

*DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE PLANNING AND VISUAL IMPACTS OF A
LANDFILL FOR THE REGION OF HALTON AT SITE D OR SITE F*

WITNESS STATEMENT AND REPORT

*Jonathan Kauffman, M.C.I.P
Planning Consultant*

for

*S. GARROD, BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
THE MILTON AREA CITIZEN'S COALITION*

January 1988

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	3
2.1 Existing Conditions	3
2.2 Compatibility with Surrounding Uses	3
2.3 Human Impact at Site D	4
2.4 Visual Impacts	4
3 EXISTING CONDITIONS	6
3.1 Site D	6
3.1.1 On-site Properties	6
3.1.2 Abutting and Nearby Properties	6
3.2 Site F	10
3.2.1 On-Site, Abutting and Nearby Properties	10
4 COMPATIBILITY WITH SURROUNDING USES	11
4.1 Site D	11
4.2 Site F	13
5 HUMAN IMPACTS AT SITE D	15
5.1 On-site Residents	15
5.1.1 Abutters and Nearby Residents	16
6 VISUAL IMPACT	19
6.1 Distances from Fill Area and View Angles	19
6.2 Landfill Profile at Site D	21

Tables

1 Existing Conditions, On-site Properties: Site D	7
2 Existing Conditions, Abutting and Nearby Properties: Site D	8
3 Distance of Dwellings from Fill Area: Site D and Site F	19
4 View Angle as a Proportion of Viewshed: Site D & Site F	19

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present a detailed view of the potential planning and visual impacts of a proposed new regional landfill at Site D and to compare this with available information on Site F.

This report differs from some of the current Environmental Assessment documentation in that it is based upon a smaller study area. In planning and engineering studies, it is normal practice to examine increasingly smaller areas with each successive stage in the study. At this stage in the Environmental Assessment process, it is considered appropriate to adopt a study area which focusses on those individuals and properties most directly affected by the proposed landfill. A study area has therefore been defined which concentrates on immediate abutters and on-site properties, an approach which is generally consistent with the Ministry of the Environment's '500 Metre Guideline'.

The Ministry of the Environment, in its *Policy Guideline for Land Use On or Near Landfills and Dumps*, considers "...the most significant adverse environmental effects of a landfill to normally occur within 500 metres of the fill perimeter". Ministry staff characterize the guideline as a 'red-flagging' mechanism. It is not a 'separation distance'; since uses, after investigation, may be permitted to locate within the 500 metres, with - or without - buffering, as deemed appropriate. The 500 Metre Guideline alerts the Ministry of the Environment, particularly in the case of residential uses (which are considered to be among the most sensitive), that the situation must be investigated further.

A study area was therefore defined including properties which were:

- o on site;
- o abutting, either directly or across a public road;

- o within 500 metres of an area potentially generating substantial impact, including the fill area and, in the case of Site D, the site entry frontage with its associated landfill activities.

In addition, adjustments were made to include: properties on Site D extending beyond the 500 metres, but with either frontage, or a substantial portion of the property, within 500 metres; one 'borderline' property on Site D just at or beyond the 500 metres but with a clear view of the proposed landfill; and 4 properties on Site F between 530-650 metres also having a clear view of the respective landfill.

The Study Area for Site D is considered a reasonable interpretation of the Ministry of Environment 500 Metre Guideline, taking into account the close proximity of Highway 25 dwellings to the site entry frontage, which can be expected to generate a number of impacts quite comparable to those associated with the fill area.

The final selection of residences included in this report's two study areas conforms very closely with the residences depicted on Maps A and B of the Comparative Analysis.

Data concerning both sites was obtained from the Stage 2C Land Use and Planning Assessment and the Comparative Analysis. In the case of Site D, this was supplemented by fieldwork, interviews, a written survey, aerial photographs and information from the Smith, Hoffman report. Landowners and occupants of properties in the Site F study area were not interviewed.

2 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

2.1 Existing Conditions

Section 3 of this report presents data on existing conditions within the two study areas.

