

To Township of East Garafraxa



Copy










From Tim Cane, MES, MCIP, RPP

Date December 24, 2008

Our File EAS – 08201-11

Re: Stakeholder Comments on Renewable Energy Policy Draft

-  Comments considered but no change recommended
 -  Change recommended
 -  Additional work required
- Note 1* Jones Planning Response
-

Stakeholder	Comments
Ratepayers of the 11 th Line Nov. 11, 2008.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">  - Transmission lines must be underground. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i>  - Do not want medium or large scale turbines since they are incompatible with Township character. <i>(Refer to Note 2)</i>  - All transmission lines to be routed underground with no exceptions. If there are constraints to prevent this, then re-route the transmission line. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i>  - Underground transmission requirements should be specifically required to be located below grade. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i>  - Cost of underground transmission lines should not be a reason for going above grade. Similar language to that of transformers in Section 6.7.7.8 should be used. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i>  - Decommissioning security of 5% or \$1 million minimum. <i>(Refer to Note 3)</i>  - Do not adopt proposed policies until another presentation to residents. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i>  - Definition of "adverse effects" should be expanded to include "loss or property value and security". <i>(Refer to Note 5)</i>  - 10 year moratorium should be placed on any medium or large scale turbines. <i>(Refer to Note 6)</i>

Memorandum

<p>John Kamphis J.K. Electric</p> <p>Nov. 10, 2008.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Opposed to turbines on the basis of visual appearance. <i>(The proposed policies require a visual impact assessment to be undertaken for every proposal so that visual appearance can be assessed at the time of a particular application.)</i> ☀ - Concerned about the possibility of tingle (stray) voltage. Stray voltage may be an issue in Melancthon and be detrimental to livestock operations. <i>(Electrical safety falls under the jurisdiction of the province's Electrical Safety Authority who is currently working with the Ministry of Energy to examine this potential issue. Follow-up can be undertaken to assess if policy changes are required.)</i> ⊘ - Efficiency of the turbines has never been proven. Melancthon is running at 21%. <i>(The efficiency of a turbine is not a land use planning consideration.)</i> ⊘ - More research should be undertaken. <i>(Significant research has already been undertaken as presented through the background research paper.)</i> ⊘ - Turbines should not be located in an agricultural area. <i>(Agricultural impacts will be considered as part of any application.)</i> ⊘ - Possible health concerns as already experienced in Melancthon. <i>(Refer to Note 9)</i>
<p>Osler on behalf of Hydro One</p> <p>Nov 12, 2008.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊙ - Hydro One is not subject to planning instruments under the s. 62 of the Planning Act. <i>(There is no disagreement on this point. The draft policies were written in full knowledge of Section 62. However, Hydro One projects are subject to the Environmental Assessment process as evidenced by the recent Bruce to Milton project. Appendix T of the Bruce to Milton Environmental Assessment states through Section 5.2.1.2 of the approved Terms of Reference that "Hydro One will consider the current Official Plans when carrying out the EA." The preamble to Section 6.7.7 clearly illustrates this relationship and the intent of the proposed policies.)</i> ⊙ - Proposed amendments purport to regulate matters of provincial jurisdiction resulting in duplication and conflicts with other provincial requirements. <i>(The proposed policies do not attempt to impose requirements on Hydro One but rather identify to all utility providers a form of development that is consistent with the broad strategic land use objectives of the municipality. At no time has there been language mandating Hydro One to undertake specific tasks. Page 2, paragraph 4 of the Osler submission is misleading and out of context by indicating that the proposed policies require certain undertakings from Hydro One).</i> ⊙ - Proposed policy 6.7.7.2 requires Hydro One to undertake specific tasks. Other jurisdictional concerns are contained in Section 6.7.7 which will create overlap and confusion. <i>(The intent of the policies is not to create overlap and confusion but rather identify to Hydro One the preference of the Township for future undertakings and their environmental assessments. Additional language can be added in this regard to minimize confusion.)</i> ⊙ - Request policies to be deleted or substantially amended. <i>(The policies do not require Hydro One to undertake specific tasks. In the spirit of the EA process and Hydro One's undertaking to consider local Official Plans, it is felt the policies are helpful in communicating the land use preferences of the Township. Therefore, amendments of the policies can be made to clarify this intent, however, it is not proposed to make substantial changes or deletions. Section 62 of the Planning Act clearly states that local policies may not apply to Hydro One undertakings. There is nothing unclear about this and as a result Hydro One can choose to ignore any local policies for activities associated under the Planning Act.)</i>
<p>Ivan Bojikov</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Policies should support decentralized generation and the concept of community

