

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2015 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

Present: K. McNeill (Chair) Y. Roy
H. Wheeler M. Mosco
C. Oaks M. Wilson
L. Renzetti

Regrets: N. Yap, S. Jobber

City: P. Patel, A. Watts, M. Ursic (Beacon Environmental)

External Groups: Yousif Kazandji, Dunsire Developments
Todd Fell, Dougan & Associates
Larry Freiburger, AET Group Inc.
Tanya Lonsdale, Brann Consulting
Steven Aboud, Aboud & Associates
Ryan Hamelin, Aboud & Associates
Shari Muscat, Stantec Consulting
Melissa Straus, Stantec Consulting
Pamela Kraft, Fusion Homes
Kevin Moniz, Strik, Baldinelli, Moniz
Luke Boudreau, Chancellors Way Medical Arts Centre
Ryan Archer, NRSI
Jeff Martin, NRSI
Michael Watt, property owner

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Call and Certification of Quorum

Attendance was noted and a quorum was declared.

3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest or Conflict of Interest

None

4. 0, 24, 26, 28 Landsdown EIR TOR

M. Ursic, from Beacon Environmental reviewed the staff report on behalf of the City of Guelph and was available to respond to questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

No further comments from Dougan & Associates.

General discussion took place and the Environmental Advisory Committee noted the following:

- Why is the location of the trail in relation to wetland buffer to be outside the first 15 m “to the greatest extent possible”? M. Ursic responded that there are several constraints related to accommodating the required SWM facilities / measures and working around adjacent property lines that make it challenging to keep the trail in the outer 15 m of the wetland buffer in all locations.
- Has reflective glass on houses been considered to reduce bird collisions? M. Ursic responded that it hasn’t been discussed for this development.
- The infiltration galleries are located on private property, and may be difficult to maintain. Dunsire Developments responded that the property owners will be notified of the infiltration gallery, that it is a part of draft plan conditions, and will be documented through the Condo registration.

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by C. Oakes and seconded by H. Wheeler

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee accept the Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) for Lots 0, 24, 26 and 28 Landsdown Drive prepared by Dougan and Associates (July 27, 2015) with the following conditions:

That wetland vegetation monitoring for any locally significant species identified for protection or transplanting, and invasive species management activities is included;

That tree compensation be 3:1 for all trees requiring compensation outside the cultural plantation, and an area-based compensation (10 m²:1) for the cultural plantation, as outlined in the 2nd EIS Addendum to the City;

That post-construction monitoring for erosion and sediment control be extended for approximately two years; and

That interpretive signs include information about the key sensitivities of the adjacent wetland, as well as the role of the infiltration galleries (and possibly other SWM measures) in helping to protect the wetland.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

5. 200 Chancellors Way EIS

P. Patel, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

R. Hamelin from Aboud & Associates provided a background of the application and commented on various concerns outlined in the staff report.

T. Lonsdale from Braun Consulting discussed the history of the pathway and indicated that Chancellors Way is a private road. The pathway is not considered a trail, it's a private walkway. The upper walkway will be closed off and lower walkway will be opened up bringing people out to Chancellors Way.

General discussion took place around the new walkway and blocking off the old walkway.

Comments from EAC Committee:

- Clarification that tree 647 will be kept
- Discussion about snow storage area
- Strongly encourage LID technologies to help facilitate SWM

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by L. Renzetti and seconded by C. Oakes

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the Scoped Environmental Impact Study prepared by Aboud & Associates Inc. for 200 Chancellors Way subject to the following:

That an EIS Addendum is provided to the satisfaction of the City Staff which includes:

- A revised buffer analysis and associated mapping which protects all hedgerow trees (adjacent to the Significant Woodland) and provides sufficient tree protection zone for all edge trees to avoid future liability and safety issue from future dieback of these trees post-development;
- Review of Grading Plan, Functional Servicing Report and all associated drawings and documents and reflects any changes to the conclusion of ‘no negative impacts’ to the Significant Woodland and associated buffers;
- That the EIS Addendum note that the trail construction timing will allow it to open by the time the existing trail is closed; and
- That the landscape/restoration plan within the buffer area ensures entry through this area is discouraged.

