

Item	855 and 927 Victoria Road South Environmental Impact Study (EIS)
Proposal	<p>The EIS was prepared to support a Zoning Bylaw Amendment to permit a medium to high density residential development. The proposal includes two options.</p> <p>Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 367 dwelling units comprised of 156 stacked townhouse units and 211 apartment units; and• 502 parking spaces in total (including driveway and garage parking for the stacked townhouses, surface parking spaces and underground parking spaces for the apartment units). <p>Option B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 400 dwelling units comprised of 108 stacked townhouse units and 292 apartment units; and• 544 parking spaces in total (including driveway and garage parking for the stacked townhouse, surface parking spaces and underground parking spaces for the apartment units).
Location	<p>The subject lands are comprised of two separate parcels of land as shown on the Location Map (Attachment 1). The northern parcel is municipally known as 855 Victoria Road South and is approximately 2.25 hectares in size and has approximately 204 metres of frontage along Victoria Road South. The southern parcel is municipally known as 927 Victoria Road South and is approximately 2.58 hectares in size and has approximately 170 metres of frontage along Victoria Road South and approximately 166 metres of frontage along Macalister Boulevard.</p> <p>The subject lands are located east of the Torrance Creek Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and southeast of the southern limit of the Arboretum lands. The Arboretum Woods Tributary of Torrance Creek is located just north of the subject lands.</p>
Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The subject lands are located in the Torrance Creek Subwatershed.• The City's Official Plan designates the subject lands as medium and high density residential with significant natural area bordering the western edge of the subject lands.• The significant natural area designation is attributed to PSW, significant woodland, warmwater fish habitat and significant valleyland (undeveloped portions of the regulatory floodplain).• An ecological linkage is located approximately 50 metres to the west of the subject lands, across Macalister Boulevard, connecting the two patches of PSW which are bisected by the road.

- Item** 855 and 927 Victoria Road South Environmental Impact Study (EIS)
- The PSW and significant woodland limits were staked with in the field with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) and City of Guelph, respectively.
 - The subject lands were used to stockpile fill for a number of years.
 - The original subdivision approval included an Environmental Impact Assessment (2001) and an Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) (2008). An EIR Update (2017) was undertaken for the Phase 4 lands.
 - The Guelph Trail Master Plan identifies a secondary trail route from the intersection of Zaduk Place and Macalister Boulevard to Victoria Road South.
 - An EIS Terms of Reference was heard at the April 12, 2017 Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) meeting. A revised Terms of Reference was approved by City staff on June 12, 2017.

Comments

Staff have reviewed the EIS prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. dated June 15, 2018 and supporting documents, and offer the following comments:

Limits to Development and Permitted Uses

- Official Plan Policy 4.1.3.4.6 states that stormwater management facilities and structures may be permitted within the established buffers to significant wetlands provided they are located a minimum distance of 15 metres from a PSW. Stormwater management ponds included in Option A and Option B appear to encroach within the 15 metre buffer.
- Passive recreation is a general permitted use within the natural heritage system (Policy 4.1.2.1.ii). In the Official Plan, passive recreational activities means “a range of outdoor activities and passive uses compatible with protecting the natural heritage features and areas including, but not limited to, wildlife habitat, wetlands and woodlands. Activities and uses include bird watching, hiking, photography, snowshoeing, and may require the construction of a trail, benches or boardwalks in accordance with the Guelph Trail Master Plan or are integral to the scientific, educational or passive recreational use of a property”. Common amenity areas do not meet the definition of passive recreational activities, and are thus not considered a permitted use within the natural heritage system, including minimum or established buffers. Common Amenity Areas appear to encroach within the minimum buffers to the PSW and significant woodland in both Option A and Option B.

Grading

- Figures 2a and 2b (Option A Site Plan and Option B Site Plan, respectively) illustrate grading associated with the proposed stormwater management pond, but do not appear to illustrate the limits of grading associated with the remainder of the development

Item**855 and 927 Victoria Road South Environmental Impact Study (EIS)**

as shown on the Preliminary Site Servicing and Grading Plans prepared by Valdor as part of the Functional Servicing Report. The Official Plan definition of development includes site alteration activities such as fill, grading and excavation that would change the landform and natural vegetative characteristics of a site. The limits of development (including grading) must respect the minimum buffers of the natural heritage system, with the exception of general permitted uses and additional uses listed in the Official Plan.

- The EIS should include an assessment of impacts associated with the grading requirements of the proposed development, and provide an opinion as to whether or not the proposal is consistent with Official Plan policies.
- The Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan and Grading Plan must be compatible. Grading and a proposed catchbasin appear to be proposed within the limits of the Tree Protection Fencing recommended in the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan.

Secondary Trail

- Insufficient detail has been provided on the secondary trail route that is to extend from the intersection of Zaduk Place and Macalister Boulevard to Victoria Road South. Comments provided by City Parks and Recreation staff appended to Appendix C of the EIS indicate that the secondary trail should be evaluated in the EIS including all potential impacts of the trail including grading, drainage measures, hazard tree management, etc. Comments also indicate that the EIS should consider all practical trail route alternatives to avoid impacts to the natural heritage features. This will require a thorough site analysis consultation and site visit(s) with relevant staff.
- The EIS should include a preliminary trail design in sufficient detail to confirm its feasibility in terms of both protecting the natural heritage system and working with the proposed development concept for the subject lands.

