

The **Miller Braeside Quarry** flyrock and blasting incidents (2005–2007) are among the most frequently cited examples in Ontario debates over quarry setbacks because they involved repeated complaints from nearby residents, documented flyrock exceeding the blast zone, and litigation over alleged property damage. Unlike the Pakenham case, there was no widely reported injury, but the incidents became central to discussions of blasting near residential areas.

Overview

Date	Incident	Reported consequence
2005	Flyrock escaped the quarry	Rocks reportedly travelled over 400 m , striking residential properties despite a 300 m setback
2007	Another production blast	Residents alleged structural damage, including foundation cracking; one homeowner claimed approximately CAD \$250,000 in damages

Quarry

The operation was:

- **Miller Braeside Quarry**
- Operated by **Miller Paving Limited** (later part of the Miller Group)
- Located near **Braeside, Ontario**, in McNab/Braeside Township west of Ottawa.

The quarry was operating under Ontario's **Aggregate Resources Act**.

2005 flyrock incident

This is the incident most often referenced in later research papers.

Reportedly:

- blast exclusion distance was approximately **300 metres**
- flyrock travelled **well beyond that distance**
- rocks reportedly landed in a nearby residential subdivision
- damage was reported to:
 - homes

- driveways
- private wells

Several reports state that flyrock travelled **more than 400 metres** from the blast.

The incident became an example used by researchers arguing that minimum quarry setbacks should exceed conventional blast exclusion distances.

What was damaged?

Sources describe damage including:

- siding
- roofs
- residential yards
- driveways
- well infrastructure

Most descriptions characterize the damage as property damage rather than catastrophic structural failure.

Unlike the Pakenham incident, there were **no reported injuries**.

Why was this significant?

The quarry reportedly maintained approximately a:

300 metre setback

Yet flyrock reportedly exceeded:

400 metres

This became one of several Ontario examples used to argue that setback distances should account for worst-case flyrock rather than average blasting performance.

Resident complaints

Residents reported concerns including:

- repeated blasting vibration
- flyrock
- dust
- noise
- fears regarding well contamination
- concern over declining property values

The quarry became the subject of numerous community meetings and municipal discussions during this period.

2007 blasting incident

A subsequent blast in **2007** did not primarily involve flyrock.

Instead, nearby homeowners alleged that blast vibration caused:

- foundation cracking
- structural movement
- additional residential damage

One homeowner reportedly claimed approximately:

CAD \$250,000

in damages.

That figure has been repeated in planning documents and quarry setback research.

It appears to represent the homeowner's claimed damages rather than a court-awarded amount.

Was liability established?

Available public sources do **not** indicate that a court ultimately determined Miller Paving was liable for the full claimed damages.

Instead, documents generally describe:

- allegations by residents
- engineering investigations
- insurance discussions
- municipal concern

No readily available judgment confirms a \$250,000 award.

Engineering issues

The incidents highlighted two different blasting hazards:

Flyrock

Physical rock projected beyond the quarry boundary.

Ground vibration

Residents alleged vibration from blasting caused structural damage.

These are technically separate phenomena.

Ontario blasting standards generally regulate:

- peak particle velocity (PPV)
- air overpressure
- blast design
- burden
- stemming
- timing

A blast can comply with vibration limits yet still generate flyrock if confinement is lost.

Regulatory response

The incidents were discussed during reviews of:

- Aggregate Resources Act policies
- Ontario quarry setback guidelines
- municipal planning processes

Researchers later cited the Braeside events as evidence that fixed minimum setbacks may not adequately protect nearby residential development.

Use in later research

The Braeside quarry became one of the principal Ontario case studies cited in papers advocating larger separation distances.

The incidents are frequently grouped with:

- Pakenham Quarry (2009)
- Duntroon Quarry
- several U.S. flyrock case histories

These publications argue that actual flyrock distances can substantially exceed planned exclusion zones.

Source of the 400 m figure

The statement that flyrock exceeded **400 metres** appears repeatedly in:

- Ontario quarry setback research papers
- planning submissions
- reports discussing mandatory minimum setbacks

Those documents describe flyrock reaching a residential neighbourhood beyond the quarry's 300 m setback.

However, I could not locate a contemporaneous Ministry of the Environment investigation report with detailed measurements comparable to the Pakenham case. Much of the later discussion relies on secondary sources that summarize the incident rather than reproducing original regulatory findings.

Source of the \$250,000 damage claim

The **\$250,000** figure consistently appears as:

a property owner's claim for damages following a 2007 blast.

Based on the publicly available material, it is best characterized as a **claimed amount**, not a judicial finding or settlement amount. I did not find evidence that the claim was adjudicated in a reported court decision.

What is well-supported versus less certain

Well-supported:

- A 2005 blast reportedly propelled flyrock beyond a 300 m setback into a nearby residential area.
- Property damage to homes, driveways, and wells was reported.
- Residents raised ongoing concerns about blasting impacts.
- A 2007 blast led to allegations of structural damage, including foundation cracking.
- One homeowner sought approximately **CAD \$250,000** in damages.

Less certain from the public record:

- The exact maximum flyrock distance (often cited as "over 400 m") is repeated in secondary literature but is not accompanied by a publicly available regulator's measurement report.
- The ultimate disposition of the homeowner's \$250,000 claim is not documented in publicly available court decisions.
- Detailed Ministry inspection reports, if they exist, do not appear to be readily accessible online.

The Braeside case is therefore well documented as an example of community impacts from quarry blasting, but the publicly available evidence is not as detailed or definitive as the documentation available for the 2009 Pakenham Quarry flyrock incidents.