

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2017 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**CITY HALL MEETING ROOM C
MINUTES**

Present: C. Oakes (Chair) M. Wilson
A. Baron A. Miller
A. Singh L. Todd
L. Renzetti

Regrets: V. Capmourteres

City: A. Nix, A. Labbe, M. Myhill

External Groups: Lloyd Grinham – Grinham Architects
Caroline Prochazka – Grinham Architects
Todd Fell – Dougan & Associates
John Vanos – University of Guelph
Eric Lyons – University of Guelph
Steve Davies – Matrix Solutions
John Ambrose – Delegate

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.

Introduction of EACs newest member.

3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest or Conflict of Interest

None

4. 190 – 216 Arkell Road

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

General comments:

- No specific infiltration targets – discussion around water budget analysis, wetland water balance and adjacency to wetland

- No underground parking facility or parking lot proposed at this time, development will provide parking for each on the units and will need space for visitor parking/accessible parking per the City's zoning requirements
- Questions around the driveway along the NE boundary and its removals – this is being looked at in relation to multiple applications and will need to be addressed
- Development applications bordering PSW and their cumulative effects – this site is one of the last around the Torrance PSW. Hopefully post construction monitoring will assist with assessing this
- Discussion around buffer analysis at Dawes Avenue needing to be in scope – less than 30 metres is proposed in order to bring the road onto the site. Alignment of Dawes Ave was shifted when the adjacent land was developed in an effort to have the future road extension be outside of the wetland boundary – however the wetland limit has been revised

Comments from NSRI:

- Accepts comments from the City and EAC and will address in updated TOR
- Discussion around trail network – sidewalks within right of way would provide pedestrian connections which has been discussed with Parks as well
- Field surveys for significant wildlife habitat – map will be provided that shows different monitoring stations and discrepancies in screening tables will be updated to include any additional surveys
- MNRF has provided a formal document for SAR snakes which will be included in updated TOR
- MTE will be completing ground water monitoring program and detailed water balance
- TOR identified tree inventory would take place 10-15 m into the edge from proposed development
- Reference 2016 Guelph District MNRF for treed habitats and bats
- MNRF Guelph District is planning to have descriptions for SAR bats in near future
- Significant wildlife habitat analysis – relate rationale back to MNRFs criteria and if data cannot carry forward into EIS, rule out
- Provide consideration of impacts to features where limits extend beyond 120 metres
- Identify where SAR have been considered and type of study in terms of specific species
- In the EIS stage the trail alignment proximity to the wetland buffer and trail concept plan will be done by a landscape architect – looking at trail from trail connectivity perspective in that area and not just relying on pedestrian access

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss.

Moved by L. Todd and seconded by L. Renzetti,

THAT a revised EIS TOR is provided which includes:

- **A more detailed description of the proposed undertaking recognizing the necessary trail connections and storm water management facilities that will be part of the development;**
- **That the trail alignments clearly illustrate the proximity to the wetland and buffer area and that the preliminary design will be completed by a Landscape Architect (member of the OALA);**

- **Clarification as it relates to the field study program including point/plot locations for amphibian, breeding bird and crepuscular bird surveys;**
- **Clarification that the EIS will include an evaluation of significance for Significant Wildlife Habitat and Habitat for Significant Species, as applicable and that this be carried into the impact assessment;**
- **Consideration for the protection of ground water functions including recharge, as well as recommendations or requirements from the Torrance Creek Subwatershed Study within the EIS; and,**
- **Identification of Opportunities for protection, enhancement and restoration of trees within the Urban Forest as part of the EIS;**
- **The use of current protocols for bat surveys (including SAR bats) of treed habitats and buildings as available from Guelph District MNRF;**
- **Clear rationale for the identification of candidate SWH that reflects MNRF's Criteria Schedules for Ecoregion 6E.**

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

5. Guelph Turfgrass Institute Relocation

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

General Discussion:

- Water balance for the original report had larger study area based on previous site plan, 2.4 hectare not within tributary catchment area
- Clarification around risk management associated with Source Water Protection and the need for a risk management and salt management plans at Site Plan stage
- Consideration of ecological value of constructed wetland – SWM infrastructure is not habitat
- Compensation wetland receiving flows from SWM facility and ability to have clean water going into this
- Discussion around habitat classification provided by the MNRF