Memorandum

Nov 18, 2008.	energy projects. <i>(The proposed policies provide clarity for the siting of renewable energy facilities and therefore a decentralized generation model.)</i>
Grand River Conservation Authority Nov 3, 2008.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - No objections. - Have not undertaken a coordinated response with adjacent Conservation Authorities.
Doug, Bonnie, Brian, David and Steven Gear Nov 3, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Major concerns about the possibility of transmission lines along the front of properties on the 11th Line. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - No exceptions for requiring underground transmission lines for projects within or outside of the Township. If they can't be underground then re-route. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> - Already impacted by Bruce to Milton line. - Request to be notified. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i>
Penelope Perry Nov 10, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request to be notified. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i>
Peter Grimley Nov 19, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Questions the urgency of the need for alternative energy. <i>(The need for alternative energy is not a question for the Township. This need has already been established by the Provincial and Federal governments).</i> ⊘ - Tax payers should not be responsible for cost overruns or decommissioning. Calculating securities could reflect the same as the mining companies that are done on a yearly basis based on financial performance. <i>(It is agreed that the developer should be responsible for all costs. Current policies address decommissioning securities and provide sufficient flexibility to appropriately deal with this issue.)</i> ⊘ - Supports a 10 year moratorium. <i>(Refer to Note 6)</i> ⊘ - Regrets that documents do not contain a range of figures regarding financial data and statistics but accepts if this data is not appropriate in the OP. <i>(The financial data of renewable energy projects is not a land use planning consideration. The Background Research Paper does examine studies and statistics relevant to developing planning policies.)</i> ⊘ - Would like some benefit to the Township to offset land use impacts. Would like to see small and micro facilities supported where power is used in the Township. <i>(The proposed policies suggest Amenity Agreements with proponents to encourage local benefits. Small and micro facilities are supported by policies in that their approval processes are less onerous).</i> ⊘ - Request that during construction, local trades/services are used first. During operation, local residents could be trained and used rather than outside residents. <i>(This cannot be mandated by any planning approval but is encouraged to be included as part of any future Amenity Agreement).</i>
Trevor Wilson Nov 20, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Section 6.7.1 contradicts itself by securing an energy supply while maintaining local character. <i>(Appropriate scales of renewable energy in appropriate locations have the potential to secure local supply while maintaining local character. This is a worthy goal to pursue).</i> ⊘ - Agrees that turbines cause all of the tests contained within the proposed definition of Adverse Effects. <i>(It is possible that a particular turbine in a particular location</i>

Memorandum

could meet all of the tests for Adverse Effects. It is therefore important for policies to minimize this potential when siting new or expanded turbines.)

