

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 07, 2012 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C  
MINUTES**

- Present:** G. Drewitt (Chair) E. Blenkhorn  
C. Parent L. McDonell  
S. Lohnes
- Regrets:** B. Mungall, M. Gillen, G. Najcler, J. Tivy
- Staff:** A. Hearne, M. Ursic, V. Laur
- External:** J. McEachren, former City of Guelph Environmental Planner
- External Groups:** Valerie Stevenson, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.  
David Stephenson, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.  
Steven Aboud, Aboud & Associates Inc.  
Paul Kemper, Coletara Development  
Helmuth Strobel, Coletara Development  
David Brix, Terra View Homes  
Astrid Clos, Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants  
Chris Sims, Gamsby & Mannerow  
Matt Nelson, Gamsby & Mannerow  
Charles Cecile, Guelph Field Naturalists

**1. 1077 Gordon Street – Scoped Environmental Impact Study**

J. McEachren, former City of Guelph Environmental Planner, provided a brief overview on the subject property and advised that the applicant is proposing three four-storey apartment buildings on the subject lands.

Steven Aboud, from Aboud & Associates Inc., provided a brief overview of the context and findings on Figure 1 of the 1077 Gordon Street Scoped EIS dated December 9, 2011.

Matt Nelson, from Gamsby & Mannerow spoke to the hydrology of the site and advised that the potential for impacts on this development are very low.

Steven Aboud, from Aboud & Associates Inc., advised that the EIS is in conformance with the Official Plan Amendment #42 with respect to the Significant Wetlands, Restoration Areas and Potential Habitat for Locally Significant Species. He also noted that the development proposal and natural environmental and hydrogeological issues are not going to impact the Provincially Significant Wetland.

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

Moved by C. Parent and seconded by L. McDonell

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee accept the Scoped Environmental Impact Study prepared by Aboud & Associates Inc. with the following conditions:

- That, as a condition of the Zone Change, an Environmental Monitoring Plan be submitted for approval prior to Site Plan Approval. This plan must outline proposed mitigation measures to ensure the proposal and its associated work, will not negatively impact the wetlands features or functions. Mitigation measures to be addressed include sediment and erosion control and environmental monitoring frequency. Reporting is to be sent monthly to the City of Guelph;
- That all comments provided by City Engineering Staff and any additional comments made by the Grand River Conservation Authority are addressed;
- That section 9.0 Recommendations be implemented into the design at the Site Plan stage; and
- That the EIS identify any potential LID measures that can potentially be utilized on site.”

**Motion Carried  
-Unanimous-**

## **2. 728 Eramosa Road – (Guelph Lakes)**

J. McEachren, former City of Guelph Environmental Planner, provided a brief overview on the subject property and advised that the proposed land use is a draft Plan of Condominium for residential development. The proposal includes low, medium and high density residential, mixed use areas, municipal roads, parks, open spaces, pumping station block and stormwater management facilities.

Astrid Clos, from Astrid J. Clos Planning Consultants, provided a brief overview on the EIS and was available to respond to questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

David Stephenson, from Natural Resource Solutions Inc. advised that the tree inventory included all the trees on site and they will retain trees associated with the storm water management outfall and now only 15 trees are being removed.

General discussion took place and the following items were noted:

- Concern of long term vegetation changes in Wetland C.
- Increased recognition in the EIR on the potential impacts of rear yard swales if they were no longer there five years from now.
- Conduct pre-construction surface water monitoring to gather baseline data.

The floor was opened to delegations.