It was found that at Site D, there are up to 5 dwelling units which might have to be acquired (two with heritage significance), including the recently completed T & MJ Martin residence; and the Tomosky residence, if it is decided to acquire all of this property. Up to 10 adults and 3 children would be dislocated by these property acquisitions. In addition, 3 businesses and one airstrip associated with these properties would have to be relocated, if this were possible in all cases, and up to 9 properties could go out of agricultural production depending upon the extent and success of rehabilitation (Table 1).

In terms of abutting and nearby properties it was found that up to 22 households with 64 inhabitants, including 42 adults and 22 children, 3 businesses, 3 owner occupier farms and 7 other agricultural properties would potentially experience disruption as the result of a landfill. In addition, use of one private airstrip might be lost (Table 2).

If a landfill were located at Site F, there would be no dislocation of households, since there are no on-site dwellings. The potential use of one virtually inactive shale quarry would be lost. Within the nearby area, 6 dwellings would potentially be subject to disruption. No associated businesses are recorded for these dwellings.

2.2 Compatibility with Surrounding Uses

Section 4 examines the compatibility of the proposed landfill with uses in the immediated vicinity.

The compatibility of a landfill with the three main land uses at Site D, taking into account the number of uses concerned and their distance from the landfill, are: rural residential 'low'; agriculture, 'low'; and owner occupied farms, 'low'. For Site F, the main land use categories and their compatibility ratings, after adjusting for number and distance, were found to be: rural residential, 'moderate'; recreation, 'moderate'; industrial, 'moderate-high'; and public uses and utilities, 'high'. The overall conclusion is that compatibility of a potential landfill with Site D uses would be 'low' and with Site F uses 'moderate-high'.

2.3 Human Impact at Site D

Section 5 examines the human impacts which are likely to occur if a landfill is located at Site D. The people who would be expropriated or those who are likely to be faced with significant direct impacts are identified and their particular circumstances described.

2.4 Visual Impacts

Section 6 examines the potential visual impacts of a landfill at Site D and Site F, with an emphasis on impacts which are likely to be experienced by the immediately surrounding properties, inhabitants and users.

The results of distance and view angle calculations for dwellings within 500 metres, for both sites, are presented in Tables 3 and 4. These show a significantly greater visual impact on the 8 Site D residences within 500 metres, which are rated in accordance with the Region's Visual Analysis Technical Report criteria as 'high', in comparison with the 2 Site F residences within this distance which are rated as 'low to medium'.

In terms of the representative dwellings for the Plains Road Community and the Highway 25 cluster of dwellings, it was found that the view angle of the Gillies farmhouse on the west side of Highway 25 was 36% of the 180 degree

viewshed, which is considered to be 'high', while at Site F the closest dwelling in the Plains Road Community had a view angle of 14%, and the dwelling with the greatest view angle in the same row of houses was 21%, which both come under the category of 'low to medium'.

With respect to the landfill profile at Site D, field investigations were carried out which indicated that:

- o the top of the berm would block out the view of the horizon looking east;
- o The berm would also obscure the view of the fields looking east;
- o the berm would create the impression of a closed-off view to the east, in place of the present panoramic view;
- o the profile of the berm would be unnatural in appearance. The natural character of the countryside would be adversely affected.

Taking into account not only the appearance of the berm in absolute terms, but also the relative extent to which the landscape would have been changed and the timeframe of this change, the net visual impact of these factors on the cluster of 8 dwellings along First Line is considered to be 'high', and in the case of the closest dwellings, 'severe'.

3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

3.1 Site D

3.1.1 On-site Properties

Table 1 presents the data gathered concerning Site D on-site properties. This shows that there are up to 5 dwelling units which may have to be acquired (two with heritage significance), including the recently completed T & MJ Martin residence; and the Tomosky residence, if it is decided to acquire all of this property. Up to 10 adults and 3 children would be dislocated by these property acquisitions. In addition, 3 businesses and one airstrip associated with these properties would have to be relocated, if this were possible in all cases, and up to 9 properties could go out of agricultural production depending upon the extent and success of rehabilitation.

