

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2014 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM B
MINUTES**

- Present:** K. McNeill (Acting Chair) Y. Roy
G. Johnstone C. Parent
B. Mungell R. Park
- Regrets:** E. Stahl (Chair), E. Blenkhorn
- Staff:** A. Labbé, Environmental Planner, Margot Ursic (Beacon Environmental), Katie Nasswetter, Senior Development Planner, M. Mercier, Clerical Assistant
- External Groups:** Jessica Linton, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.
Sandy Anderson – Anderson GeoLogic Limited
Hugh Handy, GSP Group
Pamela Kraft, Fusion Homes/5 Arthur St Developments
Paul Douglas, MTE
Carrie Curtis, ABA Architects
Melissa Straus, Stantec
Chris Powell, Stantec

1. **Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm.
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 Agenda item #4c – 5 Arthur St S.
4. **Development Applications**
 - a) **55 & 75 Cityview Drive Scoped EIS (August 2014)**

Margot Ursic, Consultant, acting on behalf of the City, presented her report to the committee. Margot advised that the City has received the revised application and that she is pleased with report, that the comments have been addressed and it is satisfactory from a Natural Heritage perspective. Margot added that she would like 5 years of post-construction monitoring instead of the recommended 2. Although the report recommends Option A for the trail, Margot would like to see a combination of Options B and C and that further consultation with Parks is needed. Margot also commented that she has not received comments from the Engineering Department on the Stormwater Management section.

Jessica Linton, from Natural Resource Solutions Inc. provided some background information and advised that they have received and addressed the comments on the Scoped EIS. Jessica added that they have acceptance in principle from the GRCA and are awaiting formal comment.

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

Y. Roy noted the following:

- Open space block # 149, 150 and 151 no longer show on the plans - Jessica confirmed that these blocks are now numbered 123, 124 and 125
- Suggested removing the buckthorn and re-naturalizing the buffer of Block 125
- Asked if the GRCA has a definition of valleylands – Jessica confirmed that they used the definition provided by the GRCA
- Asked if there is value to have bird monitoring in the EIR – Jessica advised that they could look into it

K. McNeill noted the following:

- Asked if there was going to be fencing along the back of the houses onto the natural area – Jessica advised that they haven't got to that level of detail but it is likely and that they would consider the fencing.
- Asked how does the roof top water get to the spreaders – Jessica replied that the downspouts lead to the spreaders and there are traps to keep leaves out
- Asked if the PSW is fed by surface water - Sandy responded yes a majority is surface water with some groundwater infiltration
- Would like to see baseline data for 5 year monitoring

Delegation:

A. Labbé advised that comments were submitted by Hugh Whiteley and were circulated to Committee Members. Committee members acknowledged receipt of the comments.

Charles Cecile on behalf of Nature Guelph provided the following comments:

- In support of recommendation
- Concerned about the small wetland down by Cityview Dr. This was part of the Lee St wetland and fits the minimum size in OPA 42. It also may exist as a water storage area. Species that are there are wetland plants. It could be a small naturalized area as part of the stormwater management plan.
- Agree that for the trail, that a combination of B and C is a better option
- Concerns with the accuracy of the vascular plant list and provided details as to what species should be clarified.

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

“THAT given the above concerns, staff recommends that the Environmental Advisory Committee accepts the Environmental Impact Study prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. for 55 & 75 Cityview Drive with the following conditions:

- THAT Stormwater Management is addressed to the satisfaction of City Engineering Staff;
- THAT data loggers be installed in select wetland piezometers and that baseline data be provided in the EIR
- THAT consideration be given to expanding vegetation monitoring to include fixed plots
- THAT forthcoming GRCA and Parks Planning comments are addressed; and
- THAT an Environmental Implementation Report be completed as a condition of Approval and include the following (not limiting):
 - Clarification regarding the number of trees inventoried, species to be used in compensation being native to Wellington County and areas to be re-vegetated;
 - Site-specific Tree Preservation Plan;
 - Site-specific habitat management plan for the invasive species removal area;
 - Site-specific grading and erosion control plans;
 - Details about the proposed education and outreach;

- Details related to trail design and mitigation; and
- Thresholds related to the monitoring
- Final trail alignment and details related to the trail.
- Provide updated vegetation species list based on Nature Guelph's comments

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous**

b) 1211-1231 Gordon St – proposed Terms of Reference for an EIR (September 8, 2014)

A. Labbé, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed her staff report. Adele noted that there is a 30 m buffer to the PSW and there is proposed infiltration outside of buffer and a stormwater management pond partially within the buffer zone proposed. Adele is not sure if there is a trail proposed in the area and Parks will review.

