

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

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

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

Regrets: N/A

Staff: A. Labbé, A. Nix, A. Watts

External Groups: Hugh Whiteley, Living Rivers and Green space Group Guelph
Karen Rathwell
Shari Muscat, Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Melissa Strauss, Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Ken Burell, NRSI
David Stevenson, NRSI
Hugh Handy, GSP Group

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call and Certification of Quorum

Attendance was noted and quorum was declared.

3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest of Conflict of Interest

N. Yap, conflict with 781 Victoria Road South

4. Development Applications

a) 781 Victoria Road South– Proposed Environmental Implementation Report Terms of Reference

A. Labbé, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report and gave background on the property.

Shari Muscat, Environmental Planner from Stantec Consulting Ltd. provided a brief history of the application. Recognized that the application has been appealed to the OMB, but the decision was made to proceed with the EIR as to not delay monitoring of the site. It was noted that Stantec recognizes an element of risk in proceeding but wants to gather baseline monitoring data this year.

Comments from EAC Committee:

C. Parent

- Refer to section 2.2.2.2, as Herpetofauna (instead of breeding amphibians)
- Section 3.2, Site Design- Servicing Infrastructure needs to be included
- Section 4.0, Encroachment needs to be included
- Agrees with monitoring plan, point of EIR is to develop the plan, plots to be identified later

Y. Roy

- Asked for Invasive Species Management section to be elaborated- Stantec responded that it is just to be done in the buffer, 3-4 plots around the site
- Inquired about buffer enhancement including fencing. Stantec responded that the whole site is to be fenced without gates and the Arboretum is in agreement- Key management method.
- Inquired about the type of monitoring? Stantec responded, plot-based vegetation, photo monitoring, encroachment
- Recommends encroachment monitoring be detailed so that management actions can be taken

C. Oaks

- Inquired about the timeframe on monitoring/management. Stantec responded that there will be some communication with the condominium corporation. Arboretum staff will be present as well and recognize their long term role.

K. McNeill

- Question regarding the OMB process. What happens to the TOR if the OMB approves something different? Stantec and City responded that it would depend on the extent of the changes; the TOR may need to be revised.

Hugh Whiteley delegated to the EAC regarding the MOE's 10 year revision to the Salt Management Plan. 5 Provinces have distinguished salt vulnerable areas. Two points were made regarding the EIR.

1. The EIR should demonstrate that the buffers are adequate and there will be no negative impacts. His understanding is that a significant number of jurisdictions have decided that a minimum 30 metre buffer to PSWS is required and anything less is inadequate. Concerned that the 20 metre wetland and 10 metre woodland buffers are inadequate. Need to demonstrate that these buffers will work.
2. Comments regarding the zoning of the buffers. The zoning will remain I.2 but should be zoned P.1.

EAC went into Committee to discuss the motion.

Moved by Y. Roy and seconded by M. Mosco

“THAT Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the Environmental Implementation Report Terms of Reference prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., subject to the following conditions:

THAT a revised EIR TOR is submitted to the satisfaction of City staff which includes:

- A study area which defines where the detailed tree inventory will occur;
- A brief overview of the anticipated monitoring program, baseline data needs and commitment to include the baseline data in the EIR;
- An indication of the Guelph Arboretum’s involvement in the development of the EIR TOR and the preparation of the EIR;
- An indication as to what will be examined and considered when developing the buffer enhancement plan, including fencing, invasive species monitoring plan, salt management plan, long-term management, etc.;
- Minor corrections;
- Any other details or clarifications to help the Terms of Reference provide an indication as to how it will fulfill the conditions of approval and special requirements to protect the Natural Heritage System; and
- If the OMB hearing results in a change of development that the EIR TOR return to EAC at the discretion of the Environmental Planner.

1 member abstained

**Motion Carried
7 in favour, 1 abstained**

b) 148-160 Delhi Street– Homewood Health Centre Expansion- Environmental Impact Study

A. Labbé, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report.

Questions from the Committee:

- C. Oaks- Good idea to maintain some Norway maples but questioned whether they should all be retained.
- S. Jobber- retention of spruce trees is a good idea; however development will affect root mass and cause stability issues due to shallow roots and spreading. Need to look at soil volumes, sensitive excavation.

Ken Burell and David Stevenson from NRSI and Hugh Handy from GSP Group presented the application for the Homewood Health Centre Expansion. David would like the Committee to give flexibility and generalize the location of the compensation planting instead of specifically adjacent to the FODM4 area. He noted that the issue of adequate soil volume is an important consideration. The proposed theme behind plantings on Delhi is clustered. David provided clarification on the pipe. The lower portion of the pipe is in good condition and the upper portion is collapsing. Currently looking at how to clean that pipe; looking at fish habitat mitigation and might suggest to cut back the pipe to bank.

