

Good morning Michael,

Upon further review of the situation, I wish to offer some additional clarity which should be added to (or replace) MTO's previous correspondence.

The scope of MTO's review of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment, which proposes to permit an agricultural lot area of 4.0 hectares and 14.4 hectares (as opposed to 40 hectares), as well as the subsequent consent application, is limited to matters governed under the *Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act* (PTHIA) and associated guidelines, policies and best practices. MTO concerns are focused upon impact to the provincial highway system and/or future improvements to the provincial highway system.

As the subject property is included in lands evaluated within a Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment for improvements to the interchange of Hwy 401 and Hwy 4/Colonel Talbot, MTO must take into consideration any impact the zoning and consent applications may have on any of the proposed alternatives included within the study.

Two of the proposed alternatives (plans provided previously) may impact both the lands to be severed and the lands to be retained:

- Alternative 5 includes re-aligning the westbound Hwy 401 off-ramp along the south edge of the subject property; and
- Alternative 6 includes re-aligning Glanworth Drive along the south edge of the subject property.

If either of these alternatives is selected as the technically-preferred alternative, the location of the realigned road, as well as the possible property requirement may potentially impact access to/from the subject lands.

As such, MTO identified that we were unable to support the proposal until such time as a final decision was made regarding the Highway 401 or the Highway 401/Colonel Talbot Road interchange, and possible re-alignment of Glanworth Drive.

However, it should be clarified that MTO does not object to the proposed zoning bylaw amendment, and MTO further identifies that if access to the severed and retained lands can be accommodated in a manner that will not impact either Alternative 5 or 6 (i.e.: via one single, mutual access from Colonel Talbot Road), MTO's concerns in regard to access in conjunction with any possible Glanworth Drive realignment may be eliminated. It should also be noted that if Alternative 6 is selected as the appropriate design moving forward, the retained 14 ha farm parcel will gain significant frontage on the new Glanworth alignment, and the field access could eventually be shifted to that location.

The Proponent's Consultant has recently provided MTO with supplemental information, whereby the Owner has agreed to accommodate access to both the lands to be retained and lands to be severed via a single mutual shared access onto Colonel Talbot Road. MTO finds this proposal to be acceptable, and notes that a condition should be identified within the consent approval indicating that a permanent easement should be registered on title for both the lands to be severed and the lands to be retained in order to ensure unrestricted access to the lands to be retained.

I trust this clarifies MTO's position, however, should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Regards,

Jodie

Jodie Lucente | Corridor Management Planner
Ministry of Transportation