

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

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM B
MINUTES**

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

Regrets: S. Lohnes, G. Johnstone

Staff: A. Labbé, Environmental Planner, Margot Ursic (Beacon Environmental) C. Fach,
Planning Clerk

External Groups: Shari Muscat, Stantec Consulting
Dan Eusebi, Stantec Consulting
Melissa Straus, Stantec Consulting
Krista Walkey, Stantec
Larry Kotseff, Fusion Homes
Neal Hallock, Fusion Homes
Barbara Mann, Sierra Club
Charles Cecile, Nature Guelph
Kyle Bittman, Coltera Development
Helmuth Strobel, Coletara Development
Glenn Anderson, Gamsby Mannerow
Angela Kroetch, Gamsby Mannerow
David Stevenson, NSRI
Ryan Archer, NSRI
Matthew Nelson, Gamsby Mannerow

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:02pm.

2. Call and Certification of Quorum

Attendance was noted and a quorum was declared.

3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest or Conflict of Interest

R. Park declared a conflict of interest on both applications as he is employed by the company that authored the reports

4. Development Applications

a) 78 Starwood Drive

Dave Stevenson, Matthew Nelson and Angela Kroetch presented photos of the swale which runs along the southwestern boundary of the site. They indicated that the surface and ground water flows to Clyde Creek and not to the PSW, however they indicated that some local flow may be directed to the wetland. They indicated that the runoff from this site will be directed to an off-site existing municipally-owned SWMP where infiltration can occur. They also indicated that trail master plan does not show a trail on this property and they suggested it would be best to continue the trail on the sidewalk.

Margo Ursic, Consultant, acting on behalf of the City, presented her report to the committee, noting there were key sources of information missing, specifically Engineering comments on the SWM and comments from Parks regarding trails. Concerns were raised with hydrological functions particularly around the uncertainty with the site's hydrologic contributions to the PSW on adjacent lands. Additional details such as tree protection were discussed.

The Committee reviewed correspondence from Nature Guelph and GRCA.

Moved by B. Mungall and seconded by Y. Roy,

“THAT a revised EIS be prepared to address:

- i. Any revisions to the development plan;
- ii. Environmental Planning comments from the City as well as comments from the GRCA;
- iii. Forthcoming comments from City Engineering and Parks Departments and Nature Guelph;
- iv. The protection of the PSW and all the functions of the buffer including an assessment of the buffer's potential function as a critical function zone;
- v. A more comprehensive consideration of the recommendations from the Clythe Creek Overview Study;
- vi. Revisions to tree protection; and
- vii. Provision of tree compensation within the Enhancement and Restoration Areas;
- viii. Consider tree compensation around the regional stormwater Management Pond;
- ix. Comprehensive consideration of a water balance discussing infiltration on site as well as within the regional stormwater management pond.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous**

781 Victoria Road South

Dan Eusebi and Shari Muscat presented the EIS Addendum, highlighting a change from the proposed 15m buffer with SWMF within it to the removal of the SWM facility with a 20m “no-touch” buffer plus fencing. Feedback from the City, GRCA and Arboretum has been positive for this. The preliminary SWM report has not yet been prepared. EIS looks at “superpipe” and quality control. They indicated that a winter wildlife survey was completed in January of 2014. They suggested that the natural wildlife corridor to the south of the property would be sufficient for movement and should be maintained. They do not believe there is a critical function zone (CFZ) beyond the buffer. There was no evidence of waterfowl nesting and noted that turtles were not in the scope of the study. While painted turtles nest close to ponds, the pond in the natural heritage area is away from the development. Stantec claims that no snake hibernacula are present.

Committee members noted the following concerns:

- Questioned why a 30m buffer could not be incorporated? The consultants indicated that current policy requires that they look for an appropriate buffer and they have done that.
- Discussed that a major rationale for 20m is based on *Phalaris* community. The consultants confirmed but also indicated that the report speaks to stressors and mitigation (fencing). More sensitive communities are associated with swamp which is further in.
- Indicated concern that encroachment into the woodland will be an issue and questioned whether encroachment should be addressed in the EIR or is it better in the EIS?
- The consultants indicated it could be done at EIR stage and that it could also be dealt with this through the condo corporation.
- The Committee indicated that perhaps fencing along Victoria Road South is warranted.
- The Committee indicated that much of the discussion presented by Stantec at this meeting was not in the report.
- Other concerns were raised about the report only providing information on past and current stressors but not the stressors from the proposal.
- Lack of information about invasive species management options
- No hydrogeology information in the Addendum.

A. Labbe reviewed the Staff Report indicating that the EIS Addendum was much improved and highlighted key concerns that could be addressed through an Environmental Implementation Report which is recommended to be a condition of development.

The floor was opened to delegations:

J. Martin spoke on behalf of the Sierra Club.

- While she believes the plan has been improved, she still thinks the subject lands should be part of the NHS.
- Milkweed plants exist on the property and meadows are scarce
- 20m buffer is not sufficient. 30m should be the minimum.
- If the development proceeds, the buffer should be enhanced and diversified.
- Not convinced that fencing will protect the natural features and would prefer enhanced measures.

C. Cecile spoke on behalf of Nature Guelph

- Opposes the development of this property
- Now there's an Addendum saying 20m so, apparently a 15m wasn't enough.
- *Phalaris* wasn't even mentioned in the first EIS
- Feels that the development is pursuing a 20m buffer because it would not be economically feasible with a 30m buffer.
- No reptile or salamander surveys.
- The Southgate development identified major amphibian movement.
- Considers this proposal to be bad planning.
- Concerns with encroachments, off-leash pets, etc.
- Referenced literature from Arboricultural and Urban Forestry Journal.
- Concerned with the carbon footprint as there are no amenities within walking distance.
- He urged EAC not to accept the staff recommendation.

