



Updated Peer Review of Agricultural Impact Assessment Proposed Edworthy West Pit

Part Lots 16, 17, and 18, Concession 9, North Dumfries, Waterloo

Location: 1262 Greenfield Road and 1354 Spragues Road, Cambridge
Part Lots 16, 17, and 18, Concession 9, North Dumfries
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

CCS Project No.: 5141
Date: May 30, 2023
Updated: August 7, 2023

Prepared for: Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Prepared by: Clark Consulting Services

1. INTRODUCTION

Clark Consulting Services (CCS) was retained by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, on May 10, 2023, to review an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) prepared by MacNaughton Hermesen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), in support of a proposal to remove aggregate materials from lands currently in an agricultural condition. The proposal also is for the rehabilitation of the property back to an agricultural condition following the removal of the permitted volume of aggregate.

Approval of an *Aggregate Resources Act* License Application and *Planning Act* applications are required for the approval of this aggregate facility. The purpose of the Peer Review, is to ensure the AIA is consistent with the requirements of the applicable planning documents, in particular, the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Guidance Document (OMAFRA).

The Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) was prepared by MHBC with the '*Soil Survey and Canada Land Inventory Classification*', prepared by DBH Soil Services Inc.

Clark Consulting Services (CCS) received authorization to prepare this Peer Review from the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, and have completed a full review of various documents including, but not limited to:



- Planning Justification Report & Aggregate Resources Act Summary Statement, January 2023 (MHBC);
- Agricultural Impact Assessment, January 2023 (MHBC);
- Site Plans (Existing Features and Cross Sections, Operational Plan and Rehabilitation Plan) MHBC January 2023;
- Air Quality Assessment, RWDI Air Inc., August 4, 2022;
- Best Management Practices Plan for Dust, RWDI Air Inc., November 12, 2021; and
- Addendum by MHBC issued July 21, 2023.

Planning documents including the Provincial Policy Statement (2020), the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (August 28, 2020), the Official Plans of Waterloo Region (ROP) and the Township of North Dumfries 2018, and the Zoning By-law of North Dumfries were reviewed, and the Agricultural Information Atlas and the Agricultural System for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, as a resource.

A site visit of the area, including a windshield survey of land use within 1,500 m of the subject property, including an investigation of possible livestock facilities within that area, was made on May 17th, 2023, and this Peer Review was subsequently completed on May 30, 2023, and provided to the proponent for their review.

The initial Peer Review raised concerns with the impact of the proposed Haul Routes. This concern was addressed in an Addendum prepared by MHBC and issued on July 21, 2023. This updated Peer Review includes a review of the Addendum, which is found to be supportive of the objective of rehabilitating the lands to agricultural production.

1.1. Proposal

The proposed Edworthy West Pit is located on a number of land parcels totaling 44.3 ha for the licensed area and a total of 35.2 hectares for the extraction area. The land parcels involved include the majority of one farm parcel of approximately 26.5 ha, a vacant farm parcel of approximately 21.5 ha and a portion of a farm parcel of approximately 11 ha. Developed and treed areas of the first and third of these farms are not included in the licensed area. The majority of the licensed area is productive farmland. Because of this, the approval of this aggregate operation represents a loss of productive agricultural lands. There is a requirement of the rehabilitation of the lands, following completion of extraction, with the return of lands on the pit floor to an agricultural condition.

The AIA provides additional information relating to the Edworthy North Pit. This is an aggregate operation that is nearing completion of aggregate removal. Rehabilitation has begun, as the pit has completed various phases. Almost one quarter of the rehabilitation is now complete, and those lands are producing crops. These comments are included to indicate how the rehabilitation process will be carried out on the subject lands.



1.2. Peer Review of an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

The Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Guidance Document (OMAFRA) provides valuable information in completing and reviewing AIAs for the purpose of municipal purposes. Section 1.7 of the document recommends that the Peer Reviewer confirms their qualification to complete the review, and that they have no perceived or actual conflicts of interest in association with the AIA.

Attachment A to this report includes the CV of the Peer Reviewer, Bob Clark, his professional qualification and a statement declaring he has no perceived or actual conflict of interest in the completion of this Peer Review.

2. STUDY AREA

The AIA describes how the study is based upon a Primary Study Area and a Secondary Study Area. This approach is consistent with the preparation of an AIA. The Primary Study Area includes the subject lands, and lands in this case, up to 120 m from the subject lands, most likely to be impacted by approval of the aggregate operation. The Secondary Study Area is a zone extending 1.5 km from the subject lands. The 1.5 km distance helps to identify agricultural uses and operations which may experience impact, as a result of the new aggregate operation. The study areas also focus mitigation measures as appropriate.

