

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2014 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM B
MINUTES**

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

Regrets: R. Park

Staff: A. Labb  , A. Nix, B. Herczeg

External Groups: Jessica Linton, Natural Resource Solutions
Ken Burrell, Natural Resource Solutions
Jeff Neumann, Owner, 132 Clair Rd.
Astrid Clos, Astrid J. Clos Planning
Matt Nelson, GM Building Planning & Engineering
Chris Sims, GM Building Planning & Engineering
David Stephenson, Natural Resource Solutions
Caroline Baker, GSP Group Inc.
Chris Parent, North South Environmental
Andrew Lambden, Terraview Homes

1. Call to Order

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

2. Call and Certification of Quorum

Attendance was noted and quorum was declared.

3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest or Conflict of Interest

Chris Parent declared a conflict of interest on 132 Clair Road West (Environmental Impact Study Terms of Reference) as well as 132 Harts Lane (Proposed Subdivision)

Chris Parent declared a conflict of interest on 132 Clair Road West

4. Development Applications

a) 132 Clair Road West- Environmental Impact Study Terms of Reference

April Nix reviewed the staff report on behalf of the City. Clarification is sought on various aspects of the TOR, which will help identify the scope of the EIS. Staff suggested that a scoped EIS should take place; and the TOR should include adjacent lands.

Chris Parent spoke on behalf of the Applicant and noted that there is some confusion regarding the request for a concept plan before the EIS is undertaken. He indicated that he felt the proponent is being asked to provide results of the EIS within the TOR. Chris noted that he believes sufficient detail has been provided in the TOR.

Astrid Clos spoke on behalf of the Applicant requesting a revision to the suggested motion. Rather than deferring, she requested the Committee accept the TOR subject to the list of items below being addressed to the satisfaction of staff. This would avoid coming back to the Committee for more discussion.

Committee members had the following comments/concerns:

There were no delegations.

Committee discussion was had:

Yvette Roy

- The purpose of the TOR is to capture the necessary information that will go into the EIS and that all the required surveys are done. Without the species at risk pre-screening, the Committee cannot know if additional in depth studies are required so the question is whether the Committee is comfortable with further detail being sorted out with City staff or returning to Committee for their consideration. The Proponent needs to clarify if additional studies are needed before the EIS is done so additional surveys are not requested after submission.

Erin Blenkhorn

- Indicated comfort without a concept plan given the EIS should indicate constraints and opportunities.

Kelsey McNeill

- Asked how far south the property extends.
- Clarification of the property boundary and the study areas needs to be addressed within the TOR.

Moved by Greg Johnstone and seconded by Kelsey McNeill

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee accepts the Terms of Reference for an Environmental Impact Study prepared by North South Environmental Inc. for 132 Clair Rd West as revised to include the following:

THAT a revised EIS TOR is resubmitted to the satisfaction of City staff, which;

- Includes a description of planned development, clarification of study area and a revised proposal which includes information regarding infrastructure and servicing for the development;
- Identifies all known natural heritage features and areas (e.g. Significant Landform) and includes available information (species records) for potential features;
- Includes a screening of existing and potential SWH and Habitat for Significant Species;
- Includes a program for field studies to assess for SWH and Habitat for Significant Species that includes detailed field methodologies based on the completed screening;
- Identifies whether a Tree Inventory is required as part of an EIS and includes details regarding the proposed Tree Inventory; and
- Includes a section to analyze and address all policy requirements,

THAT the final EIS TOR is circulated to the Environmental Advisory Committee for information,”

Motion Carried
1 member abstained

b) 148-160 Delhi Street (Homewood) – Environmental Impact Study Terms of Reference

Adèle Labb   reviewed the staff report which included:

- Specified the date of the application was in May of this year so the December 2012 Consolidated Official Plan is applicable to this application. There will also be regard for OPA 42.
- Along with the consent which is a Committee of Adjustment file the applicant is seeking variances on setbacks for the proposed severed parcel.
- There is some confusion with the purpose of the proposal, consents are typically accompanied by proposed building envelopes.
- There is a concurrent EIS being undertaken by the applicant in support of a site plan application made in 2013 and the TOR for both studies are very similar but tailored to each application. The site plan application for the EIS TOR has been reviewed by City Staff as well as GRCA and has been accepted.

- The property is regulated by the GRCA and the GRCA have also accepted the EIS TOR for the consent but note that features should be staked in the field and verified by staff.
- Indicated the need for potential future building envelopes to be identified in the EIS, which will help inform the impact analysis.
- Indicated that the proponent has put in a request for information from MNR, when the MNR responds there will be more information about species at risk. There is potential for Chimney Swift habitat within the vicinity of the site.
- Lastly if the consultant could clarify the time spent on snake habitat surveys and turtle nesting surveys that would help inform the TOR.

Committee members had the following comments/concerns:

Kelsey McNeill

- Needs clarification on where the land severance is located on the map (about 5.8 hectares).

Yvette Roy

- Asked for clarification about the ability to identify potential building envelopes
City staff also noted that consideration should be given to fragmentation of the NHS when examining potential impacts of the severance.

Caroline Baker provided further information on behalf of the proponent including:

- Clarification that the owners are not severing to develop; there is an existing building on the severed piece that operates as conference and office space. It is unusual to sever a piece that will not be developed but if there is future development, a site plan application would need to be conducted which would potentially require a zone change.
- There isn't a planning purpose for this severance; but will allow for an additional mortgage to finance the addition being proposed through the Site Plan process.

Jessica Walker from NRSI clarified:

- That there is no intent to remove any trees on site.
- That formalizing a public trail is a concern because of the sensitivity of the services provided at Homewood. The public does have access to the trails through Friends of Homewood, but Homewood requests that people register because there are concerns of safety for their patients as well as the public.

There were no delegations, but EAC did receive an email from H. Whately and has reviewed it.

Moved by Yvette Roy and seconded by Bill Mungall

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

THAT EIS TOR be revised to:

- Recognize that all healthy, non-invasive trees are to be considered in compensation plans;
- Consider potential environmental impacts that may result from the services of future buildings;
- Recognize existing and potential SWH;
- Provide details regarding snake habitat and turtle nesting survey methodologies;
- Information regarding adjacent parcel properties and how they will relate to each other (i.e. intensification and cumulative impacts); and
- Review the Grand River Assessment Report to review ground water vulnerability of the area.”

Motion Carried
-Unanimous

Chris Parent declared a conflict of interest on 132 Harts Lane

c) 132 Harts Lane- Proposed Subdivision

There was a conflict of interest and a member of Committee left the table.

Adèle Labb   presented the staff report.

Staff comments included:

- Vascular plants that are within the wetland were not identified in the report (i.e. Torrey's Rush which is rare in Wellington Country) and staff would like to see the rare species mapped.
- There are a high number of trees reported to be in poor condition, and discussions is on-going between staff and the consultant concerning this.
- Barn Swallow structures are proposed to be moved to the buffer area, staff are uncertain if this would affect the ownership (public agency or not) therefore, staff would like the maintenance and monitoring requirements described in more detail.
- The deer movement corridors, areas fragmented by roads are not typically wildlife corridors but the report should be more practical and take into consideration what might be significant in the city.
- There needs to be more discussion about the shallow ground water function of the wetlands; specifically with respect to any proposed changes and how it may affect wetland functions.
- With respect to buffers, distance separation, encroachment and noise, were not explicitly addressed in the EIS.
- Environmental Planning staff would prefer Option 1 for Harts Lane, to be a multi-use trail, however the city will need have more of a dialog about that in the future with various departments.
- Staff strongly encouraged that storm water management be relocated outside the 30m buffer to provide the wetland with better protection. The report should also have a section regarding low impact development corridors.

The proponent provided some information including:

- Proposed changes to the water balance are minuscule and it is driven by the regional water table;
- The wetland area was once groundwater driven and is now driven by surface water;
- The hydrogeologist reviewed the geology and hydrogeology of the area and described that the soils have a 2-3 m layer of sandy silt till consisting of sand, silt, clay and gravel which is underlaid by a hard pan of clay silt till.
- Clarified that the soils have low hydraulic conductivity and that the intersection of shallow groundwater occurs at the base of the slope;
- Also indicated that the team is getting more information as they have installed another piezometer at the area identified by staff where there is potential seepage.
- Indicated that the staff comments can be addressed;
- Indicated there is a sedge meadow area which was pointed out by City staff.

The proponent's team requested that the Committee delete the reference to Harts Lane from within the motion and specified that the GRCA also supported Option 1. It was also requested that EAC have the responses provided in an Addendum to the EIS. As well, they requested that Committee accept the EIS and indicated the comments could be addressed with staff.

Committee members had the following comments/concerns:

Erin Blenkhorn

- Inquired on whether any discussion had occurred with respect to relieving the damming effect of Harts Lane through provision of more culverts.

Kelsey McNeill

- Would like the proponent to consider data loggers to record water levels. There are seasonal fluctuations and a baseline study needs to be conducted for measurable results. The data would be beneficial for baseline information to monitor change.

- Indicated that although the summer flora was said to be complete, it is lacking at least a handful of species that are reasonably easy to identify.
- Monitoring plot locations need to be clarified; monitoring wildlife crossings and how they are affected as well.
- Fencing is another important aspect at this location.

Yvette Roy

- Are there any other examples of Barn Swallows successfully using buffers for nesting habitat? Would a 30m buffer create a forging habitat? The Proponent responded that the province is monitoring the success of these types of swallows within buffers and there are various construction techniques. The wetland area on this site does provide an excellent habitat for barn swallows.
- Would like to see the section on the buffer expanded upon to include habitat requirements and impacts to the surrounding environment, water quality and slopes as it relates to the final buffer width.

Bill Mungall

- Asked if Harts Lane will be used for access during construction. Specified that this should be included in the EIS.

Greg Johnstone

- There are issues with the spreadsheet concerning the tree inventory. There is an error with tree removal as well as the total number of trees present. This information is located on page four of the tree inventory.

Moved by Bill Mungall and seconded by Greg Johnstone

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee defer the Environmental Impact Study to support a proposed development at 132 Hart’s Lane prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc., until such time that the further information is available as it relates to Harts Lane as well as until further information is provided in the EIS as it relates to :

1. Seeps and shallow groundwater functions (i.e., using data loggers to collect additional consistent baseline data).
2. Comprehensive vascular plants inventory (particularly summer flora) as per the TOR
3. Barn Swallow constructed habitat;
4. Bat species-at-risk;
5. Deer movement corridors;
6. Significant Wildlife Habitat (mapping);
7. Natural Hazards (floodplain) mapping;
8. Tree Inventory, Preservation and Compensation Plan;
9. Wetland water balance/SWM potential impacts and mitigation plans; and
10. Buffer analysis as it relates to encroachment, noise, Barn swallow habitat, water quality, fencing, impacts of slope to the function of the buffer.
11. Assessment of potential impacts (i.e., salt) to wetland from runoff and infiltration to stormwater ponds,
12. Information on access for construction equipment to the site.
13. A discussion of the alternatives that could enhance conveyance under Harts Lane (i.e., reducing damming effects).
14. Additional discussion within the pre-and post-construction monitoring plan.

THAT EAC supports option 1 for the Harts Lane road alignment options; and

THAT the additional requested information be provided in an Addendum to this report.”

Motion carried

- 1 abstained

Moved by Greg Johnstone and seconded by Kelsey McNeill

Motion to continue meeting past 10 pm

Motion carried
- 1 abstained

5. Adoption of Previous Minutes

Some minor changes were requested.

Moved by Kelsey McNeill and seconded by Erin Blenkhorst

"THAT the minutes of the Environmental Advisory Committee meeting held on June 11, 2014 be adopted as amended."

Motion Carried
-2 abstained

6. Correspondence and Information

Staff handed out two submissions to the committee members, Lansdown resubmission, as well as the 55/75 Cityview resubmission.

Greg requested when the Agenda goes out that there are dates next to the documents being reviewed to ensure Committee members are reviewing appropriate materials.

7. Other Business

A presentation of the City's Emerald Ash Borer Strategy was provided by Martin Neumann.

Kelsey asked about accessing properties under review. Staff responded requesting members who wish to access lands to provide an email request to confirm permission.

8. Next Meeting

September 10th 2014

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10pm

Moved by Greg Johnstone and seconded Yvette Roy

Motion carried
-Unanimous

CHAIRMAN