

**APPENDIX A.10**

**HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY**

**STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

## **STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #7**

### **HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY**

**DATE:** September 10, 2004  
**LOCATION:** Bowman Room, Cambridge Place  
**IN ATTENDANCE\*:** April Souwand, Albert Hovingh, Carlo Radicioni, Alex Koch, Yvette Rybensky, Hans Madan, Gus Rungis, Wendy Wright  
**REGRETS:** Ken Cornelisse

\* the meeting was observed by MGWA members John Vasiga, Cathy Murphy and Mary Hammer and videotaped by them.

#### **1. Update on Status of Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study**

April Souwand informed the committee that this meeting had been called to update them on the status of the Hespeler West Subwatershed Study which has not yet been approved by Cambridge Council. Wendy Wright indicated that PEIL has made changes to correct mapping errors in their final report dated March 2003, revised November 2003. She indicated that Council convened a Working Committee to review the community concerns with the study and to report back to Council. A public meeting is being held on September 16, 2004 at the Wanner Mennonite Church on Beaverdale Road, and all Steering Committee members are encouraged to attend. There will be an open house from 6pm to 7pm and a presentation and question and answer period will occur at 7pm. Working Committee member Brian Cunningham will chair the meeting and John Vasiga and Wendy Wright will make the presentation. Public input from this meeting will be taken and a report is scheduled to go the Cambridge Council on September 28, 2004.

#### **2. Draft Summary Report (#3) Review**

Wendy Wright proceeded to walk the committee through the draft summary report, making the following observations:

- a) Wetland evaluation review – refine boundaries and fine-tuning of PSWs was done by MNR with the help of the MGWA. The City re-hired Dougan and Associates to update information on areas which are now outside the PSW – we expect information back early next week (work in progress). This will be incorporated into the final report.
- b) Potential ESPAs – polygons have been identified by the Region.
- c) Floodlines – PEIL has corrected their errors and this has been peer-reviewed by TSH – TSH was also hired to re-calculate the floodlines based on current information and to run scenarios. They have determined that subcatchment 2120 is not in the Middle Creek subwatershed

(connection to Randall Drain has been re-instated). Subcatchment 2125 has been the subject of discussion about its ultimate drainage, and 2115 has been split into 2115 and 2116. The northeast corner of Maple Grove and Speedsville Roads have been re-surveyed as it was determined that the City's contour mapping was inaccurate in this area. The floodlines around the spill area along Beaverdale Road have been closed. It has been recommended that the floodplain policies for this area need to be firmed up in the community plan. An updated survey by MTE of the Hammer property which has been partially filled has resulted in the floodline not covering as much of the Hammer property as it had in the past. Gus Rungis commented that there were problems in the PEIL report with reporting inconsistencies but in the end, the TSH floodplain limits are similar. The final THS floodline report will be Appendix B of the Summary Report.

- d) Natural Heritage Protection – Stewardship areas are no longer shown on the Greenspace Management Strategy. The Working Committee has decided that the program will apply to the whole area. Buffers have been a subject of much discussion. The MGWA is concerned that 30 m is too large. Wendy Wright showed the committee a map which details context-sensitive buffers adjacent to PSWs (30m), LSWs (30m), potential ESPAs (30m) and “other” high constraint areas (EIS at Community Plan Stage done by City to determine buffers, unless buffer is within floodplain, where it will remain 30m). She distributed Table 3 from the draft summary report which details these widths of study area to establish or change buffers. She also showed some areas on the map where buffers are to be removed when they are across a road from the natural area they are associated with. She indicated that the MGWA is looking for buffers of 15m from PSWs, 3m from upland forests, 1m from plantations and 0m from cultural features. She indicated that her position is that we do not have enough information on land use to take this extra step of reducing buffers, but reduced buffers are not unrealistic. There is no consensus on this between the MGWA and the technical people on the Working Committee. On Table 3 from the summary report, Wendy pointed out the area of study required with no buffers determined by the HWSS and the agency responsible. Wendy Wright asked for any concerns or comments with this approach. Hans Madan asked how this would be implemented. April Souwand indicated that the community plan will have to be quite detailed in order to do an EIS. Yvette Rybensky warned that this would be an expensive and lengthy process to do the detail at the community plan stage and Hans Madan indicated that the developer may want to do the work again to further refine the buffers at the time of development application. Wendy Wright indicated that she realizes the expense and difficulty to do this, but in the spirit of compromise, it needs to be done at the community plan. At this point in the meeting, Hans Madan indicated he has a conflict of interest with the West Hespeler Community Plan as he

has a relationship with a group that owns a small parcel of land in the community plan area.