Wetland Water Balance

- The site area included in the pre-development monthly water balance is 5.44 ha whereas the site area included in the post-development monthly water balance (prepared for Option A and Option B) is 4.50ha. With respect to evaluating the potential for hydrologic impacts to the adjacent PSW, the results of the water balance are thus not comparable.
- The Hydrogeology Study (Stantec June 8, 2018) and Functional Servicing Report (Valdor May 2018) indicates that an annual infiltration deficit of 9,948m³ under Concept A and 10,129m³ under Concept B will occur, post-development. Both reports indicate that a site water balance was previously completed for the entire Kortright East Subdivision and that stormwater management

Item**855 and 927 Victoria Road South Environmental Impact Study (EIS)**

facilities 1,3,4,5 and 6 were designed to incorporate a centralized infiltration basin in order to infiltrate stormwater runoff. It was determined that the stormwater management pond for the subject property (SWM No.2) would be designed as a wet pond due to the fairly impervious nature of the soils in this location. SWM No.1 was designed to account for additional infiltration that could not be accommodated in the catchment for SWM No.2, with post-development infiltration rates exceeding pre-development rates, based on the results of the site water balance completed for the wetland adjacent to SWM No.1 and No.2 (i.e., excess of 49,081m³/yr). Both reports indicate that no additional infiltration is required for the subject site due to sufficient additional infiltration provided by SWM No.1.

- The wetland water balance should demonstrate the amount of additional infiltration provided by SWM No.1 and compare to the infiltration deficit in catchment 101. In addition, clarification on whether or not SWM No.1 infiltrates to the same aquifer as catchment 101 would be beneficial, as would the direction of groundwater flow in relation to additional infiltration provided at SWM No.1 to compensate for deficit in catchment 101. The EIS and supporting wetland water balance must demonstrate that the proposed approach to stormwater management will not result in a negative impact to the wetland or groundwater regime.
 - For example, the stormwater management plan prepared for the Kortright subdivision included a water budget analysis for the north wetland that compared pre-development conditions in catchment 102 (5.79ha) to post-development conditions in the catchment for SWM No.1 (15.7ha). Based on the information presented, it is not possible to determine whether or the proposal will work.
- The water balance indicates a substantial increase in runoff, post-development (8,691 m³/yr to 30,017 (Option A)-30,518 m³/yr (Option B), representing an approximate 250% increase in runoff). This demonstrates a hydrologic impact to the wetland, and may result in a negative impact to the receiving tributary and indirect fish habitat. The EIS should include an assessment of impacts associated with increased runoff and the proposed outlet to the Arboretum Woods Tributary and downstream riverine PSW, as well as potential impacts to the adjacent PSW and groundwater regime.

Impact Assessment

- The EIS should include an evaluation of the need for an established buffer (per Official Plan policy 4.1.1.11). This evaluation should include an assessment of the proposed development's grading requirements and trail alignment. Recognizing that the trail corridor requires a width of 6.5 m, consideration should be given to a greater buffer the minimum buffer widths included in the current proposal.

Item

855 and 927 Victoria Road South Environmental Impact Study (EIS)

- Option A and Option B both include underground parking spaces. Given the high water table on the subject property, the EIS should assess impacts associated with dewatering requirements to accommodate underground parking. Mitigation measures should also be recommended.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

- The EIS recommends that native shrubs and pollinator-friendly flowering species be planted within the buffer. The effectiveness of the buffer would be enhanced through a more varied planting approach that includes both trees and shrubs to strengthen the PSW/woodland edge, especially following the removal of Common Buckthorn.
- Invasive species management is proposed as a mitigation measure. Measures to control Common Buckthorn are recommended. It is expected that a future EIR would include a detailed description of this mitigation measure.
- Recommended mitigation measures could be expanded to include funnel fencing to improve the effectiveness of the wildlife culvert under Macalister Boulevard, given the potential for increased traffic and increased amphibian/reptile road mortality associated with the proposed development.

Minor Comments

- The Canadian Wildlife Service lists the breeding bird window for Bird Conservation Region 13 Nesting Zone C2 as April 1 to August 25 (not April 15 to August 9).
- It would be helpful if Figures 5a and 5b could be updated to include the surveyed limits of natural features, in addition to their buffers.
- Chain-link fencing is proposed at the limits of the development. Please clarify if the recommendation is to place the fencing between the development and the trail, or between the trail and the natural heritage system.
- Section 7.4 Net Environmental Assessment lists minimal vegetation removal as a measure to protect the adjacent PSW and significant woodland. Clarification on what is meant by 'minimal vegetation removal' is requested (e.g. limited to hazard tree removal).
- The EIS Terms of Reference included a proposed monitoring section. The EIS does not appear to include this information.

Comments have yet to be received from GRCA, and the City of Guelph's Park Planning and Engineering Departments.

Item

855 and 927 Victoria Road South Environmental Impact Study (EIS)

Suggested Motion

Staff recommends that the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the EIS for 855 and 927 Victoria Road South, prepared by Stantec dated June 15, 2018, subject to the preparation of an EIS addendum that:

- provides a revised concept plan that is consistent with natural heritage system policies of the Official Plan (i.e., limits to development established by natural heritage system policies);
- provides a revised concept plan that includes the required trail alignment;
- provides an updated water balance to demonstrate how the infiltration deficit identified for the subject lands is accommodated for in the design of the stormwater management pond 1, located to the west of the subject lands, within the Kortright Subdivision;
- provides an updated stormwater management approach and water balance to address the 245% increase in runoff;
- provides an impact assessment of the required trail alignment;
- provides an impact assessment of the proposed development on the hydrology of the adjacent wetland;
- provides an impact assessment of the proposed stormwater outlet to the tributary of Torrance Creek, and downstream wetlands;
- provides an impact assessment of the proposed development on the local groundwater regime; and
- provides an impact assessment of dewatering required to support underground parking on site.