- ① - Questions if the Township has formally identified Built heritage Resources under the Heritage Act. *(No, the Township has not done this. The proposed policies rely on the current identification of the Grand River Valley as a heritage river for the purposes of conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes).*
- ① - Definitions relating to heritage, landscapes, conservation, districts, etc are confusing. *(Definitions have been reviewed and no changes are proposed.)*
- ① - Questions the identification of the Grand River Valley as a Cultural Heritage Landscape and whether the Township is identifying it now. *(The Grand River has been identified as a Heritage River through other Provincial and Federal processes as discussed in the Background Research Paper. It is proposed to apply this definition to the Grand River Valley containing the heritage river feature, for the purposes of conservation policies.)*
- ① - Questions the term Significant and whether the Province is the only agency to determine. *(The term "Significant" for local policies is the same as the Provincial definition for reasons of consistency. The Province does not have to determine what is significant. Township planning staff can consider features to be significant during the application process.)*
- ① - Remove exceptions for underground transmission lines and adopt similar language as used for transformers regarding cost. *(Refer to Note 1)*
- ① - Use of the term Significant for Cultural Heritage Resources, Built Heritage Resources and Archeological Resources leaves the door open for the proponent to define. *(The proponent can define resources as they wish, however, the Township can choose to agree or disagree with this interpretation prior to considering any planning application).*
- ① - Suggest a moratorium on new energy projects until a review/audit is carried out in Melancthon and Amaranth. *(Refer to Note 6. The policies have been developed with the knowledge of nearby projects.)*
- ① - Clarification regarding who bears the cost of peer reviews. *(The policies are explicit – the proponent pays).*
- ① - Questions the need to list features in Area 1. Why not allow nothing in Area 1? *(Most renewable energy projects are not permitted in Management Area 1. The only allowable uses are those considered not to have a negative impact on the listed features).*
- ① - Questions setback to receptors and why not use 500m instead of 450 metres for medium and large scale. Medical evidence suggest that setbacks should be greater. Possibility of a missing reference to height in Section 6.7.4.3.10 c). *(Medical evidence is still inconclusive regarding the health impacts of turbines. The setbacks presented in the policies are a starting point only and specific setbacks will be established through the planning application process once the particular characteristics and potential impacts of a project are better understood. Setbacks of 450 metres have been deemed to be appropriate in other jurisdictions by municipalities and the Ontario Municipal Board. Refer to Notes 7, 8 and 9.)*
- ① - Should natural heritage features consistent with the attributes of Management Area 1 not preclude turbine development in these areas. *(Yes, natural heritage features not shown in Management Area 1, but present in other areas, may preclude turbine development).*

Memorandum

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Section 6.7.6.3.4 uses the word “should” and therefore is not restrictive. This comments applies to other sections where this language is used. <i>(Discretionary language is used by the policies as a guide for considering future developments. Specific or more restrictive language can be considered at the time of a particular application when specific details are fully understood).</i>
<p>John Fitzpatrick Nov 24, 08</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Opposed to OPA to facilitate the installation of wind turbines. <i>(Provincial Policies support the installation of wind turbines, but not any size in any location. Wind turbines may be an appropriate land use depending on their characteristics and location.)</i>
<p>Alan Saunders Nov 24, 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agrees with overall content with regard to commercial installations. ⊘ - Small and micro scale facilities used for on-site consumption should not be included in the policies and not require rezoning or permits, and only have minimum setback requirements. <i>(Small and micro facilities, regardless if they are for on-site consumption, have the potential for land use impacts and therefore have been included in the proposed policies. These types of facilities have a less onerous approval process.)</i> ⊘ - Totally opposed to the Township being involved with decommissioning on private lands. <i>(Like other land use approvals on private lands, the Township wants to ensure that land use impacts are minimized. In the case of large scale turbines, minimizing land use impacts may require the removal of the turbine if it ceases operation.)</i> - Awaiting copy of revised OP policies.
<p>Mary Jane & Irving Langill Langcrest Farm 30 Nov 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unequivocally opposed to medium and large scale turbines in the Township. ⊘ - Policies facilitate rather than protect against large turbines. <i>(Provincial Policy requires that the Township consider renewable energy uses. The proposed policies represent a balance between the need for renewable energy and existing land uses).</i> ⊘ - Wind farms are unsightly, decrease property values, encumber adjoining properties without consultation and prior approval. <i>(Visual impacts will be assessed as part of any application. Property values are not a land use planning consideration. Adjoining properties are directly notified and considered during the approval process. All landowners have appeal rights under the Planning Act).</i> ⊘ - Disregard of individual property rights. <i>(Refer to above.)</i> ⊘ - Policies should prohibit wind turbines within 1 – 2 km of the Grand River. <i>(Large and medium scale turbines are prohibited from the Grand River Valley. Turbines within 1 km of the river valley are subjected to a higher order test for their appropriateness with respect to the Valley's Cultural Heritage Landscape.)</i> ⊘ - Natural areas should not be eroded or defaced. <i>(Natural Heritage features are reflected in the proposed policies.)</i> ⊘ - Policies will allow turbines to be located close to homes and barns. <i>(Refer to Note 7)</i> ⊘ - Turbines should not interrupt existing views which were paid for. <i>(Views from properties are not necessarily a land use planning decision unless Cultural Heritage Landscapes may be impacted. Visual Impact Assessments will be required to assess and minimize visual impacts.)</i> - No intention to live near a commercial wind farm despite wanting to enjoy an active agricultural life. - There is a substantial investment in their farm and spin-off economic benefits to the