Jessica Linton, from Natural Resource Solutions Inc. provided some background on the application. Jessica advised that the site has been degraded and that they will plan to restore and enhance the area as well. Jessica added that they are dealing with MNR with how to deal with the bats and they are getting the wetland boundaries surveyed next week.

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

K. McNeill noted that they should provide some rationale for why the recommended type of monitoring is appropriate.

Moved by G. Johnstone and seconded by C. Parent,

“THAT based on this review, staff recommends that the Environmental Advisory Committee accept the Terms of Reference for an Environmental Implementation Report prepared by NRSI with the following condition:

- That the Provincially Significant Wetlands are staked in the field and confirmed by the GRCA;
- That in addition to the SWM Report, Site Plan, Hydrogeological Report, Landscape Plans and Topography information, detailed grading and drainage plans as well as Erosion and Sediment Controls are also appended to the EIR;
- That a Salt Management Plan is included;
- The floodline is delineated in EIR mapping;
- That monitoring wells are equipped with continuous data loggers to support wetland water balance analyses and mitigation design;
- That any baseline monitoring data is included in the EIR; and
- That sufficient rationale is provided if any encroachment is proposed within the 30 m buffer.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous**

c) 5 Arthur Street South – Environmental Implementation Report (September 5, 2014)

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

Melissa Straus, from Stantec provided some background on the application. Melissa advised that there have been some additional studies done since the EIS, they have addressed the comments received to date, they are still adjusting the lists for the species plan for Phase 1, they will be putting in a temporary trail between Phases 2 and 6 and there will be a green roof over the parking garage to be done as part of Phase 1. Melissa added that the river wall inspections will be done two times a year, a

risk management plan and the health and safety management plan are being developed and pollinator meadow will be included in the plans. The entire project is being phased and is expected to be developed over the next 12 years.

Chris Powell, from Stantec advised that they have a commitment to incorporate the objectives in subsequent phases of project as it relates to river walk and that further discussion with the GRCA and the City will be required as work progresses.

Pamela Kraft, from 5 Arthur St Holdings provided a breakdown of the phasing of the project. Each phase is expected to take approximately 16 months. Pamela noted that she feels that the concerns with the riverwalk and floodway area are premature until those phases are being developed as they are still at least 6-10 years out. Pamela raised a concern over the delay in getting the EIR done which will delay starting construction for Phase 1 and would like to see the EIR approved subject to conditions. Pamela added that they are meeting with Engineering tomorrow on the structural report of wall.

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

B. Mungall noted the following:

- Asked if the structural assessment of the wall include the northerly section of wall. Pamela responded that no, it only included the portion south of the rail line and the heritage building and that the wall is going to be under ownership of condo and there will be no liability for the City.
- Indicated a preference of not having the riverwalk done in phases

G. Johnstone raised concerns with the phasing of the riverwall and added that he would prefer to see the riverwalk completed all at once instead of in pieces.

C. Parent provided some suggestions for some stewardship materials including:

- Items that provide a connection between what people are reading and what is in front of them
- Very specific material dealing with site history and history of river ie. what fish in river, wildlife etc
- Information on the chimney swifts
- Ecological enhancements
- Need to recognize what it is and only so much enhancement can be done

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

“ THAT based on this review, staff recommends that the Environmental Advisory Committee defer the Environmental Implementation Report prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. until such time:

- That a structural assessment is undertaken to the satisfaction of the City and to inform mitigation planning as it relates to surface water and fish habitat, as applicable;
- That comprehensive design details are provided for the floodway zone;
- That further work is undertaken regarding access to the river;
- That detailed design of signage is provided;
- That City staff's comments are addressed to their satisfaction;

AND

- That the Environmental Advisory Committee's recommendations are considered during the further development of the riverwalk design.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous with 1 abstainer**

5. Adoption of Previous Minutes

Moved by G. Johnstone and seconded by Y. Roy,

“That the minutes of the Environmental Advisory Committee meeting held on September 10, 2014 be adopted.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous with 1 abstaining**

6. Correspondence and Information

A. Labbé advised that the University of Guelph has submitted an EIS TOR for the storage yard fronting onto Stone Rd. They are looking to renovate storage area and are going through the Site Plan approval process.

7. Next Meeting

November 12, 2014 at 7pm.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

CHAIRMAN