2016 submission by Harrington McAvan Ltd. along with the following drawings.

- Existing Features Plan, Drawing 1 of 5, Issue Date: December 2015, Revision 2.
- Operational Plan Phase A, Drawing 2 of 5, Issue Date: December 2015, Revision 3.
- Operational Plan Phase B-E, Drawings 3 of 5, Issue Date: December 2015, Revision 2.
- Section Details, Drawing 4 of 5, Issue Date: December 2015, Revision 0.
- Rehabilitation Plan, Drawing 5 of 5, Issue Date: December 2015, Revision 1.

Our current submission comments are listed in the table below (the “Re” refers to the number in previous submission. Comments on a drawing should be reflected on all drawings.

No.	Re	Comment
Existing Features Plan		
2.1	1.	<i>The drawing shows a dashed line along Wellington Road 124 on the property which could be a road widening. If a road widening has been decided to the County the boundary of the area to be licensed should be shown at the limit of widening.</i>
		No further comments.

No.	Re	Comment
2.2	2.	<i>The ownership of the unopened road allowances on the property will need to be confirmed.</i>
		No further comments.
Operational Plan Phase A		
2.3	1.	<i>Phase A, Note 4 – Berm #4 is to be corrected to Berm #3.</i>
		No further comments.
2.4	2.	<i>Noise mitigation information:</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Note 17 – Hours of Operation will be reviewed with Township.</i> • <i>Note 18 – Nighttime delivery will be reviewed with Township.</i>
		Comment still applicable.
Operational Plan Phase B-E		
2.5	1.	<i>Suggest adding the Section 5.3 Summary from the Archeological Assessment to the Technical Recommendations Section.</i>
		No further comments.
Section Details		
2.6	-	<i>No comment.</i>
		No additional comments.
Rehabilitation Plan		
2.7	1.	<i>Rehabilitation Notes</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Note 10 should include spreading of available “overburden” and “topsoil”.</i>
		No further comments.

No.	Re	Comment
2.8	2.	<i>Section 2.3 of the Planning Report indicates that upon completion of the extraction operations the lands will be rehabilitated to agricultural. Rehabilitation Note 7 indicates that available topsoil replaced will be a minimum 150 mm thick. Given that the vertical limit of extraction is to the top of bedrock, a minimum depth of topsoil (and overburden) must be specified in order to support viable agricultural activities.</i>
		No further comments.

The final submission of Site Plan Drawings will be reviewed to confirm all comments are reflected on the drawing.

Yours truly,

R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited



Glenn E. Clarke, S.T.
GEC:mp

cc: Ms. Meaghan Reid, Township of Guelph/Eramosa (enc.) (Via: Email)
Mr. Dan Currie, MHBC Planning (enc.) (Via: Email)
Ms. Emily Elliott, MHBC Planning (enc.) (Via: Email)