Memorandum

	<p>Township.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aggressively resist anyone wanting them to maintain their agricultural use amongst turbines. ⊘ - Loss of property value. <i>(Refer to Note 5)</i> ⊘ - Long term health hazards of living near turbines. <i>(Refer to Note 9)</i> ★ - Participating in trumpeter swan reintroduction program and are concerned about hazards of turbines in close proximity. Young swans fly around the property for many hours before leaving. <i>(The Atlas of Breeding Birds in Ontario does not identify trumpeter swan sites in East Garafraxa. Regardless, the policies can be revisited to specifically consider this species when preparing background studies assessing natural heritage impacts in Management Area 2.)</i> - Request to be kept informed. <i>(Residents participating in the policy process will be notified directly)</i>
<p>Richard & Shann Leighton</p> <p>Dec 1, 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Support alternative energy but turbines should be placed in areas where there is no population to be adversely affected. <i>(The characteristic and density of the Township have been considered in the development of the proposed policies.)</i> ⊘ - All transmission lines should be located below grade, no exceptions. If not possible then re-route. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - Underground transmission requirements should apply to projects outside of the Township. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - Economics should not be a reason for above ground transmission lines. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - Decommissioning should be 5% of turbine cost or \$1 million minimum. <i>(Refer to Note 3)</i> ⊘ - Request another public meeting before Council votes on the OPA. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i> ⊘ - 10 year moratorium should be applied. <i>(Refer to Note 6)</i> ★ - Concern over environmental impact on migratory birds and other natural heritage features. <i>(Policies can be revisited to consider specific species and study requirements).</i> ⊘ - Should be increased setbacks to property lines, residential buildings and barns. <i>(Refer to Note 8)</i> ⊘ - Wind turbines should not be on prime agricultural lands. <i>(Provincial Policy permits wind turbines on agricultural lands since the two land uses are considered to be compatible. Once established turbines occupy only a small portion of agricultural lands allowing for agricultural activities to continue in close proximity.)</i>
<p>Lou & Stephanie Flanagan</p> <p>Nov. 28, 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Concern over industrial turbines being erected on the countryside. <i>(Provincial Policy requires that the Township consider renewable energy uses. The proposed policies represent a balance between the need for renewable energy and existing land uses. Refer to Note 2).</i> ⊘ - Medium and large turbines may be inefficient and unreliable. <i>(The efficiency of a turbine is not a land use planning consideration.)</i> ⊘ - Effects on wildlife, livestock and health risks have been discovered. <i>(Applications for renewable energy projects will have to consider these potential impacts and demonstrate to the Township that any adverse effects are minimized. Refer to Notes 7,8 and 9).</i>