An Agricultural Land Use Study is included with the AIA. *Figure 2* illustrates the location of barns, the limits of the Primary and Secondary Study Areas, and crops within fields, which generally indicates the agricultural capabilities of the lands.

The gathering of information for this Peer Review included a site visit, which reviewed the lands and areas shown as the Primary and Secondary Study Areas.

2.1. Primary Study Area

The Primary Study Area includes the subject lands, and a zone extending 120 m from the subject lands. This includes agricultural lands, residential uses, aggregate use, and municipal office and public works use. A barn is within this area (1262 Greenfield Road). The agricultural uses include soy, hay and forage. There are some unknown land uses because of poor sightlines.

2.2. Secondary Study Area

The Secondary Study Area includes a number of agricultural operations of cash crop use and livestock facilities. The AIA describes these operations in detail. Ten (10) barns were noted in the Secondary Study Area, and not all were considered livestock facilities.

A review of agricultural investment in the area, identified a grain elevator at Shouldice Road and Alps Road. Some agricultural tile drainage was noted, indicating an additional level of agricultural investment. The drainage areas are not extensive.



3. FIELD COLLECTION DATA

The Field Collection Data section focusses on the soils of the subject lands. For this portion of the review, the applicant engaged the services of DBH Soil Services Inc. to confirm soil type and capability and to assist in the preparation of the Rehabilitation Plan.

3.1. Soil and CLI Capability

The AIA describes the soils of the subject lands as primarily Classes 1 and 4 soils. This was confirmed by a review of the AgMaps program maintained and published by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. The available mapping on this program is derived from the original soils study titled *Soils of Waterloo County, Report No. 44 of the Ontario Soil Survey, Presant & Wicklund 1971*.

The DBH Soil Services Inc. Report is included as *Appendix A* to the AIA. In preparing that report, the author prepared a detailed study of the soils of the subject lands by excavating a number of test pits using hand augers and analyzing the surface and subsurface soils. The location of the soil inspection sites is shown on *Figure 5* of the AIA. This appears to show a total of 63 inspection sites. The AIA, Section 3.1, says a total of 22 inspection sites were examined. We expect this number should be 63 and is a typographical error.

The completion of a detailed soils review requires a minimum of one inspection site per 2 hectares of land under review. In this case, the 44.3 hectare licensed area would require a minimum of 23 sites. Since the actual number of inspection sites is greater than that required, we find the density of inspection sites for the gathering of soils information is more than adequate.

The AIA presents a summary table showing that Class 1, 2 and 3 soils (those soils comprising Prime Agricultural Soils as defined in the PPS), make up 89.9% of the surface area of the subject lands. This shows the subject lands are viable soils for farming with few constraints to growing common field crops. This information provides a basis in the preparation of the Rehabilitation Plan.

4. PLANNING POLICY

The AIA describes the Data Collection and Review of documents in Section 1.1. This identifies various planning documents including the Provincial Policy Statement, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, and the Township of North Dumfries Official Plan and Zoning By-law. Planning Policy is reviewed in Section 4.0 of the AIA. The following is a review of how this section meets the intent of the Draft AIA Guidelines.

4.1. Provincial Policy Statement (2020) (PPS)

The Provincial Policy Statement (2020) (PPS) provides for the designation of Prime Agricultural Lands and areas, and establishes policy for the development within those lands and areas including the extraction of aggregates.



The AIA provides descriptions of Prime Agricultural Areas, Prime Agricultural Lands and Specialty Crop Areas. It goes further to describe how the subject lands are on Prime Agricultural Lands within a Prime Agricultural Area (*as shown on the Agricultural Systems Mapping*). It also says that the lands are not on designated Specialty Crop Lands or within a Specialty Crop Area.

The AIA describes the policies of the PPS that permit the establishment of an aggregate operation within a Prime Agricultural Area. This says that aggregate may be extracted from the subject lands provided this is an interim use, and that the site will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition. Conditions for rehabilitation are presented in PPS Section 2.5.4.1. This identifies that restoration of part of the subject lands is permitted, where complete restoration is unfeasible. It is expected that 23.4 hectares of the extraction area of 35.2 hectares will be returned to an agricultural condition. The remaining portion of the entire property will be side slopes, berms and open areas.

CCS agrees with the interpretation of the applicable policies of the Provincial Policy Statement.

