

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2013 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

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

Regrets: S. Lohnes, E. Blenkhorn, R. Park

Staff: A. Labbé, P. Wong

External Groups: Todd Fell, Dougan & Associates
Yousif Kazandji, Dunsire Development
Jessica Linton, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.
Hugh Handy, GSP Group
Hugh Whiteley, LRG3
Katherine St James, Stantec Consulting
Shari Muscat, Stantec Consulting

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

C. Parent declared a conflict of interest on Agenda item 4c (Pergola Subdivision 23T03507, Terms of Reference for an Environmental Implementation Report) due to his involvement on adjacent lands.

4. Development Applications

a) 55-75 Cityview Drive Environmental Impact Study

A. Labbé gave the Committee background information on the proposal. She noted that the latest EIS submission, dated July 2013, had been reviewed by Beacon Environmental Ltd. on behalf of the City. She noted that this EIS was vastly improved over the first submission in that it:

- Takes all development outside the PSW and associated 30m buffer;
- Includes a comprehensive screening of SWH;
- Provides for preservation of more (albeit not all) of the Cultural Woodland;
- Includes a detailed tree preservation/removal plan;

- Incorporates more detailed information about the current status of the former intermittent stream to Clythe Creek; and
- Provides generally good guidance with respect to opportunities for enhancement and restoration.

Hugh Handy, GSP Group, & Jessica Linton, NRSI, noted that they had been retained by the owners to take over from IBI Group. They noted that a public meeting had been held on November 4, 2013 and that the applicant will continue to work with staff on comments.

A. Labbé presented the staff comments. She identified issues with the following topics:

- Cultural Woodland – establishment of a buffer to prevent encroachment
- Valleylands – providing refined boundary mapping
- Ephemeral Watercourses, Seeps and Significant Wildlife Habitat – further analysis for the potential of SWH in relation to the watercourse and seeps; incorporation of these features in the water balance
- Water balance on-site and off-site considerations – information to confirm protection of PSW water levels and groundwater recharge inputs
- Site grading – avoid cuts below the groundwater table
- Monitoring – extension of PSW monitoring to at least 5 years
- Tree Preservation – preservation of five mature sugar maples (60 – 90 cm dbh)
- Trails – incorporation of a north-south community trail; closure of informal trails; identification and removal of invasive species and hazard trees along formalized trails; coordination of enhancement plantings with trail formalization
- Stewardship plan – more specifics on outreach and engagement of future residents

The Committee received written correspondence from Nature Guelph and discussion centered on Nature Guelph's comments about a rare plant reported on site: Downy Willow, *Salix lapponum*. Jessica Linton stated that it was her understanding that the University Arboretum currently lacks a specimen of this plant.

E. Stahl asked for the Grand River Assessment Report to be included as a background document and that salt management be included in the stewardship insert.

C. Parent asked why there was uncertainty in the amount of residential units proposed. Hugh Handy responded that there are multi-residential blocks proposed in the concept plan.

C Parent asked for more discussion on endangered species and that the EIS clearly demonstrate that there are no endangered species on the site. He also noted the following:

- Pg. 59: more clarification on wildlife corridors from a landscape scale
- Pg. 64/65: buckthorn seeds having a 5 year viability period and to not use a cut-pull method for removal
- Pg. 70/71: wanted more enhanced ESC plans due to proximity to the PSW

- Pg. 84: wanted more details on post-construction monitoring including the parameter used for monitoring, the frequency of monitoring, reporting details, contingency planning and staging of buckthorn removal

Y. Roy noted that section 7.4 (induced impacts) included recommendations to minimize human intrusion into natural areas. She wanted to see these recommendations brought forward to the implementation sections, specifically the stewardship insert and the fencing.

E. Stahl noted that the Committee also received emails from the Sierra Club Canada and Hugh Whiteley. It was noted that Hugh Whiteley agreed with the need for further consideration for groundwater impacts.