Comments from Dougan:

- They will address City and EAC comments successfully
- Dr. Whitely's dataset was incomplete but his interpretation is valued and aligns with Dougan's
- Will include statement in report that data received by Dr. Whitely will not be included in analysis
- Inaccuracies in the Water Balance table (15, 16, 17) on page 35 – Dougan to address
- Provide clarity around the numbers in tables, 19, 29, 21 on page 41
- Significant discussion around tile drainage and water balance
- Consider impacts to significant species and carry forward in adaptive monitoring plan

Delegation: John Ambrose

- Consider Barn Swallows that were nesting in equipment sheds
- Section 6.1.4 – City should ensure this is looked after and some kind of monitoring should be put in place
- Grasslands and meadows provide significant habitat but are prime development areas – what can be done to protect these?
- Weakness of institutional zoning – this area is open space
- Chemicals being introduced into stream drainage are registered chemicals known to have impacts and monitoring is needed. Nutrient loading is also a concern.
- Consider wildlife management issues that may occur due to conflicting use of turf research and arboretum, and propose measures to address them
- Consider insect control
- Consider enhancements to the stream system that goes through Arboretum

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss.

Moved by A. Baron and seconded by L. Todd,

THAT the meeting be extended past 10:00 PM

**Motion Carried
-6 moved, 1 abstained-**

Moved by L. Renzetti and seconded by A. Baron,

The Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the EIS Addendum #2 by Dougan and Associates dated November 2016, subject to the following conditions:

THAT an EIS Addendum #3 is prepared in the form of a Letter Report to the satisfaction of staff which:

- **Clarifies the habitat restoration goal and conceptual design;**
- **Includes information regarding the impacts associated with servicing;**
- **Updates the impact analysis for water quality and quantity to include impacts and mitigation measures where it is currently indicated no impact;**
- **Clarifies how all compensation habitat will be protected long term given the universities institutional zoning;**
- **Referring to figure SK-14F that was presented at the EAC committee meeting, Jan 11, 2017, presenting the SWM strategy, EAC requests that a cost analysis be conducted to explore the opportunity to replace the SWM infrastructure (SWM facility, storm pipes, OGS, and infiltration gallery) with a strategy that uses only permeable pavers to manage stormwater;**
- **That a monitoring well be shown on the drawings, and that monitoring of the permeable pavers is a requirement;**
- **Considers expanding upon the water quality monitoring to include nutrients;**
- **Revisit numbers presented in the water balance table and include irrigation component to the tables; and**

THAT an Environmental Implementation Report is prepared in support of the Site Plan application and include:

- **A stormwater management design brief that incorporates LID as recommended in the EIS Addendum #2;**
- **A servicing report which includes information regarding the limit of disturbance and minimizes impacts to trees along College Avenue;**
- **A detailed Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan for Phase 2 of the development and a comprehensive compensation plan which considers all phases of the development;**
- **Detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plans;**
- **Integration of EIS recommendations onto drawings (i.e., wildlife sighting protocol, etc.);**
- **A habitat restoration plan that support mitigating/offsetting impacts to Habitat for Significant Species;**
- **Detailed Landscape Plans prepared by a member of the OALA;**
- **A detailed adaptive monitoring plan including monitoring stations, design and reporting guidelines and deadlines. The adaptive monitoring and management plan be expanded to include potential management responses to rectify potential negative impacts, verify performance targets (e.g. habitat for target species), and unforeseen negative ecological impacts;**
- **A maintenance plan for the permeable pavers, and any other LID features, developed as a requirement of the EIR; and**
- **As part of the EIR EAC requires a vegetated filter strip be designed as part of the buffer to the tributary that receives runoff from the site to release water as sheet flow.**

**Motion Carried
-6 moved, 1 abstained-**

6. Approval of Minutes from December 14, 2016

Moved by **L. Renzetti** and seconded by **A. Singh**,

THAT the Minutes from the December 14, 2016 meeting be approved.

**Motion Carried
- 6 moved, 1 abstained-**

7. Correspondence & Information

- Review EnviroGuide for next meeting
- Updated appendices for binder
- Vice chair position available
- Still working through Victoria Park Village EIR

8. Next Meeting- February 8, 2017

9. Adjourn

Moved by M. Wilson and seconded by A. Baron,

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

CHAIRMAN