

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2014 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

Present: Y. Roy (Chair) K. McNeill
E. Blenkhorn B. Mungall
C. Parent

Regrets: G. Johnstone, S. Lohnes, E. Stahl, R. Park

Staff: A. Labbé, V. Laur, R. Templeton, J. Pathak

External Groups: Astrid Clos, Astrid J. Clos Planning
Jessica Walker, NRSI
David Stephenson, NRSI
Pete Graham, Acorn Developments
Mike Watt, Moshi Holdings Ltd.
Terry Ellery, Moshi Holdings Ltd.
Judy Martin, Sierra Club of Canada
Charles Cecile, Guelph Field Naturalists

1. 46, 47 & 87 Hyland Road – Terms of Reference for an Environmental Impact Study

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

David Stephenson, from NRSI, identified concern on the trail alignment and clarified the City's request is to assess feasibility and recommend alignment.

General discussion took place and the consultants were available to respond to questions and hear feedback from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

C. Parent noted the following:

- Asked that the consultant confirm with the MNR what Species at Risk (SAR) need surveys and confirm the methodology.
- EIS – Page 8, Under Seasonal Areas, for Raptor Wintering – do survey in the winter (now) while snow is on the ground.
- Surveys should extend within the core area.
- Amphibian Calling Surveys – if it's in a cultural community that is questioned in terms of retention, do a couple of extra early spring surveys.
- EIS – Page 14, last paragraph – add Endangered Species Act and Ontario Regulation 150/06.

Y. Roy noted the following:

- Identified JESA record is 1993. Check with the MNR about need for surveys.
- Noted that West Virginia White emerges in early spring and feeds on toothwort. Check with the MNR about need for surveys.

Moved by E. Blenkhorn and seconded by K. McNeill

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the proposed Terms of Reference for an Environmental Impact Study at 46,47 and 87 Hyland Road prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc., with the following conditions:

That the Terms of Reference for the EIS:

- Include a revised Figure detailing the proposed development area and field survey locations;
- Clarify the purpose of a natural heritage feature water balance and that it will be analyzed using monthly data;
- Include staff confirmation of the Significant Woodland boundary on site;
- Include field surveys for Least Bittern, communication with MNR to confirm SAR survey requirements and protocols. Jefferson Salamander occurrences are all historical and clarification of snake and/or bat hibernacula and turtle nesting site survey methods/timing;
- Ensure the analysis identifies any features that may be present but not mapped, in consultation with appropriate agencies (ex., wetlands or cultural woodlands);
- Include analysis in consideration of Regional and Local Significance and report flora and fauna by ELC community;
- Include a complete policy analysis including the current OP and OPA 42, ESA (2007) and Ontario Regulation 150/06;
- Include the City’s proposed trail alignment and an impact analysis to address it;
- Include a winter survey to assess the study area as a Raptor wintering area;
- Ensure the surveys extend significantly beyond proposed development areas to assess potential impacts on retained natural areas; and
- Ensure the Marsh Monitoring Protocol (MMP) is enhanced with two additional spring surveys for explosive breeders if warranted.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

2. 44, 56 & 76 Arkell Road (Arkell Woods) - Environmental Impact Study

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

David Stephenson, from NRSI, noted the following:

- Acknowledged MTE is not here.

- A three season flora inventory was done.
- Uncertainty with OPA 42 tree compensation interpretation.

Astrid Clos, from Astrid J. Clos Planning commented that Policy 6.1.9 in regards to street trees was not clear and asked for clarification.

David Stephenson, from NRSI, spoke to water management and noted that the GRCA suggests that this site make up for infiltration targets that were not hit on other development sites.

David Stephenson also spoke to the City's proposed trail and noted the following:

- There is concern/challenge of how to accommodate a trail within the condominium as it is privately owned.
- In the current plan the SWM is private
- Trail would have to be outside the SWMP
- Getting to Arkell is a challenge

J. Pathak, City of Guelph Park Planner, noted that the preference is for land dedication, however conservation easements are also able to be considered.

Y. Roy noted that there is a need to look at appropriateness of a trail in the buffer. J. Pathak recognized Guelph's uniqueness is somewhat attributed to trails and trails should be allowed in buffers.

The floor was opened to delegations.

Delegation:

Charles Cecile with Nature Guelph provided the following comments:

- Supports the staff recommendation.
- Barn swallows should be included as part of the breeding bird surveys.
- Additional Milksnake surveys using snakeboards are warranted for this site.
- Sweet-coltsfoot should be added to the Significant Plant List and further documentation and mapping of this species in the study site should be undertaken.