Memorandum

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - 10 year moratorium should be applied. <i>(Refer to Note 6)</i> ⊘ - Setbacks should be revisited. Four hundred metres to dwellings and agricultural buildings is insufficient and unrealistic. <i>(Refer to Notes 7 and 8)</i> ⊘ - Impacts on rural and agricultural countryside. <i>(The proposed policies have been developed to ensure that all potential land use impacts are considered as part of any planning application).</i>
<p>Doug & Bonnie Gear</p> <p>Nov 29, 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents are not ready or wish to have turbines and transmission lines. ⊘ - Property devaluation is a concern. <i>(Refer to Note 5)</i> ⊘ - More health implications within the last few weeks attributed to power sources. Possible health problems already in the Township because of hydro towers. <i>(Refer to Note 9. The Township is not aware of existing health problems both with East Garafraxa and surrounding municipalities as a result of renewable energy facilities. Refer to Note 8).</i> ⊘ - Do not approve any proposals until concrete evidence of no health impacts. <i>(Refer to Note 9)</i> - Minister Smitherman has repeatedly stated that he wants 'willing hosts' for turbines. East Garafraxa is not.
<p>Carl Tacon & Lyn Carter</p> <p>Dec 1, 2008.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Large and medium turbines are incompatible with the nature of the Township. <i>(Provincial Policy requires that the Township consider renewable energy uses. The proposed policies represent a balance between the need for renewable energy and existing land uses. Refer to Note 2).</i> ⊘ - All transmission lines should be located below grade, no exceptions. If not possible then re-route. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - Underground transmission requirements should apply to projects outside of the Township. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - Economics should not be a reason for above ground transmission lines. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - Decommissioning should be 5% of turbine cost or \$1 million minimum. <i>(Refer to Note 3)</i> ⊘ - Request another public meeting before Council votes on the OPA. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i> ⊘ - 10 year moratorium should be applied. <i>(Refer to Note 6)</i> ☀ - Concern over environmental impact on migratory birds and other natural heritage features. <i>(The proposed policies require that natural heritage features are studied and considered. Policies can be revisited to consider specific species and study requirements).</i> ⊘ - Should be increased setbacks to property lines, residential buildings and barns.
<p>Chris Chihrin & David Tilley</p> <p>Nov 29, 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Concern over industrialization of the landscape. <i>(Provincial Policy requires that the Township consider renewable energy uses. The proposed policies represent a balance between the need for renewable energy and existing land uses. Refer to Note 2).</i> ⊘ - Property devaluation because of other people's land use choices. <i>(Refer to Note 5)</i> ⊘ - Properties affected by visual impacts should have reduced taxes. <i>(Property taxes are not a land use planning issue. Visual impacts will be considered as part of any application. Refer to Note 5)</i>