AND

That an Environmental Implementation Report including but not limited to the following is prepared prior to site plan, tree permit and/or site alteration permit applications to the satisfaction of the City Staff and EAC:

- Details of Buffer Enhancement, Edge Management and Invasive Species Management in consideration of the detailed grading plan, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and other construction drawings. This should include restoration landscape plans including any required clean up or debris removal and invasive species management;
- Details of Monitoring Plan and Approach including but not limited to buffer enhancement, edge management, invasive species management, construction and post-construction monitoring;
- Hanlon Creek Subwatershed Studies recommendations for lot level infiltration practices & vegetative best management practices which promote natural as opposed to structural infiltration be explored as part of the EIR and be integrated through the review of the detailed engineering submissions;
- Consider how buffer will be protected from encroachment;
- A Detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan supported by an Erosion and Sediment Control Report in accordance with the GRCA adopted Erosion and Sediment Control Guideline for Urban Construction (2006);

AND

That the TOR of the EIR is submitted prior to the EIR submission to the satisfaction of City Staff and that the EIR is submitted to the satisfaction of EAC and City Staff.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

6. Kortright Phase 4 EIR Addendum TOR

Y. Roy declared a conflict of interest.

P. Patel, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

S. Muscat from Stantec Consulting provided a brief background on the application and outlined various concerns in the staff report:

- Policy requirements related to conformity to the current Provincial Policy Statement (2014).
- Assessment of changes was not required previously; assessment was already undertaken as part of the original draft plan of subdivision.
- FOC2-2 was assessed as part of the original application and was originally accepted by the City and the GRCA.
- An impact assessment is an EIS requirement not EIR. Draft plan hasn't changed and the development concept hasn't changed so this shouldn't be required.
- Additional monitoring can be added.
- Preservation of existing woodland should have already been dealt with in original submission.

Comments from EAC Committee:

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by M. Wilson and seconded by H. Wheeler

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Implementation Report prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. with the following motion:

That a revised EIR TOR be submitted to the satisfaction of the City Environmental Planner addressing the following conditions:

- That the EIR TOR be revised so that the proposed outline of the report matches with the Table of Contents;
- That updates to the policy requirements including conformity to the 2014 PPS policies and consideration and regard for the City of Guelph's 2014 Official Plan policies be provided under a new sub-section 1.6 Policy Conformance Requirements.
 - Draft Plan for the site was approved after 2014 PPS came into effect.
 - EAC suggests that the significance of the woodland FOC2-2 which is contiguous with the previously staked Significant Woodland and Significant Wildlife Habitat be revised to reflect the existing conditions and functions.
 - EAC suggests that a serious consideration of preservation of existing woodland such as FOC2-2 which is contiguous with the Significant Woodland and Significant Wildlife Habitat feature and the hedgerow south of the property be addressed as part of the EIR.
- That Section 3 Proposed Development be revised to include separate sub-section on Stormwater Management Plan with a summary and updates to Stormwater Management Criteria and approach, grading and post development drainage patterns, quality control, LID options, peak flow control and centralized infiltration, water balance and erosion and sediment

control plan & report in accordance with Erosion and Sediment Control Guideline for Urban Construction (2006);

- That Section 3.3 be revised to Site Grading and Drainage Plan;
- That Section 3.4 Trails be revised to provide clarification that the detailed trail plans be supported by an analysis confirming no negative impacts to the Natural Heritage System;
- That a separate section be included to provide updates with regards to impacts associated with Trails, Road, Stormwater Management Facilities, and Other, specific to vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat, and the Natural Heritage System designations through the study area;
- That the Section on Mitigation of Potential Impacts be revised to ‘Conservation and Management Measures.’ Further that this Section include the following:
 - Sub-section on Restoration, Enhancement and Buffer Management Plan be included, along with details on edge management for the woodlands and details on wildlife crossing locations and construction details.
 - Sub-section on Stormwater Management Facility be included.
 - That environmental education signage locations and construction details be provided as part of the Landscape Plan.
 - Subsection Access Control/Fencing be revised specifying buffer plantings and property demarcation fence will be used for private lots abutting public open space and details illustrating the fence locations, construction detail and buffer plantings will be submitted as part of the EIR.
 - Sub-section Erosion and Sediment Control Plan provide summary based on description under Stormwater Management Plan subsection under Section 3.
- That a separate section for monitoring including compliance and performance monitoring be included along with any updates as necessary. That a template for Erosion and Sediment Control Inspection report be submitted as part of this section;
- That a spreadsheet with a list of all commitments including but not limited to suggested recommendations, mitigation measures, compensation, restoration and enhancement and monitoring elements be submitted as part of the EIR;
- That trail plans be added to the list of appendices;
- That impacted trees be compensated at 3:1 within the buffers and/or adjacent areas to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) to enhance the ecological function and/or attain a net ecological gain to the NHS;

AND

That comments from GRCA on the Kortright Phase 4 EIR Addendum TOR be addressed prior to the submission of the EIR Addendum.”