4.2. *A Place to Grow, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GPGGH)*

The entire Region of Waterloo is within the GPGGH and land use within the Region is subject to policies contained within this provincial document. Section 4.2.6 describes an Agricultural System and discusses issues of compatibility between uses outside of Settlement Areas. Section 4.2.6.3 says, *"Where agricultural uses and non-agricultural uses interface outside of settlement areas, land use compatibility will be achieved by avoiding or where avoidance is not possible, minimizing and mitigating adverse impacts on the Agricultural System. Where mitigation is required, measures should be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed. Where appropriate, this should be based on an agricultural impact assessment."*

The subject lands are within the Growth Plan Area, so the Agricultural Impact Assessment is required for the submission of the required planning applications. The AIA meets the requirements of the Growth Plan by identifying impacts to the Agricultural System, identifying mitigation measures and providing recommendations for the rehabilitation of the lands back to an agricultural condition.

We find the AIA meets the requirements of the Growth Plan (GPGGH).

4.3. *Region of Waterloo Official Plan (ROP)*

The ROP recognizes areas of potential aggregate resource areas including the lands proposed as the Edworthy West Pit. Map 7 of the ROP identifies the subject lands as within the Prime Agricultural designation. The ROP permits an aggregate operation as an interim use, provided the lands are rehabilitated in accordance with the ROP. Section 9.F.2 indicates that complete rehabilitation may not be required where conditions make it impractical. The AIA describes the feasibility of the extent of rehabilitation.

We find the AIA has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the Region of Waterloo Official Plan (ROP).



4.4. Township of North Dumfries Official Plan

The Official Plan of the Township of North Dumfries, Section 5.2.3.4, provides for a maximized agricultural rehabilitation of the aggregate operation when it is established within the Prime Agricultural Area designation. This is further discussed in Section 5.2.4.1 g) where it says, “a rehabilitation plan documenting the intended end use of the site, and the measures that will be undertaken to achieve the end use, in accordance with Policy 5.2.8.3” must be submitted. 5.2.8.3 says:

“All proposals for new mineral aggregate operations, including wayside pits and quarries, will include a rehabilitation plan to the satisfaction of the Township and the Region, ensuring that:

- a) progressive rehabilitation will be carried out so that depleted areas are restored while extraction continues in other areas of the site;*
- b) final rehabilitation will be carried out and will comply with the land use designations contained in this Plan, and be compatible with the character of surrounding land uses;*
- c) comprehensive rehabilitation will be carried out, to the extent possible, where a proposed new mineral aggregate operation abuts one or more existing licensed mineral aggregate operations;*
- d) within the Prime Agricultural Area and Rural Area designations, and in a manner consistent with Policy 5.2.4.4, rehabilitation to agriculture will be the first priority as follows:*
 - i) within the prime agricultural area, substantially the same land area will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition to allow for the same range and productivity of crops common in the area.”*

The AIA presents a review of the Rehabilitation Plan showing how it maximizes the lands returned to an agricultural condition. The subject lands are within the Prime Agricultural Area. Policy 5.2.8.3 d) i) says, *the first priority for rehabilitation is to rehabilitate substantially the same land area back to an agricultural condition.* In this case, a substantial amount of land will not be able to be rehabilitated back to a condition that would see it produce common field crops, because of the depth of the extraction. Section 5.2.3.4 provides for this reduction by requiring a maximized rehabilitation. The Rehabilitation Plan does provide for a maximized area to be rehabilitated, so we find the proposal meets the requirements of the North Dumfries Official Plan.

The initial Peer Review raised concerns about the location of proposed internal haul routes. Section 5.2.5.10 encourages *“the construction of intra-pit road systems and new roads intended for aggregate traffic as to lessen the impact of aggregate traffic on local residents and sensitive land uses.”* As the Addendum makes clear, the internal haul routes are to be located through the licensed lands, which will limit their impact on adjacent lands and allow these roads to have a limited impact on the adjacent uses, and they will be rehabilitated as part of the Rehabilitation Plan when they are no longer required.

This explanation is consistent with the requirements of the North Dumfries Official Plan.

4.5. Township of North Dumfries Zoning By-law 689-83

The Township of North Dumfries Zoning By-Law 689-83 zones the subject farm as Zone 1 – Agriculture. Section 6.22 of the By-Law says, that pits and quarries are prohibited, except within the



Zone 14 areas. Since the subject lands are within the Zone 1 area, approval of the pit requires a Zoning By-law Amendment.