Memorandum

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - No windmills. <i>(Refer to Note 2)</i>
Darlene Chapman Dec 1, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Submitted YouTube video link regarding health issues and wind turbine syndrome. <i>(Refer to Note 9)</i>
Marilyn & Jim Thompson Nov 30, 2008.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Large and medium turbines are incompatible with fragile nature of Township. <i>(Refer to Note 2)</i> ⊘ - Noise and shadow flicker effect on animals and humans. <i>(Noise and shadow flicker studies are required and will be considered by the township before any project is approved.)</i> ⊘ - Impact on property values. <i>(Refer to Note 5)</i> ⊘ - Visual impacts from access roads and above ground transmission lines. <i>(Visual impacts will be considered once the particular attributes and location of a project are known).</i> ⊘ - Risk associated with ice throw and mechanical failure. <i>(Proponents will need to demonstrate to Council, through appropriate studies, that risks of a project are acceptable)</i>
Jack Wilhelm Dec 2, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are residents not opposed to alternative energy projects. - Surprised by the amount of NIMBYism given air quality concerns in Ontario. - Applauds Council efforts to develop policies and direct projects into appropriate areas.
Evan & Nisha Craighead Dec 1, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Concern over allowance of medium and large turbines and scale compatibility. <i>(Scales of turbines have been defined within the proposed policies. Larger scale turbines have more stringent planning controls that must be met to ensure compatibility.)</i> ⊙ - Section 6.7.3.1 should be expanded to include studies/evidence that projects will not contaminate surface or ground water. <i>(Studies to ensure that surface and groundwater is not contaminated should be included in Section 6.7.4.3.12.)</i> ⊘ - Section 6.7.3.4 should be amended to remove exceptions for above grade transmission lines and re-route where necessary. <i>(Refer to Note 1)</i> ⊘ - Section 6.7.3.7 should include addressing public safety concerns and mechanical failures. <i>(Public Safety and risk will be considered through required studies as scoped in Section 6.7.4.3.12 d.)</i> ⊘ - Section 6.7.3.12 should be amended to not consider large scale systems until comprehensive review of other projects in nearby Townships. <i>(Projects in nearby Townships have been considered by the background research paper undertaken for the development of the proposed policies.)</i> ⊘ - 1 km setback to settlement areas in Section 6.7.4.2.2 and 6.7.4.2.3 should also be applied to non-participating residences. Management Area 2 criteria should be applied to Management Area 3 particularly with respect to migratory birds, agriculture, soil/water contamination, and heritage. <i>(The attributes of Management Areas 2 and 3 have carefully been considered in order to determine the appropriateness of any future renewable energy facility.)</i> ⊘ - TransCanada is not in compliance with the Public Notification requirements in Section 6.7.4.3.7. <i>(TransCanada is not required to meet the proposed public notification requirements until the draft policies are approved by the Township.</i>

Memorandum

	<p><i>TransCanada is being encouraged to consider these policies before submitting their planning applications.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Sections 6.7.4.3.10 and 6.7.4.3.11 should be amended to have a setback distance of 1km. <i>(Refer to above note regarding settlement areas)</i> ⊘ - Section 6.7.4.3.12 b) should be amended so that noise has a greater influence on setbacks to non-participating properties. Setbacks less than 500m would have sound levels exceeding Provincial Standards. Setbacks of at least 1000m are required and preferably 1600m. <i>(There is no evidence that setbacks less than 500m will not meet Provincial noise standards. Provincial noise standards are being met by existing projects in Melancthon Township and other municipalities with setbacks less than 500m. Setbacks to meet noise guidelines are dependent on the particular turbine attributes and its locations. Once the noise attributes of a project are specifically understood, appropriate setbacks will be determined.)</i> ⊙ - Management Plan should include spill and contamination. <i>(Agreed – Section 6.7.4.3.12 h) should be amended.)</i> - They hope for serious investigation of their suggestions and taken into consideration and a second public meeting. <i>(All public comments have been considered and additional investigations will be undertaken where required. Refer to Note 4.)</i>
<p>Carl Tacon Dec 2, 2008.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request Council reconsider the December 9 meeting. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i> - Concerned over the 1 hour time slot allocated to the issue since there will not be enough time to hear public comments. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i> - Request for an evening meeting. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i>
<p>Public Meeting Nov 12, 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊘ - Complaint about short notice for further comments, also lack of circulation. <i>(Refer to Note 4)</i> ⊙ - Grant Evans- summarized letter from 11th Line residents - general consensus of residents that wind turbines not wanted, but want to work with council; also, transmission lines to be underground only; and high level of resistance to the Province forcing wind turbines on residents, and suggested additional policies to address their concerns; also, questioned power generated outside Township, and requested further Public Meeting be held in Marsville. <i>(Refer to responses to their written submission)</i> ☀ - Barb Evans- concerns regarding “tingle” effect from hydro on livestock, and noted flicker effect of turbines a real issue; also, peer review to be done by Township. <i>(Electrical safety falls under the jurisdiction of the province’s Electrical Safety Authority who is currently working with the Ministry of Energy to examine this potential issue. Follow-up can be undertaken to assess if policy changes are required.)</i> ⊙ - Jim Angus - questioned capacity issues with respect to projects; also commented on migratory birds. <i>(Hydro One confirms that there is transmission capacity in the Township. It is recommended that policies be revised to reflect trumpeter swan sites in the Township.)</i> ⊘ - Peter Curtis - questioned how management areas determined; also emphasized sensitive area along Grand River, and suggested a 1km buffer from all creeks and tributaries. <i>(Extending the identified cultural heritage feature to include tributaries would require specific cultural heritage studies. The 1 km area around the valley as part of Management Area 2 and its requirement for this type of study is considered sufficient.)</i>