3.1.2 Abutting and Nearby Properties

Abutting and nearby properties fall into two main groupings: properties along First Line, which would be subject to potential impacts from the face of the landfill; and properties along Highway 25, which although more than 500 metres from the face of the landfill, are still within 500 metres of the site entry frontage and associated potential impacts, as well as being subject to a special impact in terms of disruption of Escarpment view.

Table 2 presents the information gathered on these properties, which shows that up to 22 households with 64 inhabitants, including 42 adults and 22 children, 3 businesses, 3 owner occupier farms and 7 other agricultural properties might experience disruption as the result of a landfill. In addition, use of one private airstrip is likely to be lost.

Table 1 Existing Conditions, On-site Properties: Site D

<i>Property</i>	<i>H'se hold</i>	<i>Adlt</i>	<i>Chld</i>	<i>Business/ Agricultural Use</i>	<i>Improvements⁴</i>
<i>First Line (east side)</i>					
W&D Martin ¹	1	2	(2) ³	Airfield/ Antique Aircraft Restoration Agricultural Use	Residence Hangar Workshop Airstrip, 2 runways
Marangoni ¹				Agricultural Use	
Verres ¹				Agricultural Use	
T&MJ Martin ¹	1	2			Residence 2 car garage
Reed ¹	1	2	1	Dog Grooming & Breeding Painting Studio	Century farmhouse w/ grooming extension Outbuildings
<i>Highway 25 (west side)</i>					
De Paoli ²				Agricultural Use	
Tomosky ²	1	2		Agricultural Use	Heritage dwelling
Dolinar ²				Agricultural Use	
Tibout ²				Agricultural Use	
Wombat Inv. ¹				Agricultural Use	
Miller- Figa ¹				Agricultural Use	(Residence-destroyed) Barn
Newman ¹	1	2	2	Garden Centre	Residence Barn Swimming pool
TOTAL	5	10	3	3 Businesses 9 Agricultural properties	

1 To be acquired in full

2 To be wholly or partially acquired

3 At home part-time, not added to total

4 Barns not recorded for agricultural properties

Table 2 Existing Conditions, Abutting and Nearby Properties: Site D

<i>Property</i>	<i>H'se hold</i>	<i>Adlt</i>	<i>Chld</i>	<i>Business/ Agricultural Use</i>	<i>Improvements¹</i>
<i>First Line (west side)</i>					
Gentrex Pharm. Inc.				Agricultural Use	
Joch				Agricultural Use	
Public Utility ²					
Nilomis Ltd.				Agricultural Use	
Chaput	1	2			Residence Hangar Airstrip, lighted
Chlon	1	2	(1) ³		Residence Steel barn
Pompa	1	2			Residence Decorative pool
	1	1		Rental Unit	Apartment within main dwelling
Dhillon	1	2	2	Owner Occupied Farm, Field Crops	Residence (under con- struction) 2 Car garage & imple- ment shed
Kete- laars	1	2	3		Residence
Mishos	1	2	2		Residence 8 stall insulated barn Swimming pool
Seehaver	1	2	4		Residence Barn
Tichbon	1	2	2		Residence Barn
Runnals	1	2	n/a ⁴		Residence Shed
SUBTOTAL	10	19	13		