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

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee defer making a decision on the Environmental Impact Study prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. for 55 & 75 Cityview Drive until the above mentioned items are addressed.”

Motion Carried
-Unanimous-

b) 24, 26, 28 and 32 Landsdown Drive Terms of Reference for an EIS

A. Labbé presented the staff report for the proposal. She noted that the proposal was a zoning by-law amendment to allow for the development of 25 single-detached houses adjacent to the Torrence Creek PSW.

The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) provided comments and requested that a 2-season study (spring-summer) be included and that the Coefficient of Conservation be included in the inventory table. Further, GRCA indicated that the 30 metre buffer mentioned in the Terms of Reference should be recognized as a minimum width and that there may be a need for larger buffers.

A. Labbé presented the following staff recommendations:

- To include a tabular screening tool for Significant Wildlife Habitat
- To include delineation of feature boundaries
- To reassess the development concept depending on the results of the EIS to ensure compatibility with development constraints and opportunities
- To consider the feasibility of a public trail alignment that would not result in any negative impacts to PSW
- To include a tree compensation approach for any tree removals
- To include both surface and subsurface contributions in the wetland water balance

Todd Fell, Dougan & Associates, and Yousif Kazandji, Dunsire Developments, addressed the Committee on behalf of the proponents. Yousif Kazandji stated that the proposal was an infill development located beyond the backyard of existing houses. Todd Fell noted that the site has shown limited signs of succession due to constant plowing/mowing. He further stated that the GRCA has been out on site to stake the edge of the PSW and that the boundaries had been surveyed and included on the drawings. He expressed concerns about the need for another two-season study because the summer field work had already been completed and that the EIS for the adjacent property could be used to supplement existing information. Further, he stated that the site did not have woodlands and had limited potential as amphibian habitat. In regards to the plantation at the north end of the property, Todd Fell clarified that it was an Austrian Pine plantation.

K. McNeill expressed concerns about the wetland water balance and that the analysis should be performed at a monthly rather than an annual basis.

C. Parent stated that the ELC work should also inform a discussion on the sensitivity of flora on the adjacent property. He asked the proponents whether they had details on the vegetation located south of the pine plantation. Todd Fell replied that it was mowed grasses. C. Parent commented that the two-season study may be necessary in order to fully assess the PSW and its ecological functions. He stated that this would inform the adequacy of a 30 metre buffer as is currently proposed.

E. Stahl requested that the Grand River Assessment Report be used as background information and to inform the vulnerability of the aquifer.

G. Johnstone asked for clarification on the proposed trail alignment. He stated that a finalized trail alignment should also include considerations to inventory any nearby hazard trees.

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

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the proposed Terms of Reference for a Scoped Environmental Impact Study prepared by Dougan and Associates provided that:

- A minimum 2 season study (spring-summer) be included;
- The Coefficient of Conservation be included within the inventory table;
- The Torrence Creek Subwatershed Study, Natural Heritage Strategy, Urban Forest Management Plan, Guelph Trail Master Plan, and Grand River Assessment Report be utilized as background information;
- Feature delineation be included in the scope of work;
- The adequacy of a 30 metre buffer be assessed;
- The EIS recognize that all development conceptually proposed within proximity of the significant features be examined in the Scoped EIS to determine whether or not they are compatible uses and no negative impacts can be demonstrated;

- A monthly water budget be examined;
- Vascular plants are presented by ELC community; and
- The EIS review the proposed trail location and include a tree inventory for hazard trees within striking range of the trail.”

Motion Carried
-Unanimous-

c) Pergola Subdivision 23T-03507, Terms of Reference for an Environmental Implementation Report

A. Labbé presented the staff report for this application. She noted that EAC had previously approved an EIS for this property on February 9, 2005 provided that traffic calming measures, detailed planting plans and a second SWM outlet in Block 12 was addressed through the EIR.