Memorandum

- ⊘ - Carol Davison - concern with real estate values. *(Refer to Note 5)*
- ⊘ - Gail Hartley - questioned de-commissioning; also, health impacts. *(Refer to Notes 3 and 9)*
- ⊘ - Luke Grit - concerns regarding long term usefulness. *(The efficiency of a turbine is not a land use planning consideration.)*
- ⊘ - Tibor Vizi - questioned size of project, and what happens to foundation and infrastructure. *(No specific projects are formally proposed. Foundation would be removed as part of decommissioning.)*
- ⊘ - Al Saunders - stated too much confusion, and that decommissioning should only be a landowner issue. *(Like other land use approvals on private lands, the Township wants to ensure that land use impacts are minimized. In the case of large scale turbines, minimizing land use impacts may require the removal of the turbine if it ceases operation.)*
- ⊘ - Juergen Garbe - questioned distinction between own use and large scale. *(Policies have been developed regardless of personal or commercial use. Potential land use impacts are the same regardless.)*
- ⊘ - Jim Davison - referred to the Belwood Wind Project, and stressed that transmission lines should be underground only. *(Refer to Note 1)*
- ⊘ - W.T. Martin - questioned airstrips and restriction with respect to turbines. *(Policies require any airstrip, regardless if identified on the schedule, to be considered as part of any proposal. Turbines will only be restricted in size or location in those instances of aviation hazards.)*
- ⊘ - Doug Gear - concerns regarding Hydro One expansion, and co-location. *(Refer to response to the Osler submission.)*
- ★ - David Baird - noted that map indicating airstrips inaccurate, also whether environmental concerns regarding migratory birds addressed. *(Airstrip locations will be verified. Policies for migratory birds should be considered.)*
- ⊘ - Alex Burnett - noted that potentially there are 7 turbines proposed in East Garafraxa re Belwood Wind Project, and that setback from property lines should be same as from roadways, and should be further restrictions from houses. *(Refer to Notes 7, 8 and 9)*
- ⊘ - Diane Bond - questioned OMB process. *(Clarification provided at the meeting. Any land owner can appeal a decision of Council to approve or refuse a renewable energy project on land use planning grounds.)*
- ⊘ - Dennis Greenley - suggested should be a referendum. *(The Planning Act and Provincial Policy require the Township to have appropriate land use policies for renewable energy facilities, regardless of the outcome of any referendum.)*
- ⊘ - Janet Harris - questioned set backs from barns and requested copy of presentation. *(Refer to Notes 7, 8 and 9)*
- ⊘ - Darryl Burnett - also questioned setbacks from barns. *(Refer to Notes 7,8 and 9)*
- John Kamphuis - commented on electrical currents affecting hot tubs. *(Refer to Bard Evan's response above)*
- ⊘ - Peter Grimley - concerned regarding timing of future comments. *(Refer to Note 4)*
- ⊘ - Henry Rebhan - other wind projects, ie. out west, should be investigated. *(Other projects have been investigated as part of this policy development exercise.)*
- ⊘ - Vivian Marachi, Trans Canada - addressed Belwood Wind Energy project, noting

Memorandum

that applications have not been filed to date with the Township, and that they will not file until Township policies in place, and that they are currently proceeding with the environmental assessment process. She also indicated that they have an RFP at the Ontario Power Authority for consideration, but have not been selected to date, and would not know until January, 2009 if successful. She emphasized that they want to work with Council and the public and are trying to complete their draft environmental study by March, 2009, and will apply for zoning applications by April, 2009 at the earliest. Ms. Maraghi also confirmed that they will utilize underground lines, as they have done in Quebec.