...continued

Table 2 (Cont'd) Existing Conditions, Abutting and Nearby Properties: Site D

<i>Property</i>	<i>H'se hold</i>	<i>Adlt</i>	<i>Chld</i>	<i>Business/ Agricultural Use</i>	<i>Improvements¹</i>
<i>First Line (east side)</i>					
Santarosa (Graham tenant)	1	3	1	Boarding Stable	Residence 2 Barns Shed
Eppinger				Agricultural Use	
New Owner	1	3			Residence Barn
<i>Highway 25 (west side)</i>					
Goldenberg (Curtis tenant)	1	1	1	Rental Unit Agricultural Use	Residence Barn
Winter	1	2	2	Owner Occupied Dairy Farm (46 head)	Residence Barn Polebarn 3 Sheds 2 Silos
<i>Highway 25 (east side)</i>					
Viteta	n/a	n/a	n/a	Abbatoir	Abbatoir
Vertulia	1	1		Dog Breed'g & Board'g Kennel Painting Studio	Residence Brick Kennels
Gillies	1	2	2	Owner Occupied Registered Polled Hereford Breed- ing Farm (120 head)	Residence Barn 4 Polebarns
	2	3		Rental Units	Century farmhouse
Hall	1	2			Residence 2 Barns
Mashke- Robson	1	n/a	n/a	Agricultural Use	Residence ⁵ Barn
H&M Jarvis	1	2	3		Residence Garage

...continued

Table 2 (Cont'd) Existing Conditions, Abutting and Nearby Properties: Site D

<i>Property</i>	<i>H'se hold</i>	<i>Adlt</i>	<i>Chld</i>	<i>Business/ Agricultural Use</i>	<i>Improvements¹</i>
<i>Highway 25 (east side)</i>					
Fosseri Inv. Ltd.				Agricultural Use	
TJ&H Jarvis	1	4			Stone House (c. 1857) Frame Garage
TOTAL	22	42	22	3 Businesses 3 Owner Occupied Farms 7 Other Agricultural properties	

- 1 Barns not recorded for agricultural properties
- 2 Small severed lot
- 3 At home part-time
- 4 Data not available
- 5 Occupancy status unknown

3.2 Site F

3.2.1 On-Site, Abutting and Nearby Properties

The available data from the Stage 2C Land Use and Planning Report concerning residents and abutters within the Site F study area is presented below:

Properties within the Site F Study Area

<i>Location</i>	<i>Residences</i>	<i>Businesses</i>
On-site	0	Virtually inactive Shale Quarry
Beyond site	6	none indicated

Since there are no dwellings on-site, no Site F households would experience dislocation. The potential use of one virtually inactive shale quarry would be lost. Within the nearby area, 6 dwellings might be subject to disruption. No associated businesses are recorded for these dwellings.

4 COMPATIBILITY WITH SURROUNDING USES

This section examines the compatibility of the proposed landfill with uses in its immediate vicinity.

4.1 Site D

Site D is located in a stable, predominantly agricultural area with a mixture of rural residential uses, farmland and owner occupied farms. A substantial number of properties have associated home or property based businesses from which residents gain their principal means of livelihood. The majority of the land used for agricultural purposes, whether owner occupied or not, is in active production.

The study area is bisected toward the northeast by a tributary of the Sixteen Mile Creek. Within the study area, much of the land drains in a nominal south-westerly direction into the two owner occupied farms to the south and east, and rural residential properties along Highway 25. Part of the site drains into the Bronte Creek system via abutters' properties west of First Line. Site D is not served by a piped water supply, therefore wells are used for domestic and agricultural water supply, which may be supplemented by surface impoundments for agricultural use.

Compatibility is discussed below in terms of the three main land uses which occur within the study area:

- o **Rural Residential.** The potential impacts of a landfill on this use include,
 - potential contamination of domestic water supply,
 - potential contamination due to wind and airborne pollution,
 - potential noise and visual impact,
 - potential traffic congestion and safety hazard to school age children,

- potential odour and litter impact;

On the basis of these potential impacts, the compatibility of a landfill with a rural residential use in the immediate vicinity of Site D is considered to be 'low'. Since a substantial number of residences are involved, and some are quite close to the source of impact, the compatibility adjusted for number and distance would still be considered as 'low'.

o **Agriculture.** This use may experience,

- potential contamination of ground water and soils, and farm water supply,
- potential contamination due to wind and airborne pollution,
- potential conflicts between landfill traffic and more slowly moving farm implements,
- potential litter hazard to livestock through direct ingestion or contamination of feed,
- potential for gulls and vermin to act as vectors of livestock disease and crop contamination,
- potential for reduced yields due to vermin;
- potential marketing problems due to stigma or contamination,
- potential fragmentation of farmlands;