A. Labbé stated that the proposal had since been redline-revised which was subsequently approved by EAC on November 14, 2012 provided that alternative techniques be used to address the low points within the wildlife corridor, that the EIR include the design and implementation of the wildlife corridor, that SAR screening be conducted, and that opportunities to restore the wildlife corridor be explored with the adjacent property owners. She also stated that stormwater management for this site had been addressed through the Phase 1 EIR.

A. Labbé noted that the GRCA had provided comments recommending that sediment and erosion controls be completed in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Guideline for Urban Construction (2006) and that larger tree stocks be used to provide resiliency from deer browsing. It was noted that a GRCA permit would be required.

A. Labbé also presented the following staff recommendations:

- To consider the need for a long-term monitoring plan to monitor the performance of the wildlife corridor design;
- To include drawings to support the restoration plans for Open Space Blocks.

B. Mungall asked for clarification on the trails on this property as it relates to the trail strategy for the south Guelph. A. Labbé stated that the trail analysis to be performed through this EIR would look at viable connections to Clair Road. She noted that the EIR for the adjacent Dallon property recommended that a trail on that site was not feasible.

Shari Muscat, Stantec Consulting, addressed the Committee on behalf of the proponents. She noted that there were no natural heritage features on this property and recognized that the EIR would look at the feasibility of a trail on this site. She stated that recent wildlife studies had been performed for meadow breeding birds and that a SAR screening had been conducted.

E. Stahl asked that the Grand River Assessment Report be included as a background document.

B. Mungall stated that the EIR should also look at the removal of construction debris and garbage on this site.

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

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee support the proposed Terms of Reference for an Environmental Implementation Report for a Draft Plan of Subdivision (23T-03507) prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. for 1820 Gordon Street, provided that the EIR also include:

- How all the conditions of approval have been met;
- How municipal infrastructure servicing and the protection of natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions have been addressed;
- Alternative techniques to address the low point within the wildlife corridor and the use of a catch basin including measures to mitigate catch basins impacts to wildlife, should a catch basin be required
- Consideration and recommendations with respect to the need for and design of a long-term monitoring plan to monitor the performance of the wildlife corridor design;
- Opportunities for coordinating between adjacent property owners with respect to restoration of the wildlife corridor; and
- Drawings by a full member of OALA, to support restoration plans for Open Space Blocks.”

Motion Carried

1 member abstained

5. **Adoption of Minutes from Previous Meeting**

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

“To accept the minutes as amended.

- Under agenda item #1 (66 Eastview Environmental Impact Study), change K. O’Reilly to K. McNeill.”

Motion Carried
-Unanimous-

6. **Correspondence and Information**

A. Labbé distributed the Terms of Reference (EIS) for Hyland Road and the Terms of Reference (EIR) for 66 Eastview Road. These items are to be mailed out to absent members.

7. Other Business

E. Stahl noted that the Solid Waste Master Plan had completed an online survey and held a workshop for members of the public. She noted that attendance was low and there was limited feedback.

C. Parent raised a concern on addressing cumulative impacts on site-specific applications. He noted that applications were building up to the edge of buffers and that there are likely to be impacts over time. He stated that applications do not fully assess the impacts at a landscape scale and the need for ecological linkages. He stated that it is hard to ask the last developers for increased buffers when previous applications were approved with smaller buffers.

K. McNeill stated that circumstances do change and that buffer recommendations should reflect this.

E. Stahl stated that members should be challenging proposed buffer widths where they see it as necessary.

Y. Roy stated that current policies to support enhancement and restoration areas are not strong enough.

A. Labbé said that the current EIS guidelines contain sections to address these concerns. She reminded the members that the current Official Plan does contain strong policies to address ecological linkages and that staff will look at any other existing tools to support the restoration of habitat.

8. 2014 Meeting Schedule

The next meeting is scheduled for January 8, 2014. V. Laur will send out the full list of meeting dates for 2014. It was also requested that staff poll the members to determine whether the March meeting would meet quorum due to March Break.

9. Adjourn

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

CHAIRMAN