The AIA does not provide comments on the Zoning By-law for the Township of North Dumfries within Section 4.0 Planning Policy Framework, which we assume is because the Zoning By-law does not provide policies, but does provide regulations for land use, which are regulations which implement the Official Plan. The regulations provided within the Zoning By-law, may be better understood when they are included within the context of the other planning policies. The AIA does comment that an amendment to the Zoning By-law is a required application within other sections of the report.

CCS finds that the AIA with the Addendum review of Planning Policies is complete, and that the proposal is presented in conformity with applicable policies.

5. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

The AIA says, the purpose of this section is to assess the potential impacts of the proposed Edworthy West Pit on components of the Agricultural System.

5.1. Reduction/Loss of Agricultural Land and Infrastructure

The subject lands are said to be comprised of soils which meet the PPS definition of Prime Agricultural Soils. Following completion of extraction, the subject lands will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition, thereby meeting requirements of planning policies as identified in Section 4 of the AIA.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs provided comments on the proposed pit. Their comments support the proposed approach to progressive rehabilitation, and include a series of comments and suggestions related to the documentation of the baseline, and rehabilitated soil conditions are to be documented and the review of the water table elevations. We agree with these comments.

The extraction of aggregate at this location will be such that, the rehabilitated agricultural lands will be at the level of the pit floor. Steep side slopes are to separate the rehabilitated lands from the lands surrounding the extraction area. This reduces the area available for rehabilitation to an agricultural condition. The expected loss of Prime Agricultural Lands due to this proposal is 9.7 hectares.

Planning policies permit a reduction of lands available for agriculture, as long as rehabilitation methods maximize lands available for agriculture. In this case, the rehabilitation proposal appears to show that land available for farming will be maximized, and that the soils will remain as Prime Agricultural Soils. By way of illustration of the applicant's intent, the applicant is currently in various stages of rehabilitation on the Edworthy North Pit.

The lands subject to pit license do not have agricultural buildings on them, nor do they have tile drainage areas. No infrastructure is to be removed in the extraction of the subject lands.



5.2. Fragmentation of Agricultural Lands

The AIA says that farming practices have been assessed to determine if they will be impacted, where they isolate other farm parcels.

There appear to be lands currently farmed that will be somewhat isolated adjacent to the subject lands. These portions are on the south-west part of 1262 Greenfield Road. These fields are adjacent to Edworthy Road and are currently capable of cultivation, forage or pasture. The Addendum clarifies that these parcels are part of the licensed extraction area and will either continue to be farmed or will be included in the rehabilitation plan when the aggregate is removed, and the extracted lands including the haul route is rehabilitated. CCS is satisfied with this explanation and has removed the comments about fragmentation of agricultural lands.

5.3. Dust Impact

Dust from the new aggregate operation can lead to issues with farm equipment and health of animals if they are frequently within a dusty environment. It appears the agricultural uses of the lands adjacent to the subject lands and the subject lands will not include intensive agricultural practices, and so equipment and animals should not be kept within a dusty environment on a continuous basis, and therefore should not be impacted by dust from the operation.

5.4. Hydrogeology

The proposed extraction is to stop above the water table, is not to include dewatering or other water diversion uses. If there is no use of groundwater as described, then there should be no interruption or shortage of water for livestock within this area caused by the Edworthy West Pit. The OMAFRA comments suggest that the water table elevations should be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with the technical reports and the final extraction elevations.

5.5. Traffic

Agricultural traffic on Shouldice Side Road and Alps Road should be generally protected from pit traffic based on the traffic patterns shown on *Figure 10 - Entrances and Haul Road*. Agricultural vehicles on the easternmost portion of Alps Road will have to consider truck traffic at the Truck Crossing. This may cause some inconveniences while moving agricultural equipment on and off local fields, but should not create a substantial impact.

5.6. Noise Impacts

Noise as a result of approval of the subject pit license may be generated from the pit operation and from vehicular traffic involved in the aggregate operation. As with the dust impact, it appears that there are no intensive livestock operations that could be impacted by noise within the local area. There is a poultry operation at 1038 Edworthy Road. This appears to be closer to existing pits to the north and north-east, than the subject lands (800 m compared to 1,400 m). This would imply that operations at the poultry barns are able to cope with the noises generated from the aggregate operations.



5.7. Summary of Net Impacts

The AIA provides *Table 2: Summary of Net Impacts*, page 24 of the AIA. It presents net impacts anticipated from the Edworthy West Pit, and also outlines how they are to be minimized or mitigated, meeting the requirements of the *Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment Guidelines*.