Committee members noted the following concerns:

C. Parent

- He proposed to defer because the function of an ES is to determine constraints.
- Boundary of Significant Woodland has not been confirmed and surveyed
- No agreement on buffer width
- No SWM Report
- A decision at this point is premature

B. Mungall

- Agreed with Charles Cecile's point regarding the location offering nowhere to walk. He suggested the City could be approached about providing walking trails on the Carter Well Fields. The SWS recommends it.

K. McNeill

- Land Use Planning feasibility should not be part of the buffer analysis.

Moved by C. Parent and seconded by K. McNeill,

THAT the Environmental Advisory Committee defers the acceptance of the Environmental Impact Study Addendum prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. until a revised EIS Addendum is prepared to the satisfaction of staff, which includes:

- a) Confirmation of the boundary of the Significant Woodland;
- b) Inclusion of the boundary of the Significant Valleylands on Figure 4;
- c) A minimum 30 m buffer to the PSW unless the EIS provides comprehensive confirmation that there are no CFZs which support wetland functions within the cultural communities;

- d) Provision of recommendations relating to a wildlife crossing at Victoria Road, a buffer enhancement plan, invasive species management, improved education and outreach, and monitoring;
- e) A post-development monitoring plan to examine the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and, particularly, to inform any required baseline data collection;
- f) Minor errors and the lacking Reference List;
- g) A comprehensive list of items to be examined in the EIR;
- h) Provision of a supporting SWM Report;
- i) Supporting materials (i.e., August 2013 letter from Chris Early);
- j) Information to address additional concerns/comments received from delegates;
- k) A buffer assessment which doesn't use land use planning feasibility as a factor; and
- l) Discussion on mitigative measures to limit encroachment into the natural areas both on and off site."

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous**

Motion to continue the meeting beyond 10pm by B. Mungall and seconded by E. Blenkhorn.

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous**

b) 5 Arthur Street South

M. Straus from Stantec addressed the Committee, providing an EIS Addendum to address changes to the development. Notable changes include the removal of the north/south internal road, safe access achieved from Arthur Street, more information in the EIS regarding fish habitat, the setback -15m vs. 30m setback as it relates to the riverwalk design and below-grade portion of the river wall.

Adele Labbé presented her Staff Report and indicated main comments include exploring potential river access, removing safe access along Arthur Street and suggested zones within the riverwalk to inform detailed design.

B. Mungall pointed out that the northern-most portion of the heritage wall is a gabion wall. He questioned ownership of the riverbed and was advised that Fusion Homes own approximately 1m on west side of the heritage wall.

City policy of 5m setback from property line to railway track is not a requirement. Test holes south of the GJR for contamination have been done by the original owner.

The Committee indicated they would like to see public water access address in the EIR and asked if the City is serious about exploring the opportunity for access. Staff indicated they are requesting more information be provided in the EIR to inform opportunities and constraints but are generally supportive.

Moved by C. Parent and seconded by B. Mungall,

"THAT the conceptual plan for the "riverwalk" include the following zones, in general:

- Minimum 8 m zone adjacent to riverwall to be designed as an environmental corridor and naturalization/enhancement zone. This zone should include canopy trees, pollinator species, any proposed enhancement such as bird boxes or bat boxes, etc., educational signage as well as some "look out" zones.
 - 3 m trail connection;
 - 4m zone to separate the public and private realm. This zone should include vegetation and educational signage.
2. THAT the conceptual plan for the "riverwalk" include:
- Canopy trees with adequate soil volumes and use of new technologies as necessary (i.e., soil technologies, root guards, etc.);

- Pollinator species;
 - Recommendations from the EIS such as: bird/bat boxes, nesting structures, educational signage, etc. ;and
 - Look out areas to provide the public a view of the river.
3. THAT the Preliminary Grading Plan (Fig-3) and Preliminary Servicing Plan (Fig-4) be revised to illustrate the 15m setback from the riverwall, not the property line.
 4. THAT all documents are revised to show no development within the FL zone, and to be consistent with each other.
 5. THAT an EIR be provided for the site and include detailed mitigation measures and detailed enhancement plans based on a detailed design which includes any work required for the existing riverwall/retaining wall as well as the riverwalk design.”

Motion Carried
-Unanimous

5. Adoption of Minutes from Previous Meeting

K. McNeill noted a typo on Page 3.

Moved by K. McNeill and seconded by E. Blenkhorn,

“THAT the minutes of the meeting of February 12, 2014 be adopted as amended.”

Motion Carried
-Unanimous

6. Correspondence & Information

Adele distributed packages for the development application at 816 Woolwich Street.

7. Other Business

The Committee supported starting their next meeting at 6pm. A. Labbe agreed to email Stantec representatives to see if they will be available at that time.

A. Labbe canvassed the Committee for interest in sitting to the board dealing with the Animal control By-law, without success.

Further to discussion surrounding the development application at 728 Victoria Road South, it was moved by Y. Roy and seconded by R. Parks,

“THAT City Engineering and Planning Staff be requested to examine the feasibility of implementing the trail development proposal in the Torrence Creek Subwatershed for the Carter Well property.”

Motion Carried
-Unanimous

8. Next Meeting

April 9, 2014 at 6pm

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

CHAIRMAN