This leads to the assessment of compatibility of a landfill at Site D and a nearby agricultural property as 'low'. Since many such properties are involved, and some of these are quite close to the landfill, the adjusted assessment would still be 'low'.

o **Owner Occupied Agriculture.** Potential impacts in this use would combine all the impacts encountered in both rural residential uses and agriculture. One additional potential impact, because the farm family lives on the property, would be,

- disruption of the farm community;

In light of the previous conclusions, potential compatibility of a landfill with an owner occupied farm would also be considered to be 'low'. Since there are 3 such farms, and two are considered to be direct abutters, the adjusted assessment for compatibility is also 'low'.

4.2 Site F

The Site F study area consists of a mixture of uses, including industrial uses, a public use and public utility easements, a park with recreational facilities, and rural residential. Some of the terrain is disturbed and some of the land lies vacant. Site F is well buffered by many of these uses from the nearest urban residential areas, which are located approximately 800 metres to the south, 900 metres to the west, and 1300 metres to the east. There are no businesses reported in association with the Site F rural residential uses.

Site F consists of sloping terrain which drains naturally southward. All residential areas downgradient of the site are on, or could be connected to, municipal water service. Water supplies for residences upgradient of the site are not considered to be at risk.

The compatibility of a landfill with the four main land use groupings characterizing the Site F study area follow:

- o **Rural Residential.** The potential impacts of a landfill on rural residential at Site F are considered to be:
 - potential contamination due to wind and airborne pollution,
 - potential noise and visual impact,
 - potential traffic congestion and safety hazard to school age children,
 - potential odour and litter impact;

Contamination of water supply is not considered to be a potential impact at Site F. As a result, the compatibility rating for this use is found to be 'low-moderate'. However, in view of the relatively small number of dwellings affected, and their distance from the landfill, the adjusted compatibility rating is considered to be 'moderate'.

- o **Recreational.** Potential impacts at Bayview Park could be expected to include,
 - potential contamination due to wind and airborne pollution,

- potential noise and visual impact,
- potential traffic congestion and safety hazard to school age children,
- potential odour and litter impact;

Impacts on a recreational use at Site F would be quite similar to impacts on residential use in the same location. Since recreational uses are generally regarded as being more tolerant of disturbance than residential uses, a compatibility rating of 'moderate-high' is considered appropriate. However, taking distance into account, Bayview Park being substantially closer to the landfill than the nearest rural residential uses, this rating is adjusted to 'moderate'. Water supply is again not likely to sustain an impact. Compatibility of a landfill with this use is therefore found to be 'moderate'.

- o **Industrial.** Potential impacts on existing industrial uses within the study area are likely to include,

- potential contamination due to wind and airborne pollution,
- potential noise and visual impact,
- potential traffic congestion,
- potential odour and litter impact;

Potential impacts with this use would be reduced by one further factor, hazard to school age children. Industrial uses are considered to be more tolerant of certain impacts than residential uses. However, impacts relating to health and safety are still of importance, particularly if the grounds are being used for lunch, breaks and recreational purposes. Compatibility is therefore assessed as 'moderate'. When distance is taken into consideration (the closest industrial building is more than 500 metres from the landfill), the adjusted compatibility is considered to be 'moderate-high'.

- o **Public Uses and Public Utilities.** No major impacts have been identified for this group of uses. Compatibility is considered to be 'high'.

5 HUMAN IMPACTS AT SITE D

This section examines the human impacts which are likely to be experienced by residents and abutters if a landfill is located at Site D.

5.1 On-site Residents

On-site residents will either be acquired or expropriated. The following people would be affected.