This table outlines the possible impacts and the mitigation of these impacts in a clear way. We find this meets the intent of the OMAFRA's guidelines in completing an AIA.

6. PROPOSED REHABILITATION PLAN

The Rehabilitation Plan has been prepared for the subject lands. The first paragraph declares that 23.4 ha will be returned to agriculture, with the rest of the subject lands becoming side slopes and ecological areas. It also says the objectives of the Plan are to: return the lands to an agricultural use as quickly as possible; maintain or improve soil capability; restore farmland on the pit floor.

The AIA gives examples of the rehabilitation of other pits in the area by the applicant. This describes the process of rehabilitation and provides the farmer's comments, that there were no issues farming the lands. The proposed rehabilitation follows the general and accepted process recently used in the progressive rehabilitation of the Edworthy North Pit.

The process of rehabilitation appears orderly and complete. The information for the soils for the Rehabilitation Plan is taken from the DBH Soil Services Inc. Soils Study attached to the AIA, providing a good basis for the Rehabilitation Plan.

Drawing 3 of 3, Rehabilitation Plan, describes the progressive rehabilitation of this operation. The Plan describes the creation of the side slopes and the preparation of the pit floor prior to the return of top soils. The Plan describes confirmation testing of the soils and the progressive planting of a combination seed mix to establish an organic base for the soils.

The final component of the Plan is for a qualified person to prepare an Annual Rehabilitation Report. We would recommend these reports be made available to the Township and/or the Region upon request.

This review of the available information on the Rehabilitation Plan, both drawings and text, in conjunction with the evidence of the progressive rehabilitation currently in progress at the Edworthy North Pit, provides enough information for CCS to accept the Rehabilitation Plan as provided.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following key recommendation headings (*edited for this Peer Review*) are provided in Section 7 of the AIA:

1. Extraction will occur in three sequential phases. Later phases of the operation shall remain in agricultural production for as long as possible.



2. Agricultural rehabilitation shall be in accordance with the agricultural rehabilitation sequence schematic on the Rehabilitation Plan.
3. Progressive rehabilitation procedures shall be implemented. Stripping areas shall be limited to what is required for the season of operation.
4. During pit operations, access to the agricultural rehabilitation areas and undisturbed areas used for agricultural purposes will be maintained.
5. For the areas that are being returned to an Agricultural Condition, topsoil and subsoil shall be replaced at the same pre-extraction depth, which is approximately 28 centimetres for topsoil and 68 centimetres for subsoil.
6. Soil material for agricultural rehabilitation shall not be handled during adverse conditions.
7. Once grading is completed, a vegetation cover (such as perennial crops) shall be immediately established within the agricultural rehabilitation area in order to reduce erosion. A grass-legume cover crop shall be established throughout rehabilitation and maintained for up to five years. Alternatively, field crops (e.g., wheat, soy, corn, hay) shall be established immediately following rehabilitation grading.
8. Once progressive rehabilitation has been completed in each Phase, random soil testing shall be completed at the beginning of each growing season by a qualified professional.
9. An Agricultural Rehabilitation Monitoring Program Report shall be submitted annually by a qualified professional once progressive agricultural rehabilitation efforts have commenced, and will continue until it can be demonstrated that the agricultural area in each Phase has been rehabilitated back to the pre-extraction soil capability and the final landform is completed, as shown on the Rehabilitation Plan.

8. SUMMARY

The Agricultural Impact Assessment for the proposed Edworthy West Pit provides a series of eight summary points. These outline that the proposed use is an accepted interim land use, that the use is permitted within Prime Agricultural Areas according to existing policy, that there are no Specialty Crop Areas within the subject lands area, and that the pit is within an area of established mineral aggregate operations.

The extraction is proposed to be limited to above the water table, and that rehabilitation of lands to an agricultural condition will be maximized. Full area rehabilitation cannot be met, since there will be areas used for side slopes. There will be dust and noise from this operation and these impacts will be mitigated as discussed in Section 5 of the AIA.

Clark Consulting Services has reviewed the available information, the Site Plan dated January 2023, the Agricultural Impact Assessment of January 2023, the Dust Report of November 12 2021, the Air Quality Report of August 4 2022, and the Planning Justification Report of January 2023. Included in the Agricultural Impact Assessment, is a Soils Study completed in March 16, 2022.



Clark Consulting Services has visited the area of the proposed pit and viewed the subject lands and neighbouring properties. This review included the lands within the Primary and Secondary Study Areas.