Delegation:

Judy Martin with Sierra Club of Canada provided the following comments:

- Supports the staff recommendation.
- There should be no encroachment into the wetland or woodland buffers.
- The tree replacement ratio is inadequate to maintain the tree canopy in the City – 3:1 will not replace canopy loss.
- The cedar hedge is mature and healthy and deserves higher replacement standards if it can't be preserved.

- Concerned that the removal of foraging habitat for Barn Swallows will have a cumulative impact on the swallow population.
- Need to conduct amphibian surveys.

B. Mungall noted the following:

- Asked if the EIS included an impact analysis for the City's trail and noted that EAC requested this in the Terms of Reference.

K. McNeill noted the following concerns:

- The wetland water balance indicates 9 times more water being directed to the wetland and raised particular concerns about the increase in the summer months. This was flagged as a potential impact.
- The water will not disperse evenly across the entire wetland and this should be considered.
- Wants to see an ELC for the site and more detailed vegetation in the adjacent wetland.

C. Parent noted the following:

- Would like to see more clarification/detail on the survey dates (i.e. Section 3.5.4) and why the dates were chosen.
- On page 29 – additional work needs to be done for reptiles and amphibians
- Put “removal” of old field habitat in a broader context.
 - Look at 120m around the wetland.
 - How much is proposed to be removed?
- Requested more detail regarding the proposed rip rap proposed at the SWM outlet.
- On Page 60, 7.2.3 – Response Protocol – suggested a revised protocol to have a site inspector have a permit from MNR to move something (like a Milksnake) instead of waiting for MNR staff who are not likely available.

K. McNeill noted the following:

- Post Construction Monitoring
 - Include vegetation monitoring not just hydrology.
 - Quarterly measurements are not sufficient, it was noted that monthly monitoring is better.
 - Monitor for longer than two years

Y. Roy noted the following concerns:

- Concerns with cumulative impacts if every development encroaches within the minimum recommended buffer width.
- Indicated the difference between a critical function zone and a buffer.
- Was surprised to see the health of the cedar hedge as poor.

E. Blenkhorn noted the following:

- There is a milksnake protocol available from Guelph District MNR. Note that cover boards need to be weathered (2 years old).

- Noted that bats should be looked for within the edge of the natural area.

Y. Roy reviewed comments submitted by R. Park, Environmental Advisory Committee Member.

Moved by B. Mungall and seconded by K. McNeill

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee defer the Environmental Impact Study prepared by NRSI and require that the forthcoming revised application and associated Addendum to the EIS include:

- a) Appropriate revisions and new information as it relates to the details of the anticipated revised proposal;
- b) Recommended buffer widths to protect confirmed and candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat;
- c) Consideration for provision of a 30 m no touch buffer to the Torrence Creek PSW;
- d) Additional information to inform the natural heritage water balance analysis specifically in the summer months;
- e) A revised compensation approach that focuses on the wildlife corridor and buffer design;
- f) Inclusion of the proposed City trail alignment in consultation with the Parks Planner as well as an impact analysis to confirm alignment and inform detailed design;
- g) That terrestrial field studies extend sufficiently beyond proposed development areas to assess potential impacts on retained natural areas particularly ELC of the PSW;
- h) Timing of field visits be clearly detailed;
- i) That the impact assessment quantify the area of cultural meadow located within 120m of the PSW as a whole and the proportion of the cultural meadow that will be removed by the proposed development;
- j) That the EIS assess potential impacts associated with the proposed outlet structure of the SWM facility; and
- k) That the EIS consider an alternative protocol to respond to SAR encounters on site during construction as MNR staff are unlikely to be available to respond.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

3. Correspondence and Information

a) EIS ToR Guidelines

A. Labbé asked that all outstanding appendices be forwarded to her.

b) Upcoming Applications

A. Labbé distributed the following items:

- Pergola EIR
- EIS Addendum for 50 Stone Road East (aka 781 Victoria Road South)
- Landsdown EIS
- Victoria Park Village EIR – Letter of Clarification
- Dallan EIR
- Addendum for 5 Arthur

c) Other

B. Mungall provided a brief update on the Stormwater Meeting he attended. He noted that there was concern expressed by the public re: fees for impervious surface

4. Approval of Minutes from December 11, 2013

Moved by K. O'Reilly and seconded by C. Parent –

“To accept the minutes as printed.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

5. Next Meeting

March 12, 2014.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN