

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2012 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C  
MINUTES**

**Present:** G. Drewitt (Chair) E. Blenkhorn  
C. Parent M. Gillen  
S. Lohnes B. Mungall  
G. Najcler J. Tivy

**Regrets:**

**Staff:** A. Hearne, M. Ursic, R. Philips, V. Laur

**External:** J. McEachren, former City of Guelph Environmental Planner

**External Groups:** David Stephenson, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.  
Tara Brenton, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.  
Sandy Anderson, Anderson Geologic Ltd.  
Leslie Marlowe, Industrial Guelph Equities  
John Perks, IBI Group  
Andy Kroess, IBI Group  
Steven Aboud, Aboud & Associates Inc.  
Charles Cecile, Guelph Field Naturalists  
Paul Rice, Puslinch Resident  
Judy Martin, Sierra Club of Canada  
Karen Levenson, Animal Alliance of Canada  
Melanie Allard, University of Guelph Student

**1. Southgate Business Park – Environmental Implementation Report (EIR)**

M. Ursic, Acting Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, provided a brief overview on the subject property and advised that the applicant is proposing development of an industrial business park on the subject lands.

Leslie Marlowe, from Industrial Guelph Equities, requested that the EIR be approved for all of Phases 1, 2 and 3 and advised all Phases are zoned industrial. The applicants would like Draft Plan of Subdivision to be registered and then the City can become stewards of the woodlot and trail.

David Stephenson, from Natural Resource Solutions Inc., spoke to and provided additional information in regards to the list of recommended motions in the staff report. Items noted and clarified by David Stephenson include:

**Phases 1 and 2**Tree Inventory:

- Tree compensation numbers are on page 52. The number should be corrected to show 1947 trees.
- Tree inventories do not include the trees removed or planted as it pertains to Maltby.

Pedestrian Trails:

- Clarification in text and mapping in regards to the preferred trail alignment and how it was arrived at will be in consultation with the City.
- Preferred surface treatment of any trail, particularly narrower trails, through natural areas will be the City's decision.

Addressing Comments from the GRCA:

- Noted that (2) two was the recommended number of culverts to be installed for wildlife and found that wet culverts were preferred by amphibians.

Monitoring: Noted that monitoring will be revised so that Phases 1 & 2 and Phase 3 will be addressed separately. Monitoring will be done in conjunction with the City.

**Phase 3**

In regards to identification of specific corridors for amphibian movement it was reported that monitoring was done in 2010 for 54 consecutive days. It was also noted that there is a substantial amount of east/west connectivity for movement corridors.

General discussion took place and the Environmental Advisory Committee noted the following items:

- A condition of approval should be that Block 1 cannot be severed and be a single user.
- Consider larger CSP culverts under the laneway into Block 1. Timing should be indicated when installed.
- Concerns about trails; realignment outside Block 1, along north side of Phase 2 to be considered.

The floor was opened to delegations.

***Delegation:***

Paul Rice, Puslinch resident, provided the following comments on Southgate Business Park – Environmental Implementation Report:

- Block 1 – identify amphibian movement corridors
- Move trail to the west of wetlands to not place additional stress on the wildlife and amphibian corridors
- Woodlot management – the City needs to undertake its responsibilities
- Light pollution mitigation measures – directional lighting should be applied across the site

- Deicing salts – should be banned, not just reduced on Maltby W., Southgate and Street A
- Construction traffic should be directed towards Southgate and away from area residents

***Delegation:***

Charles Cecile on behalf of the Guelph Field Naturalists provided the following comments on Southgate Business Park – Environmental Implementation Report:

- Supports deferral of Block 1
- Significant Wildlife Habitat needs further consideration and the EIR needs to identify the animal movement corridors
- The proposed private road into Block 1 needs further consideration; the proposed culverts are inadequate
- Pedestrian trails – keep them within Phase 2, west of the wetlands

***Delegation:***

Judy Martin on behalf of Sierra Club of Canada provided the following comments on Southgate Business Park – Environmental Implementation Report:

- Supports deferral of Block 1
- Need to fully protect Block 1 for significant wildlife habitat
- Jefferson Salamander surveys are incomplete
- The proposed tree replacement ratio falls short of the City's draft guidelines
- Concerns with trail placement – need to be placed outside wetland buffers

***Delegation:***

Karen Levenson, on behalf of Animal Alliance of Canada provided the following comments on Southgate Business Park – Environmental Implementation Report:

- The protection and conservation plans are inadequate and do not reflect the needs or behaviours of the wildlife in the area
- Need for mammal overpasses and proposed culverts
- No development of roads in Block 1
- 120 metre buffers need to be placed around all ponds and woodlots
- Signage needs to be erected stating that the areas designated as wildlife habitat (wetlands, woodlots and 120 metre buffers) are off limits to human activity
- Walking trails need to be developed outside of all 120 metre buffers and culverts should not open onto trails
- Concrete walls need to be constructed around buildings and parking lots to prevent human/wildlife conflicts
- Development should not be undertaken during migration or breeding season
- Trees designated for removal should be inspected to ensure no wildlife resides within and trees should not be cut down until all wildlife is removed

***Delegation:***

Melanie Allard, University of Guelph Student, provided the following comments on Southgate Business Park – Environmental Implementation Report:

- Block 1 – movement concerns for amphibians
- Western Chorus Frog is a species of special concern for this site
- There will be animal migration loss due to the creation of laneway in Block 1
- Amphibian numbers recorded during monitoring may be underestimated

General discussion took place and the Environmental Advisory Committee noted the following items:

- Concern that the standard is not being met in regards to Significant Wildlife Habitat and amphibian movement corridors.
- Assessment of potential environmental costs and benefits of a minimum of one alternative development configuration (i.e. lands to be developed versus those to be left undisturbed). This assessment should include consideration of an alternate road access.
- Discussion about the tree replacement ratio expressed by EAC and the Acting Environmental Planner

Moved by M. Gillen and seconded by J. Tivy

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee accept all aspects of the Environmental Implementation Report prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. related to Phases 1 and 2 subject to the following conditions:

That an addendum to the EIR be provided that:

- Gives consideration to animal movement across silt fencing during construction;
- Includes tree protection locations and details on all Sediment and Erosion Control/Grading drawings;
- Speaks to the need to integrate LID measures and directional lighting with regard to natural features and residences wherever feasible as development proceeds;
- Explains how the berm works along Maltby will incorporate or interface with existing plantings along Maltby Road;
- Tree Inventory:
  - Provides justification and verification that the tree compensation outlined (Table 6) is consistent with the compensation ratios laid out on page 52.
  - Mentions that any minimal damage to trees to be retained should be managed using proper arboricultural methods.

- Pedestrian Trails:
  - Ensures any comments from the City of Guelph Parks Planner, regarding Property Demarcation, the Proposed Trails and associated items such as signs, are addressed, including alternate trail alignments with regard to animal movement corridors and/or significant wildlife habitat.
- Ensures any comments from the GRCA (dated March 27, 2012) are addressed. Specifically:
  - Addresses concerns regarding the naturalized corridor and Block 2, north of Option A of the naturalized corridor easement, that appears to create developable lands without access, and any associated concerns about this resulting in encroachments into the naturalized corridor.
- Monitoring: Revises the monitoring requirements so that Phases 1 & 2 and Phase 3 are addressed separately.
- Adds a note that during Construction Sighting Protocols include the information that will be distributed to those working on the site to familiarize them with the SAR on the site, and that this information may need to be updated annually to incorporate any changes that the federal/provincial governments make to the species that are listed and occur on site.”

**Motion Carried  
-Unanimous-**

Moved by C. Parent and seconded by B. Mungall

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee Defer all aspects of the Environmental Implementation Report prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. related to Phase 3 (Block 1) subject to the following conditions:

- In light of the findings of the 2010 salamander monitoring movement study, more comprehensive consideration should be given to Significant Wildlife Habitat, specifically amphibian movement corridors, from both a policy and an implementation perspective.
- Specifically:
  - A summary of current applicable policies related to Significant Wildlife Habitat (including adjacent lands) and specific measures to address this policy;
  - Identification of specific corridors for amphibian movement;
  - Review of opportunities and constraints to development within the Phase 3 lands including the provision of road access;
  - Assessment of potential environmental costs and benefits of a minimum of 1 alternative development configuration (i.e. lands to be developed versus those to be left undisturbed). This assessment should include consideration of an alternate road access;

- Provides clarification on how wildlife will be deterred from entering CSP drainage pipes, and whether the OREG were consulted on the number, location and design of culverts as well as existence of CSP pipes, and any potential impacts they might have on wildlife;
  - Consideration of the most current information related to culvert use by amphibians, and designs most likely to support movement in the context of anticipated development such as twinned culvert designs and increasing the size of the proposed CSP (drainage culverts);
  - Potential for additional restrictions on the uses of development to address identified ecological sensitivities in the area.
- Consideration of directional lighting for all outdoor lighting within Phase 3 lands including roads, parking lots and buildings.
  - That all relevant comments from the GRCA (dated March 27, 2012) are addressed. Specifically:
    - The concrete headwalls identified in Section 9.1.1, in the laneway into Block 1, are a minimum height of 50-60cm, therefore conflicting with table #10 Wildlife Culvert Comparison identified a wall height of 46 cm. Please clarify and update.”

**Motion Carried  
-Unanimous-**

**2. Correspondence and Information**

**3. Approval of Minutes from March 07, 2012**

- Defer to next meeting.

**4. Next Meeting**

Next meeting will be May 09, 2012.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

---

**CHAIRMAN**

# INTERNAL MEMO



DATE June 26, 2012

TO **EAC Members**

FROM Margot Ursic, Interim Environmental Planner

DIVISION Planning Services

DEPARTMENT Planning & Building, Engineering and Environment

**SUBJECT Southgate EIR EAC Minutes from April 11, 2012  
Motion for Consideration of Alternate Road Access**

---

Dear EAC Members,

At last April's EAC meeting the EIR for Southgate Business Park (23T-06503) was considered. This is a substantial and complex document, and your questions and input at this meeting were greatly appreciated.

Ultimately, it was decided by EAC at this meeting (and by the City) that a portion of the EIR (Phase 2) would be approved with some conditions and that a portion (Phase 3) would be deferred to allow for more comprehensive consideration of potential approaches for addressing the unique wildlife sensitivities on this site.

As part of the motion for deferral, there was a specific request that alternatives for Phase 3 "include consideration of an alternate access road". Initially I agreed that this was worthy of exploration, however I have since been made aware that an alternate road access was already explored through the original draft EIS for this site and rejected by the City, GRCA and EAC (at that time) based on a fulsome review of the anticipated environmental impacts.

I have also consulted with City Engineering staff who have confirmed that an alternate access through the old farm laneway between the string of Provincially Significant Wetlands would need to be a City road (and therefore wider than the current private laneway proposed off Maltby) and would require a secondary access down to Maltby (adjacent to the wetlands), which would introduce some additional impacts to address.

Finally, although the GRCA was willing to re-examine the feasibility of an alternate access point, they indicated that this alternative would be in contravention of their policies, and as such would likely not be approved by their Board unless it could be clearly demonstrated that this option was likely to result in much less harm to the regulated wetlands than the current draft alternative. The consulting Ecologists on this project have indicated that based on their knowledge of this site (which they have studied extensively in support of the EIS and EIR and related monitoring), they do not anticipate that changing the access from the current proposed private laneway off Maltby to the old farm laneway between the wetlands would result in less ecological impacts on the whole, and that (assuming it is appropriately designed and mitigated), the current proposed private laneway off Maltby likely

presents the least impactful option with respect to access.

Based on these considerations, the City has decided not to ask the proponent to "include consideration of an alternate access road" as part of their EIR addendum for Block 1 (Phase 3). However, we will expect the proponent to address all the other motions passed at the April 11, 2012 EAC meeting, as documented in the minutes.

The City genuinely appreciates your continued technical support in the review of various environmental studies, and looks forward to continuing to work with you on the Addendum to this EIR and other files as they come forward. I personally would also like to thank you for your assistance in providing review of various files during my time as Acting Environmental Planner.

Sincerely,

**Margot Ursic**

Acting Interim Environmental Planner

**Planning Services**

Planning & Building, Engineering and Environment