Clark Consulting Services was concerned that there will be a loss of agricultural production on lands outside of the proposed pit lands. This concern was addressed in the Addendum indicating that the haul routes were located in the extraction areas and would be rehabilitated when they were no longer required.

Clark Consulting Services (CCS) respectfully submits that this Updated Peer Review of the Agricultural Impact Assessment, Proposed Edworthy West Pit, January 2023, prepared by MHBC for Cambridge Aggregates including the Addendum, has been prepared with regard to the requirements of the OMAFRA Draft AIA Guidelines this Peer Review. This Peer Review has been prepared by a 'Qualified Person', Robert K. Clark, with appropriate qualifications and experience in the Province of Ontario. Mr. Clark has no perceived or actual conflicts of interest in preparing this Peer Review. Mr. Clark maintains membership in good standing with the Ontario Institute of Agrologists (P.Ag.). Mr. Clark is available for further comment where appropriate.

Sincerely,



Bob Clark, P.Eng., P.Ag., MCIP, RPP, OLE
Principal Planner

z:\5141\CCS Peer Review Files\Response to Addendum\AIA Peer Review, Edworthy West Pit, North Dumfries-August 7-2023



ATTACHMENT A

Curriculum Vitae - Robert K. (Bob) Clark

Mr. Clark has no perceived or actual conflicts of interest in preparing this AIA.

Mr. Clark maintains membership in good standing with the Ontario Institute of Agrologists (P.Ag.).





Education

1972
Master of Science,
Resource Development and
Resource Economics,
University of Guelph

1970
Bachelor of Science (Eng.)
Water Resources Engineering,
University of Guelph

CONTACT



T 905-885-8023
bob@clarkcs.com
www.clarkcs.com

ROBERT K. CLARK

Bob's career in the field of planning spans 46 years. He approaches each project with creativity and a strong intent to meet and exceed the client's expectations. The Planning Field is changing rapidly to address the changing needs of our communities. While financial viability remains an important consideration in all projects, increasingly, sustainability, impact on the environment, the health of the community and the individual are key aspects of successful projects. Clark Consulting Services was created to give Bob the freedom to take on projects that he found interesting and challenging as well as work in an atmosphere guided by the principles of honesty and integrity.

Professional Qualifications and Associations

Canadian Institute of Planners (MCIP)
Ontario Professional Planning Institute (RPP)
Ontario Institute of Agrologists (P.Ag.)
Professional Engineers of Ontario (P.Eng.)
Association of Ontario Land Economists

Professional Background

1994-Present – Clark Consulting Services
Principal Planner, President

Expert Testimony

Qualified by the OMB to give expert testimony in the fields of:

- Land Use Planning
- Agricultural Land Evaluation
- Municipal Finance
- Land Economics
- Environmental Impact Assessment

CURRICULUM VITAE

Selected Experience

Agricultural Land Assessments/Analysis (Project Manager and Senior Professional Agrologist/Pedologist on all projects)

- Agricultural Lands Review, United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry
- City of Kingston - Agricultural Study
- Stormont Dundas and Glengarry: Review of Prime Agricultural Area for Official Plan Update
- Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre, Agricultural Land Assessment (as part of Environmental Assessment) Russell and Boundary Road Sites
- Vale Agricultural Land Assessment Prince Edward County
- Dafoe Agricultural Assessment, City of Quinte West
- Desjardine, Agricultural Assessment, Township of Elizabethtown Kitley
- Sills Agricultural Assessment, City of Quinte West
- Lafleche Agricultural Assessment, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry
- McQuillan Land Assessment, Haldimand Township
- Pepper/Hamilton Township
- Espie Agricultural Assessment Beckwith Township
- White Tail Golf Course Agricultural Assessment and Professional Evidence OMB
- Wesleyville Land Assembly, Municipality of Port Hope
- Baulch Road Land Review, Municipality of Port Hope
- Midtown Corridor Hamilton Township Land Evaluation
- Cavan Millbrook North Monaghan OP Prime Agricultural Land Evaluation
- Hamilton Township OP Prime Agricultural Land Evaluation
- Frontenac Islands OP Prime Agricultural Land Evaluation
- Campbellford Seymour Agricultural Land Evaluation
- Sidney Township OP Agricultural Land Evaluation
- South Fredricksburgh OP Agricultural Land Evaluation
- Agricultural Land Use Analysis, Former Township of Hope

