

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2015 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

Present: K. O'Reilly (Chair) Y. Roy
M. Mosco C. Parent
C. Oaks S. Jobber
N. Yap H. Wheeler

Regrets: B. Mungell

Staff: A. Labbé, Environmental Planner, C. Fach, Planning Clerk

External Groups: Melissa Straus, Stantec Consulting
Shari Muscat, Stantec Consulting
Pamela Kraft, Fusion Homes
Ben Jones, Fusion Homes
Ken Burrell, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.
Tara Brenton, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.
David Stephenson, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.
David Giugovaz, Valdor Engineering Inc.
Jackie Vandervelde, Land Art Design Landscape Architects Inc.
Jessi McLellan, ABA
Carrie Curtis, ABA
Astrid Clos, Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants
Hugh Whitely, Delegate
Charles Cecile, Nature Guelph

1. Call to Order

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

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. Development Applications

a) 9 Valley Road, 1242, 1250 and 1260 Gordon Street

Adele presented the report to the committee. She noted that comments on the TOR from the GRCA were received on November 26, 2014 and that Parks Planning has requested the EIS examine potential for a trail connection. A study area map was requested to be included as part of the TOR. In addition to other comments outlined in the report, clarification was requested with respect to chimney crayfish surveys, indicating that staff are not certain where the habitat is located. It was also noted that a pre-consultation meeting with City Staff has not yet occurred and as such a concept plan is not yet available. A concept plan will be required to facilitate the impact analysis of the EIS.

Dave Stephenson and Ken Burrell presented from NRSI and were accompanied by Astrid Clos, Planning Consultant. They indicated that they are prepared to accommodate and implement the comments received from City Staff to date. Deer monitoring is being done and wildlife cameras have been installed. Snakeboards are on site and vascular plant surveys will be undertaken. They indicated that cumulative impacts are difficult to assess however, it was indicated it would be done in the EIS. They assured that the developer would be employing the services of a Butternut Health Assessor. Reference to adjacent property studies will be included in background studies. They will investigate whether the lack of open land against the forested wetland meets MNR's the turtle nesting guidelines.

Delegate, Hugh Whiteley suggested to the EAC that every EIS should include a statement from the Subwatershed Study because it highlights attributes for the area. He also indicated that water balances being done on drumlins, in his opinion, are not accurate and acknowledged that staff require that proponents use the MNR guidelines. He expressed that Source Water Protection is not being addressed, and although it is not part of EAC's mandate it should be part of the Hydrogeological Study. Lastly he noted that EIS reports should advance towards a quantitative approach to salt control.

EAC went into committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by Michael Mosco and seconded by Hazel Wheeler,

“THAT EAC accepts the Terms of Reference for an Environmental Impact Study prepared by NRSI with the following conditions:

- A revised EIS TOR is provided which addresses staff comments and includes at a minimum:
 - A study area map with survey locations noted;
 - Timing, conditions and search effort is clarified for herpetofaunal and Odonata and Lepidoptera surveys;
 - Inclusion of deer movement surveys using wildlife cameras;
 - Commitment to utilize continuous data loggers to collect data (beginning as soon as feasible), to support a wetland water balance and a monthly analysis.
 - Provisions for specific surveys of potential turtle nesting habitat as guided by MNRF protocols.

and;

- THAT the EIS:
 - ensures that GRCA and Dr. Hugh Whiteley's comments are addressed, as appropriate
 - ensures that Parks Planning comments are addressed as appropriate
 - incorporates the results of neighbouring Environmental Impact Studies.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous**

b) 5 Arthur Street South

Adele presented her report to the committee. This proposal is currently being reviewed under the Site Plan process.

Melissa Straus, Shari Muscat and Pam Kraft presented for Stantec/Fusion. They highlighted some details from the original EIR for the benefit of new EAC members, indicating the main outstanding issues are the floodway and riverwalk. GRCA is satisfied with the grading to deflect flood water in Phase 5. Appendix K addresses previous comments. Heritage issues have been addressed. An updated structural assessment report has been provided and notes that the wall can support a trail as long as it is 2.6 m away from the wall. It was noted that further considerations would be needed when examining the implementation of the river access.