- **W. & D. Martin, Residence, Airstrip and Antique Aircraft Restoration Business.** Mr. & Mrs. Martin have lived on this property for 22 years. Mr. Martin's antique aircraft restoration business is relatively unique, and if closed, would represent a loss to the community as a whole. Mr. Martin intends to go on working in his present location until retirement. Rebuilding his entire complex in some other location would be a major undertaking, and even if adequately compensated, it would be difficult for Mr. Martin to find a new site today which would meet all the necessary physical, locational and planning requirements of such a business.
- **T. & M. J. Martin, Residence.** The Martins spent 5 years saving for their first custom house and one year supervising its construction. They have just recently moved in.
- **Reed, Century Farmhouse, Dog Grooming and Breeding Business and Painting Studio.** The Reeds and their son have lived at this location for two years. Prior to moving in, the Reeds had spent a lengthy period searching for a property with a century farmhouse to restore, and suitable facilities for dog breeding and grooming, breeding exotic birds, and painting. Mrs. Reed is concerned, after having just moved, disrupted her dog breeding program and had to rebuild her dog grooming clientele, that she will now have to start all over again. Mr. Reed is personally restoring their century farmhouse, a heritage feature known as 'the Ford Farmhouse' in EA documentation.
- **Tomosky, Designated Heritage Dwelling.** Mr. and Mrs. Tomosky are a retired couple. They have restored their Provincially designated Heritage dwelling, and wish to remain in this location.
- **Miller-Elga Investments, Residence and Farmland.** The residence, which had previously been vacant, was recently destroyed by fire.

- o **Newman, Residence and Garden Centre.** The Newmans have 2 children, and derive their entire income from their on-site business.

A landfill at Site D would result in the loss of 5 dwellings and associated improvements, including one century farmhouse and one Heritage dwelling. Three businesses which are principal sources of household income would be displaced, of which at least one is unlikely to reopen. Ten adults and 3 children would have to be relocated, including one retired couple.

5.1.1 Abutters and Nearby Residents

- o **Chaput, Residence and Airstrip.** Mr. Chaput, who is a DC-8 pilot, and Mrs. Chaput, who is a flight attendant, have lived at this address for 5 years. They bought this property because it was conveniently located in terms of access to their jobs at Pearson International Airport, while still being in a country environment. In addition, the property already had a lighted landing strip and hanger, which Mr. Chaput could use for his private plane and ultralight. Mr. Chaput believes that since his approach would be directly over the landfill, the gulls attracted to the landfill would make any further use of the landing strip too hazardous, and he would be obliged to move in order to continue his personal flying activities.
- o **Chlon, Residence.** The Chlons have lived here for 6 years. Mr. Chlon was forced to sell his business and retire due to ill health. The Chlons purchased this house for their retirement. They are concerned that if they had to sell at a loss, this would have a serious financial affect on their retirement.
- o **Pompa, Residence.** The Pompa's are a retired couple who have lived at this address for 7 years. They custom built this home for their retirement, including a self-contained apartment unit to supplement their income. They garden one acre for food supply, also to supplement income. Mr. Pompa supervised the construction of the house and did a substantial amount of the finishing work himself. The house is landscaped with a decorative pond in the front lawn directly across from the proposed landfill. The Pompa's are concerned about the many potential impacts of a landfill right outside their front door and feel that their retirement may be seriously affected.
- o **Dhillon, Farm and Residence.** The Dhillon family have lived on this site for 2 years. They farm the land, raising corn and soybeans. They have a large garage and implelement shed on the property, and are now in the process of finishing their house.