***Delegation:***

Charles Cecile, from the Guelph Field Naturalists, provided the following comments on 728 Eramosa Road (Guelph Lakes):

- there is no mention of the city's natural heritage system
- there is a need for more vegetation surveys
- there is a need for more rare and significant plant species surveys
- the EIS needs to include field survey timing
- there are inconsistencies in data reporting and data analysis within the EIS

General discussion took place and the consultant was available to respond to questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

Moved by S. Lohnes and seconded by E. Blenkhorn

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee defer the Environmental Impact Study for 728 Eramosa Road prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. subject to the following conditions:

*That the following be addressed as part of the EIS:*

- That, as outlined in the City of Guelph's Environmental Impact Study requirements (Official Plan p. 73), a description of the proposed development, the rationale for the development and a description of alternatives must be provided.
  - That the EIS should address all applicable City Policies including the existing OP (and associated overlays to the property such as Core and Non-Core Greenlands).
- That, as part of the policy analysis, the EIS should include OPA 42 - Natural Heritage Strategy.
- That a Tree Conservation Plan be prepared in conjunction with the EIS to ensure trees identified for retention can be accommodated within the draft plan.
  - That the tree inventory provided in the EIS addresses all trees on the property, 10cm or larger regardless of the fact that they will all be removed. This number is a critical part of working out compensation for the canopy loss as well.
  - That the number of trees (and whether they are to be removed or retained) must be provided.
  - That the detailed inventory does not have to include wetland polygons as they will be retained and descriptions are provided of their composition.
  - That once an inventory is completed compensation ratio should be recommended with rationale provided.

- That the EIS should include a section pertaining to mitigation and enhancement in addition to the “Opportunities for Restoration” section.
- That the EIS should have addressed the trails shown on the plan, existing or new and how and where they will be implemented.
- That the EIS address potential encroachment issues and proposed mitigation measures (e.g. wooden fence).
- That the EIS accurately addresses the Eastern Meadowlark (*Sturnella magna*) specifically, whether or not there is habitat and if so, how the species and its habitat will be protected.
- That further clarification be provided on the “Community Garden” block (Block 144) which is located within the 30m setback to the wetland. The EIS should address what the intention of this block is, and how it will mitigate fertilizers etc. being used in that location and overall how there will be no negative impacts to the wetland.
- That the EIS provide further information on potential long term impacts to the PSW resulting in changes from the hydrogeological regime specifically at Wetland C.

*That the following be required as part of the EIR*

- That the 30m wetland buffer is to be respected, as detailed in the EIS, with exception to the encroachment for the SWM facility in the one location (OPA 42 Allows SWM within 15m, but maintains the remaining 15m as a no touch).
  - That detail as to how the 30 m will be maintained as a no touch area given the close proximity of some of the proposed lots to the setback be provided.
  - That detail on proposed trail development within the wetland setback be provided.
- That details should also be provided as to how the wetlands will handle and/or mitigate the increase of volume of discharge to them, while maintaining no negative impacts.
- That species identified in Section 4.2 of the EIS are addressed and how restoration/compensation plans should include a variety of species that could be suitable to those species.
- That details be provided on proposed mitigation for a subsurface parking structure given the water table levels on the site.
- That given the number of sensitive species potentially on site, monitoring must include education and procedures to be in place for people working on site to ensure protection for the species.
- That details for tree protection fencing be provided, and is to be installed and inspected by City staff prior to work commencing on site.
- That alternatives to de-icing (Salt) should be investigated especially for the parking area for the apartment block.
- That low impact development measures should be incorporated into the design to the extent practical.

- That the City of Guelph EnviroGuide is provided for residents of the new subdivision. and
- That water quality monitoring be conducted in the pre-construction phase for baseline data.”

**Motion Carried  
-Unanimous-**

**3. Correspondence and Information**

**4. Approval of Minutes from December 14, 2011**

Moved by C. Parent and seconded by G. Drewitt –

“To accept the minutes as amended:

- In agenda item #4 under Other Business, change the second bullet point to read as follows (see italics):
  - C. Parent noted there is a lack *of formal direction regarding protocols to be employed in the preparation of EIS’s....;*”

**Motion Carried  
-Unanimous-**

**5 Other Business**

- Upcoming Items:
  - Development Applications
    - Southgate EIR (April meeting)

**6. Next Meeting**

Next meeting will be April 11, 2012.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

---

**CHAIRMAN**