**Motion Carried
- 6 in favour, 1 abstained-**

7. 60 Arkell Road (Gallery Towns) EIR TOR

P. Patel, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

R. Archer from NRSI had no objections to the staff report and provided clarification related to GRCA comments.

The Environment Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by C. Oakes and seconded H. Wheeler

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee accept the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Implementation Report prepared by NRSI (June 29, 2015) with the following conditions:

- That GRCA comments for the EIR TOR be addressed to the satisfaction of GRCA;
- That the design of the trail layout as required by Parks Planning supported by mitigation measures and an analysis confirming no impacts to the Natural Heritage System be included as part of the refined trail layout for the EIR submission as per June 2015 EAC motion;
- That detailed analysis of the impacts associated with the refined trail layout integrate the spring and summer inventory, and the tree inventory and preservation plan, and include a figure showing all sensitive plant species, wildlife and wildlife habitat within 25 m of the refined trail layout;
- That pre-treatment directly upstream of bio-retention units be considered through the detailed design, and the necessary field investigations to test the effectiveness of the proposed LID measures be undertaken as part of the EIR;
- That a template for Erosion and Sediment Control Inspection Report be submitted as part of the Monitoring Section of the EIR;
- That a spreadsheet with a list of all commitments including but not limited to suggested recommendations, mitigation measures, compensation, restoration and enhancement and monitoring elements be submitted as part of the EIR;
- That additional need for 10 year and 15 year performance and effectiveness monitoring be explored through the EIR;

- That contingency measures assuming potential die-back of transplanted specimens be provided with consideration of seed collection and contract growing as an option;
- That inspection of restoration plantings be undertaken during each of the 2 years of the warranty period preferably in fall;
- That permanent sub-plots be used for monitoring, and that ELC survey of the permanent 10 x 10 m plots be considered during each monitoring event and be included as part of the monitoring report; and
- That post-construction monitoring be revised to 3 years and begin at 95% build-out and following stabilization as required under the Erosion and Sediment Control Inspection and Monitoring.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

Motion to extend meeting past 10:00 p.m.

Moved by Y. Roy and seconded L. Renzetti

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

8. 1888 Gordon (Tricar) EIS TOR

P. Patel, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

AET provided no further comments.

General discussion took place and the Environmental Advisory Committee noted the following:

- Questioned why they are receiving a development application when a secondary plan is starting in this area. Planning Staff to provide clarification to EAC.
- Comments on protection of the wetland.

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by M. Mosco and seconded M. Wilson

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee defers the Terms of Reference for an Environmental Impact Study prepared by AET for 1888 Gordon St, until clarification has been provided from the City on how the planning process informs development within the Secondary Plan area;

AND

That a revised EIS TOR is resubmitted which:

- Address whether or not the wetland on site is part of the Halls Pond PSW Complex (with commitment to use continuous data loggers), and clarifies the classification of the wetland under OPA 42 as part of Guelph’s Natural Heritage System;
- Includes a screening of existing and potential SWH and Habitat for Significant Species;
- Includes a program for field studies to assess for SWH and Habitat for Significant Species that includes detailed field methodologies based on the completed screening and 3-season vegetation survey;
- Identifies whether any additional field work is required in order to satisfy Endangered Species Act requirements pertaining to Species At Risk;
- Identifies that a Tree Inventory is required as part of an EIS and includes details regarding the proposed Tree Inventory;
- Includes a section to analyze and address all policy requirements; and
- Within Section 8) Description of the Proposed Development, please ensure that any infrastructure (including SWM, LID technologies with an emphasis on Vegetated BMP) that is part of the proposed development is included within the description, and that it is equally included in Sections 7, 9 and 10 as applicable.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

9. Approval of Minutes from July 8, 2015

Moved by M. Wilson and seconded by Y. Roy

“To accept the minutes as amended.”

**Motion Carried
5 in favour, 2 abstained**

10. Correspondence & Information

11. Other Business

- P. Patel distributed material for October’s meeting
- September meeting applications-Harts Farm and 55 Cityview

12. Next Meeting- September 9, 2015

13. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Moved by C. Oakes and seconded by Y. Roy

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

CHAIRMAN