Agricultural Impact Assessment

- Fenelon Falls Baptist Church
- Cation Ag Impact Assessment
- Brown Planning Justification including Agricultural Impact Assessment
- May Agricultural Assessment
- Peer Review of Agricultural Viability for planning applications, City of Oshawa
- White Tail Golf Course, City of Kawartha Lakes
- Snug Harbour, City of Kawartha Lakes
- Murray Hills Subdivision former Murray Township

Contact



T 905-885-8023
bob@clarkcs.com
www.clarkcs.com

CURRICULUM VITAE

Agricultural Land Assessments for Solar Installations

-Agricultural Land Capability Assessment for Potential Solar Farm Installations to meet requirements of OPA FIT Program, (over 340 projects to date)

Environmental Assessment

-Public Works Garage, Class EA, Town of Gananoque,
-Wilson Island Bridge (Socio-economic Assessment), County of Northumberland,
Environmental Impact Assessment, private owners including Michael Lash, Eithery/Buttery Lands, Vanden Hoek site; Three Strand Development Group – Communal Sewage System.

Environmental Impact Study/Statement

Based on experience and training as a water resource engineer and pedologist, Mr. Clark has prepared Environmental Impact Studies/Statements for situations in which the primary issues relate to site grading, drainage and building location. Examples include:

- Lash Cottage addition (minor variance)
- Hog Island EIS (consent application)
- Eberle Farm lot creation ORMCP

Official Plans, Official Plan Updates and Amendments

Township of Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan, Township of Haldimand, Township of Hamilton, Township of Smith, Township of Lochiel, Township of Charlottenburgh, Town of Brighton, Township of Burleigh and Anstruther, Township of Sidney, Township of Frontenac Islands, Township of Hope, Town of Gananoque.

Secondary Plans

Fraserville Secondary Plan - Township of Cavan- Millbrook-North Monaghan; South Sidney Secondary Plan, Township of Sidney; Alcan District Area Study - City of Kingston; Shasta Secondary Plan - Town of Westminster, Baltimore-Creighton Heights Community Plan, Township of Hamilton, Southwest Industrial Sector Plan, Township of Hamilton, Jackson Creek West Secondary Plan, City of Peterborough.

Growth Strategy Studies

Township of Hamilton, Township of Manvers, Town of Cobourg/Township of Hamilton, Village of Stirling, Village of Cochrane, Township of Smith.

Development Charges Studies

Township of Murray, Township of Hamilton, Township of Smith, Township of Manvers, Town of Brighton, Township of Alnwick, Township of Haldimand, Township of Somerville, Township of Woodville, Townships of Anson, Hindon, Minden, Village of Omemee, Township of Galway, Cavendish & Harvey, Township of Fenelon, Township of Verulam, Township of Emily, Township of Eldon, Village of Fenelon Falls, Township of Smith-Ennismore, Township of Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan, Village of Bobcaygeon, Township of Brighton, Township of Centre Hastings, Town of Greater Napanee, County of Victoria, Township of Cramahe, Municipality of Campbellford/Seymour, Village

Contact



T 905-885-8023
bob@clarkcs.com
www.clarkcs.com

CURRICULUM VITAE

of Colborne, City of Kawartha Lakes, The Township of Frontenac Islands, The Township of Alnwick/Haldimand, Municipality of Trent Hills, Township of Rideau Lakes, Township of Asphodel Norwood, County of Peterborough, Municipality of Trent Lakes.

Municipal Financial Impact Assessments

Sandy Point Recreation Development, Harvey Township, Reference Plan Development, Cavan Township, Township of Manvers, Township of North Monaghan.

Zoning By-laws/By-law Amendments

Township of Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan; Township of Frontenac Islands; Township of Percy, Township of Alnwick, Town of Campbellford, Town of Brighton, Village of Madoc, Town of Picton

Aggregate Resource Planning

Review of Aggregate Potential for Official Plans and Zoning By-laws

Howe Island Gravel Pit – review of proposal; prepare report to Council with planning documents; provide professional opinion evidence at OMB Hearing; Stonescape II Quarry Appeal – review of proposed quarry, preparation of planning review, attendance at OMB Hearing; Codrington Pit Proposal – review of proposed pit, advice to adjacent land owner, monitor approvals

Official Plans, Official Plan Updates and Amendments

Township of Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan, Township of Haldimand, Township of Hamilton, Township of Smith, Township of Lochiel, Township of Charlottenburgh, Town of Brighton, Township of Burleigh and Anstruther, Township of Sidney, Township of Frontenac Islands, Township of Hope, Town of Gananoque.