- e) Figures – Wendy Wright indicated that several figures will be updated in the summary report. They will have the same numbering system as the PEIL report, and there will be large fold out map. She thought there may be a need for another Steering Committee meeting after the maps are available. Comments on the text would be appreciated next week. The working committee is also being asked to provide comments on the text.
- f) Aggregates – Wendy Wright pointed out that there is more detail provided on aggregate resources in the subwatersheds on page 24 of the summary report.
- g) Countryside Line Mapping Change – Wendy Wright indicated that a community plan will be done for the area that is currently within the urban area. Official Plan Amendments will be needed to go into the green area.
- h) Scheduled Areas – will be added to the floodline map as an information piece.
- i) Ponds and Dams – there was concern in the community with the recommendation to remove on-line ponds – Wendy Wright indicated that ponds can be taken off line and maintained as pond habitat.
- j) Trails – Wendy Wright discussed the concern that the conceptual trail strategy caused in the community before development plans are firmer. This will be put off until the community plan stage. The community was concerned that the buffers were of 30 m width to accommodate the trails.
- k) Public Consultation – Wendy Wright indicated that there were lessons learned about public consultation through this process. The public needs to be part of the technical discussion. She thought we could use the North Hespeler Community Plan as a model for public consultation (working sessions for the public). There is a need to get public involvement early. Alex Koch indicated that there is a big learning curve because of the complexity of issues and subject matter. Wendy said the Planning Services Department has looked at how notice is sent out for these types of projects, versus development applications which are usually one-time mailings. She also indicated that we will monitor more closely the landowner permissions for access (in the past, this was left with the consultants...the City needs to be more involved). Finally, the distribution of the final report needs to be made more accessible.
- l) Revised Greenspace Management Strategy – April Souwand went over the major changes to this on a draft map. It has been clarified that enhancement land uses are not open space, but land uses that are supportive of natural features (area of unimpeded space). The stewardship areas have been changed to a watershed-wide stewardship program to take the stigma off individual properties.
- m) Implementation – Wendy Wright indicated that in the implementation section, it is explained that development “kicks in” the recommendations of the subwatersheds study. Specific properties may need to be looked at before development (e.g. McRae – entire property is zoned OS – need to

look at what is outside the floodplain to be rezoned residential). The information from Dougan and Associates on the non-PSW area is needed before this can be done.

- n) Questions and Comments – Alex Koch asked about the EISs for trails in the community plan. Wendy Wright indicated we don't know right now – there is no easy answer. This will be discussed in the terms of reference for the community plan. Alex Koch asked for the rationale behind two sets of buffer recommendations. Wendy Wright indicated that the MGWA recommendations may not be acceptable to the agencies with jurisdiction and she will not recommend against the agencies. Gus Rungis asked about the timing of approvals. Will the summary report go to Cambridge Council first and then on to the GRCA? It was thought that the summary report could be adopted by the GRCA board as an addendum. Wendy Wright indicated it should go to Cambridge Council first so that the GRCA knows what the City of Cambridge has adopted.

### **3. Next Steps**

Wendy Wright indicated that at the public meeting on September 16, 2004, there will be no summary document. She will be doing a PowerPoint format presentation with members of the Working Committee. She will outline key changes, results, etc. and the MGWA will outline their concerns. Public input on this and the maps will be sought and there may be others wanting landowner consultation. The final draft and maps will be out as soon as possible. At that time it will be determined if another Steering Committee meeting is needed before the September 28/04 council meeting.

These minutes were prepared by April Souwand. Please advise the writer of any errors or omissions.