Hugh Handy expanded on meeting with City Staff. He noted that there are a number of moving pieces with the redevelopment at Homewood, such as built heritage, natural heritage, road improvements. Moving forward they are looking at natural heritage amongst other things to balance the many pieces.

Comments from Committee:

- N. Yap- EIS should include discussion on climate change and cumulative effects.
- C. Oaks- Clarify in paragraph on page 37 that there isn't trout in this reach of the river. Would also like a listing of where the sample stations were located.
- C. Parent- Does the SWM Master Plan speak to improving the pipe?
- Section 4.1.3, p.46- Animal movement corridors and wildlife linkages, the paragraph doesn't highlight the Speed River and adjacent lands. This should be mentioned.
- C. Parent- Comments on expanded parking lot. Recommended reading AMEC's SWM Master Plan and give some consideration of how it will impact your clients bottom line down the road. Would cost money if a SWM infrastructure tax is implemented.
- Page 65, monitoring program for SWM- Water quality analysis.
- Y. Roy- Would like to see some analysis of the optimal place for compensation plantings.
- M. Mosco- Suggested a swale to treat quality before water hits the dry pond. Consider getting rid of dry pond and use L.I.D.
- S. Jobber- Tree Management Plan- unsure of what is intended with respect to pre-stressing trees to help with construction.

No delegations

EAC went into Committee to discuss the motion.

Moved by S. Jobber and seconded by N. Yap

“THAT Environmental Advisory Committee accept the Environmental Impact Study prepared by NRSI Inc. for 148-160 Delhi Street subject to the following:

THAT an EIS Addendum is prepared to staff's satisfaction and includes:

- A recommended buffer width for the Significant Woodland in proximity to the proposed development based on the best available science to protect the features;
- A recommendation to maintain the size of the Significant Woodland affected by the development by restoring an equal or greater area of lawn into a forest community (adjacent to existing woodland) as well as undertaking a management plan for the FODM4 community;
- A revised Map 4 with a revised legend showing the NHS features that have been confirmed through this EIS, those unconfirmed but in OPA 42 as well as their buffers (instead of supporting features).
- Updated clarified species lists; Clarifications regarding mitigation and recommendations for aquatic habitat;
- Clarification regarding mitigation as it relates to stockpile locations; and

- A recommendation for educational signage;
- A Terms of Reference for an EIR based on the EIS and TPP recommendations; and
- A discussion of the impacts of climate change and cumulative impacts are included.

THAT a revised Tree Preservation Report and Plans be provided to staff's satisfaction and include:

- Modifications to the design which seek to preserve the Norway Spruce on the west side of Delhi and the Norway Maples on the east side of Delhi;
- Modifications to the proposal to accommodate increased preservation of trees along the rear of the houses facing onto Pleasant Road;
- Clarification regarding whether EAB is present in Ash trees on site (in general);
- Recommended trees for transplant and a transplant plan (include transplant notes on drawings);
- Clarifications to the Tree Preservation Fencing location and details; and
- Notes on the Tree Preservation Plan drawings; and
- The City will work with the proponent to maximize the ability to improve water quality as it enters the speed river.

THAT a revised Site Plan submission is provided once the EIS is revised and the EIR is prepared.

THAT the City work with the proponent to maximize the ability to improve water quality as it enters the Speed River.

**Motion Carried
Unanimous**

3. City of Guelph Natural Heritage System Policies Presentation by April Nix

Questions from EAC Committee:

- Multiple animal corridors- can include deer
- Cultural Woodlands vs. Significant Woodland- define if its significant woodland or cultural woodland, EIS will have to explore what needs to be protected- recommendations or mitigation required around these pieces. Could find cultural woodlands that aren't mapped in future EIS.
- email copy of presentation
- Get Land Use Plan for EAC members

4. Adoption of Minutes from Previous Meeting

Moved by C. Oaks and seconded by C. Parent,

“THAT the minutes of the Environmental Advisory Committee held on January 14, 2015 be adopted as amended.”

**Motion Carried
Unanimous**

5. Correspondence & Information

Upcoming Applications

- Arkell Woods
- Homewood

A. Labbe distributed the following items:

- MOE interpretation/information bulletin for SWM- will be emailed

6. Next Meeting

March 11th, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm

Moved by Y. Roy and seconded by H. Wheeler.

**Motion Carried
Unanimous**

CHAIRMAN