- **Ketelaars, Residence.** Mr. Ketelaars has an automation machinery business and keeps a business plane at the Burlington Airpark, which he frequently uses. Mr. Ketelaars is concerned about the health of his 3 young, pre-school children, and of Mrs. Ketelaars, who is home all day taking care of them.
- **Mishos, Residence and Stable.** Mr. & Mrs. Mishos have lived at this address for 12 years and have 2 children. They have built the property up from a vacant lot, over a period of 15 years, because they had planned to live and retire here. Improvements include an 8 stall insulated stable, many trees and a small orchard, a pond and an above ground swimming pool.
- **Seehaver, Residence.** The Seehavers have lived here for two years. They have 4 school aged children who go school by bus. They are concerned about traffic, water contamination, and other potential impacts of the landfill
- **Tichbon, Residence.** The Tichbons have lived at this address for 3 years and have 2 young children. They are concerned about traffic safety when their children reach school age, potential contamination of water supply, and the loss of their country environment.
- **Santarosa, Residence and Boarding Stable.** This property has recently been leased to new tenants, the Grahams, who are using the facilities to run a boarding stable. This is a part time occupation, although it is a registered business.
- **Goldenberg, Residence and Farmland.** Mrs. Curtis, who is retired and lives here with her son, has been a tenant at this address for 26 years.
- **Winter, Residence and Dairy Farm.** The Winters have lived on this property, with their two young daughters, for 1 year. They have a 46 head dairy herd, and crop some of their own livestock feed on the property. The Winters bought the property specifically because it was already set up for milk production. They are concerned about the quality of their farm water supply, which is particularly important for the hygienic conditions required on a dairy farm. They have a water impoundment which is fed directly by a Site D drainage tributary. The prevailing wind also comes across their property from Site D.
- **Vitteta, Abbatoir.** This use would be sensitive to any form of above or below ground pollution.

- **Vertulia, Gallery Artist, Breeding and Boarding Kennel.** Mrs. Vertulia, who has lived at this address for 22 years, is a successful artist and breeder of English setters. She has designed and landscaped her grounds, which include the compound of a substantial brick kennel. She is concerned about the view, traffic noise; the environment of the landfill creating an unfavourable impression on her painting clientele; and the effect of a polluted water supply on her dog breeding and boarding.
- **Gillies, Registered Polled Hereford Breeding Farm.** Mr. & Mrs. Gillies, have been at this address for 28 years. The Gillies, who breed Herefords and also grow field crops locally, have built up most of this property by themselves. They are concerned about the effect of a contaminated water supply on their family and their 120 head of Herefords, movement of farm implements by road, and contamination of crops by seagulls. The Gillies have also restored a century farmhouse on their property, which they rent. The two storied building has a direct view of Site D.
- **Hall, Residence.** The Halls are a retired couple, and have lived at this address for 16 years. They do woodworking and gardening on the property, and derive 30% of their income from their property.
- **Jarvis, Residence.** The Jarvis family, who have lived here 27 years, are the younger descendants (see below) of the original homesteading family who obtained this land by Crown Grant in 1856. They are concerned about visual impact, water supply, truck traffic and access to their own site, pollution borne by vermin and gulls, and odour borne across their property by the prevailing wind.
- **Jarvis, Stone Residence.** The property is occupied by 3 senior members of the original Crown Grant homestead family, and one other adult. Three are retired, and one works part-time. Part of their land has already been expropriated for public purposes, a Regional sludge storage facility. The stately old house of grey Escarpment stone, in which they live, was built by John Jarvis in 1856.

Location of a landfill at Site D would result in potential disruption of up to 22 households with 64 inhabitants, 42 adults and 22 children. 3 businesses, and 3 owner occupied farms might also be affected. Financial impact on those who consider it necessary to move could be quite severe, because of potential losses in equity, particularly in the case of retired households and businesses or farms with a substantial investment.

6 VISUAL IMPACT

This section examines the potential visual impacts of a landfill at Site D and Site F, with an emphasis on impacts which might be experienced by the immediately surrounding properties, inhabitants and users.

6.1 Distances from Fill Area and View Angles

Distances were measured for each dwelling at Site D and Site F within 500 metres of the fill area, from the closest point in the dwelling to the nearest point in the fill area. This is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Distance of Dwellings from Fill Area: Site D & Site F

<i>Distance from Fill Area (metres)</i>	<i>Site D (dwellings)</i>	<i>Site F (dwellings)</i>
150 - 199	2	-
200 - 249	1	-
250 - 299	3	-
300 - 349	-	-
350 - 399	1	-
400 - 449	1	-
450 - 499	-	2

View angles were calculated for the same dwellings by measuring the horizontal angle occupied by the landfill when seen from the dwelling and expressing this as a percentage of viewshed, taken as 180 degrees. This is presented in Table 4 below, expressed as a frequency distribution.