Discussion and comments were provided surrounding protection for the river wall with respect to trees being planted beside it, chimney swifts and opportunities for un-capping the chimney earlier, the spruce trees along the GJR, the proposed maintenance plan and proposed signage.

The committee suggested that: no chemical spraying occur within the riverwalk given proximity to the river, consideration be given to using fallen leaves as mulch, that the maintenance of the bird boxes consider clearing out house sparrows each spring to provide habitat for other native birds.

Suggestions for signage included photographs for the Pollination sign as well as a change in approach to describing “panfish” using a conservation-oriented approach rather than a consumptive one.

Moved by Yvette Roy and seconded by Colin Oaks,

“THAT the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally accept the Environmental Implementation Report prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. provided that:

- Staff comments are addressed to their satisfaction;
- Educational signage materials are adjusted, corrected and improved;
- The proponent continues to work with staff to ensure an appropriate street tree planting plan for the site as phases progress; and
- Efforts are made to preserve the White Elm tree near Neeve Street in Phase 4.”

**CARRIED
Unanimous**

c) 1211-1231 Gordon Street

Adele presented her report to the committee. She highlighted that the comments provided in her report were very detailed and that the majority could be addressed at a Site Plan stage. An EIR Addendum was requested to address the EIR comments prior to proceeding with Site Plan approval. She noted that the numbers of tree removals required correction and confirmed that the City would like to see compensation provided at a 3:1 replacement ratio for all native and non-native trees.

Tara Brenton, Carrie Curtis and Jessi McLellan from ABA provided some clarification with respect to bat boxes being proposed on private property, as well as confirming that *Salix lucida* is a native species. They acknowledge the discrepancies with tree numbers and indicated they would address this. They also clarified that they will consult with MNR regarding work within 25 m of the Butternut on site.

The committee asked questions regarding the timing for bat exclusion from the vacant houses, hydrologic monitoring, tree protection zone encroachment, compensation and terrestrial monitoring. The Committee noted that there is insufficient baseline data to do hydrologic monitoring and that the proponent should have collected data using continuous data loggers for at least one year to have any form of useful baseline data. The Committee expressed interested in having this done. The Committee also noted that the development plan should be provided overlaid on an aerial photo and that terrestrial monitoring protocols should be provided in the EIR.

There was also discussion about herpetofauna using anthropogenic debris (i.e., rock/debris piles) and that if any occur within the buffer that is to be restored, they should be replaced as part of the restoration plan. The Committee also acknowledged the good work put into the Stormwater Management solution.

The committee discussed a motion in committee.

Moved by Michael Mosco and seconded by Hazel Wheeler,

“THAT EAC accept the Environmental Implementation Report prepared by NRSI with the following conditions:

THAT an Addendum letter and revised drawings are provided to address Staff comments and the following comments:

- Revise Map 2 (Drawing SP-2) so that it is overlaid on an air photo;
- Review Section 3.4 for accuracy and provide a summary table of significant species previously recorded from the subject property or known to occur in the area;
- Anthropogenic debris should be removed between November 1 and March 30 to minimize potential impacts to wildlife and any anthropogenic debris deemed to be wildlife habitat should be replaced with similar natural material (e.g. rock piles) to provide habitat heterogeneity and compensate for removal of potential function (e.g. nesting habitat);
- A salt management plan be submitted and it shall include certification of property management/contractor;
- Provide a detailed monitoring program for terrestrial and disturbance components including locations, frequencies, timing, methods and options for adaptive solutions; and
- Amphibian use of SWM pond should be included in the monitoring plan.”

**CARRIED
Unanimous**

5. Adoption of Previous Minutes

Moved by Yvette Roy and seconded by Colin Oaks,

“THAT the minutes of the Environmental Advisory Committee meeting held on October 14, 2014 be adopted as amended.”

**Motion Carried
Unanimous**

6. Communications

Adele distributed EIS documents for a proposed Site Plan application for the Homewood Health Care Centre at 148-160 Delhi St.

7. Next Meeting

February 11, 2015 at 7 pm

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 pm.

CHAIRMAN