- ⊖ - Glenn Lott - suggested council should receive written confirmation from Trans Canada with respect to Ms. Maraghi's comments ; however, it was noted that her comments will be in the minutes of the Public Meeting, which is adequate.
- ⊕ - Unidentified - questioned why setback distances greater from multiple houses than from single house, and requested clarification with respect to underground transmission lines. *(Refer to Notes 1, 7, 8 and 9)*
- ⊕ - Michael Bowman, Osler – Addressed Council on behalf of Hydro One. He noted that the Bruce to Milton expansion had been a cooperative process to date. However, under the Planning Act, Hydro One is exempt from local policies and it is outside the jurisdiction of Council to regulate those activities. *(Refer to responses to their written submission)*

NOTES

1. Section 6.7.3.4 currently requires transmission lines associated with renewable energy facilities to be located underground except for physical and environmental constraints. This section will be amended to remove any exceptions to allow above grade infrastructure. It is also proposed that this section be amended to state that economics is not a reason for above ground transmission lines. The proposed policies will also be amended so that renewable energy infrastructure originating from outside of the Township is subject to these policies.
2. There are a variety of factors to consider for medium and large turbines based on the particular attributes of a project and visual impact. The outright prohibition of larger scale turbines is not defensible from a land use planning perspective based on Provincial Policy and other approved projects.
3. Decommissioning securities should be established in light of a specific project once cost of construction is known and specific turbine details are known. The proposed policies provide sufficient flexibility to appropriately deal with specific securities on a project by project basis.
4. All residents of the Township will be invited to the Council meeting on January 13 where stakeholder comments and policy responses will be discussed. No policies will be considered or adopted by Council until stakeholder comments and policy responses are considered on January 13, 2008.
5. The definition of "adverse effects" used in the policies is the same as the Provincial Policy Statement in order to maintain consistency on land use planning terms. The Ontario Municipal Board, through various decisions on planning matters, has concluded that "loss of property value and security" is not a land use planning issue. It is the goal of renewable energy policies to responsibly site renewable energy facilities so that adverse effects are minimized and as a result any possible impacts on property values are reduced.
6. The placement of a 10 year moratorium on wind turbines is not an appropriate policy from a land use planning perspective and current Provincial Policy.

Memorandum

7. Policies provide general setbacks to houses, sensitive receivers and points of reception on both participating and non-participating properties. Larger setbacks to houses, sensitive receiver s and points of reception are on the basis of current Ministry of Environment noise guidelines. The setbacks contained within the proposed policies represent a starting point and intended to be refined once the details of a project are known, any potential land uses impacts (i.e. noise, risk, shadow flicker, etc.) and the type of turbine being proposed. As a result of careful review of supporting information for a planning application, setbacks to turbines may be amended. Setbacks of 450 metres have been deemed to be appropriate in other jurisdictions by municipalities and the Ontario Municipal Board. Barns are not considered to be a Point of Reception since they are not considered to be a “noise sensitive building” as per Provincial definitions. Turbines on adjoining properties will be required to be setback the height of the turbine from the boundary. Assuming that nearby barns are not typically on the property line, one could expect even larger setbacks.
8. The policies were specifically developed to exclude setbacks that are in many instances arbitrarily defined. We feel that that work undertaken as part of an official plan amendment, rezoning and site plan applications will adequately deal with setback and siting issues.
9. There is documentation indicating that turbines do not pose a health issue. Similarly there are studies that say turbines do pose a health issue based on anecdotal evidence, however there is a lack of research specifically on this topic proving that turbines do have health impacts. Many potential health issues may be associated with turbine noise. MOE noise guidelines have been developed to address these issues and must be met before a Certificate of Approval is issued by the province for a turbine to operate.