Table 4 View Angle as a Proportion of Viewshed: Site D & Site F

<i>View Angle as Proportion of Viewshed (%)</i>	<i>Site D (dwellings)</i>	<i>Site F (dwellings)</i>
70 - 79	2	-
60 - 69	1	-
50 - 59	-	-
40 - 49	1	-
30 - 39	3	-
20 - 29	1	2

View angles were also calculated for one residence (the Gillies' century farmhouse) considered representative of the cluster of Highway 25 dwellings opposite Site D, and for two dwellings (one closest, and one with the greatest view angle) considered representative of the nearest Plains Road Community dwellings opposite site F. The Gillies farmhouse view angle was measured to the landfill, not the Highway 25 screening berms, in order to remain consistent with the other data for comparative purposes.

The results of Table 4 show a significantly greater visual impact on the 8 Site D residences within 500 metres, which are rated in accordance with the Region's Visual Analysis Technical Report criteria as 'high', in comparison with the 2 Site F residences within 500 metres, which are rated as 'low to medium'.

The Site F Visual Analysis Technical Report states on page 14 that:

"...the correlation between visual impact and distance from the proposed landfill is not linear. The impact is significantly higher when in close proximity to the site. Thus there is much greater difference in impact between the high and medium categories than between the medium and low categories. For these reasons, the medium to low categories were combined."

Therefore it is possible that the above ratings actually understate the relative difference between the visual impacts potentially experienced by these two groups of housing.

Comparing view angles between the Highway 25 representative dwelling and the Plains Road Community representative dwellings, it was found that the view angle from the Gillies farmhouse on the west side of Highway 25 was 36% of the 180 degree viewshed, which is considered by Technical Report criteria to be 'high', while at Site F the closest dwelling in the Plains Road Community had a view angle of 14%, and the dwelling with the greatest view angle in the same row of houses was 21%, both of which come under the category of 'low to medium'.

6.2 Landfill Profile at Site D

A field investigation was conducted in order to determine the visual outlines of the proposed landfill at Site D, as seen from the closest dwellings, which are located along the west side of First Line. The Pompa residence was selected as being a typical example for this cluster of dwellings. A 20 foot (6.1 metre) scale, similar to a surveyor's range pole, was erected within the landfill site at two distances from the First Line property boundary corresponding to the highest point in the screening berm (8 metres high at 60 metres from the property line) and the highest visible point of the landfill (16 metres high at 225 metres from the property line). Photographs were taken of the scale in these two locations, from the walk of the Pompa residence immediately in front of the main entry.

On the basis of these photographs it is considered possible to identify the likely visual impact of the landfill on a nearby residence along First Line, as follows:

- o the top of the berm would block out the view of the horizon looking east, to a height above the horizon equivalent to approximately twice the average height of trees in the woodlot at the center of the site.
- o The berm would also obscure the view of the fields looking east, from the horizon to the property line along First Line.
- o the berm would create the impression of a closed-off view to the east, in place of the present panoramic view. The east side of First Line would be occupied by an embankment 8 metres high (26.2 feet) running the length of First Line from Lower Baseline to Britannia Road.
- o the profile of the berm would be unnatural in appearance. It is likely that it would be perceived as an engineering works and a man made feature. The natural character of the countryside would be adversely affected.

The assessment of this type of a visual impact is somewhat subjective, however, there is little doubt that a significant impact would occur. Taking into account not only the absolute appearance of the berm, but also the extent to which the landscape would have been changed and the timeframe of this

change, the net visual impact of these factors on the cluster of 8 dwellings along First Line is considered to be 'high', and in the case of the closest dwellings, 'severe'.