Recent Renewable Energy Projects

Planning Approvals, Wolfe Island Wind Farm, Township of Frontenac Islands; Gas fired Peaking Plant Location study; Epcor, Skypower; Solar Farm; Algonquin Power. – Wind Farm

Watershed Plans

South Sidney Watershed, Lower Trent Region Conservation Authority; Storm Water Management Plan, Town of Delhi; Oshawa Creek Watershed Master Plan, City of Oshawa.

Waterfront Studies

Town of Deseronto, Town of Deep River, City of Kingston.

Tourism Development Studies

Ministry of Industry and Tourism, Tourism Development Strategy Trenton Cornwall and Renfrew

- Kingston Zones, County of Northumberland Tourism Planning Study.

Contact



T 905-885-8023
bob@clarkcs.com
www.clarkcs.com

CURRICULUM VITAE

Socio-Economic Assessments

TransCanada Pipelines Transco Project, Brampton to Burlington Gas Pipeline, TransCanada Pipelines, Eldorado Nuclear Hexafluoride Refinery, Hope Township site, Wilson Island Bridge, County of Northumberland, Three Strand-Communal Sewage System EA.

Recreational Studies

Riverwalk-Minden, Georgian Trail, Township of Collingwood, Recreation Master Plan, Township of Cavan, Beavermead Park Redevelopment Plan, City of Peterborough,; Rail Corridor Study, County of Victoria; Pangman Conservation Area Master Plan, Lake Simcoe Region Tourism Study, ESI - Sir Sandford Fleming College, provided Social-Economic Impact Assessment for the Millennium Trail Master Plan, County of Prince Edward.

Advisory Services including Planning Appraisals

Township of Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan; Township of Frontenac Islands; Township of North Monaghan, Township of Smith, Township of Burleigh and Anstruther, Municipality of Sherbourne McClintock and Livingstone, Township of Stanhope, Township of Lutterworth, Township of Hope, Township of Hamilton, Township of Alnwick, Township of Percy, Township of Seymour, Town of Campbellford, Town of Gananoque, Village of Hastings, Township of Haldimand, Municipality of Trent Hills, County of Prince Edward

Industrial Development Studies

City Owned Industrial Land Study, City of Kingston; Lucas Point, Town of Cobourg, Township of Charlottenburgh, Town of Brighton, Great Lakes Deep Water Port Industrial Site Development Plan, Township of Hallowell; Draft Plan of Subdivision; Cataraqui Business Park, City of Kingston.

Economic Development Studies

Accommodation Evaluation, Township of Asphodel-Norwood; South Dundas Economic Development Study, South Dundas Economic Development Commission, Almonte Economic Development Study, Town of Almonte and Township of Ramsay; Best Use Study, Douro-Dummer Township.

Housing Policy Statements

Town of Cobourg.

Solid Waste Management Studies

County of Haliburton, Township of Hallowell, County of Northumberland, Seymour Township, National Capital Region, Lanark County, Snow Disposal Study, National Capital Region.

Private Development/Projects

Assist developers in the design and approval of both residential and industrial/commercial projects. References available upon request.

Contact



T 905-885-8023
bob@clarkcs.com
www.clarkcs.com

CURRICULUM VITAE

Recent OMB Cases

OMB Case No. PL090057 Lash
OMB Case No. PL100622 – Reynolds
OMB Case No. PL101329 – White Tail
OMB Case No. PL100904 – Stonescape
OMB Case No. PL090838 - Sepa
OMB Case No. PL09841 - Bremer
OMB Case No. PL100475 - McDonald
OMB Case No. PL050584 – City of Ottawa
OMB Case No. PL031324 – City of Ottawa
OMB Case No. PL080239 – City of Ottawa
OMB Case No. PL080373 – City of Ottawa
OMB Case No. PL070728 - Carter
OMB Case No. PL090147 – Semler
OMB Case No. PL1000711 – Mound Brighton
OMB Case No. PL011198 – City of Kingston, Alfred Street
OMB Case No. PL030524 – City of Kingston
OMB Case No. PL110520 - City of Niagara Falls
OMB Case No. PL130785 – Township of McNab/Braeside
OMB Case No. PL141138 – Evans
LPAT Case No. PL 150192 – Municipality of Brighton
LPAT Case No. PL160588 – Municipality of Trent Hills
OMB Case No. PL170008 – Township of Brock
OMB Case No. PL170878 – Burl's Creek
LPAT Case No. PL171446 & PL 180385 – Municipality of Brighton
LPAT Case No. PL170178 – Municipality of Clarington

Contact



T 905-885-8023
bob@clarkcs.com
www.clarkcs.com

CURRICULUM VITAE