

**CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY WORKING COMMITTEE
MEETING NO. 16
MINUTES**

Thursday, August 5, 2004
Allan Reuter Seniors' Centre, 507 King Street, Cambridge (Preston)

Committee Present: Councillor Rick Cowsill (City) (Chair), Erich Ritzmann (MGWA), John Vasiga (MGWA), Charlene Schiedel (MGWA), Nancy Davy (GRCA), Wendy Wright (City), April Souwand (City), Brian Cunningham (Small Property Owners), Ian Rawlings (Large Property Owners), Cathy Murphy (MGWA), Chris Gosselin (Region of Waterloo), Ken Cornelisse (MNR)

Others Present: Ron McKittrick (alternate (MGWA)), Mary and Larry Hammer (landowners)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Wendy Wright for the Chair, Rick Cowsill who was delayed in arriving at the meeting. She suggested that the presentation by Kevin Curtis be dealt with first.

4. Presentation – Countryside Line

Kevin Curtis, Administrator of Policy Planning for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo gave a presentation on the Region's Growth Management Strategy and the associated Countryside Line. The Growth Management Strategy looks forward to the next 40 years of growth in Waterloo Region. The Countryside Line is the firm boundary between urban and rural areas of the community to be used throughout the Region. It was approved in June of last year, with four areas in the Region where a definitive line was unable to be drawn. The "stars" on the Regional Growth Management Strategy map indicates portions of the Countryside Line which are to be further refined. In Cambridge, this is the area between Speedsville and Hespeler Roads. The uncertainty is the result of a decision by Regional Council to include the Hiff and Snyder lands to the east of the Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study. Regional staff had found that those lands were not needed for urban development uses, but City and Regional Councils wanted to add them in. However, it is not clear exactly where the boundary will be located or the extent of lands to be added in. Staff will be looking for physical features, administrative features or technical consideration (e.g. roads, rivers, ESPAs, property lines, servicing boundaries, and land availability and demand) distinguishing between urban and rural areas to help draw the line. But in this area, several studies (e.g. Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study, Chilligo Subwatershed Study, Regional Wastewater Master Plan and Regional Transportation Master Plan) must be completed or updated to help determine the appropriate boundary. A Regional Official Policies Plan amendment and a Cambridge Official Plan amendment will be needed to add any land to the urban area. Regional staff are in the process of taking a report to council in this fall requesting the ability to conduct

a public open house this fall in which to gain public input. The proposed 2005 Countryside Line ROPP amendment will not refine the line between Speedsville Road and Hespeler Road as the aforementioned studies will not be completed until approximately 2007. The Region will propose a separate ROPP amendment to define the Countryside Line in this area once the studies have been completed.

Wendy Wright indicated that this information would be incorporated into the updated Summary Report, as it has changed since the original study was done. Charlene Schiedel disagreed with this approach and didn't think that the line needed to be in the study. It was suggested that it could be put in as a "status" report, or an information report. Charlene Schiedel agreed to this approach. John Vasiga questioned the past history of location of the countryside line. Kevin Curtis explained the "iterations" that the line has gone through and that with the currently approved line, there will be no line between the City of Cambridge and Woolwich Township in the general area of the Regional airport (map attached). He explained that the upcoming ROPP review would be looking at the expansion of the urban area to the year 2026 within the Countryside Line which is a 2041 line. This is because the Provincial Policy Statement currently only allows municipalities to plan for expansion within a 20-year time frame.

2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

None.

3. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved by Brian Cunningham Seconded by John Vasiga

THAT the Minutes of the Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee meeting held July 22, 2004 be amended as follows:

- Mention should be made of the Special Council Meeting scheduled for September 14, 2004 under item 5c).

And adopted as amended.

CARRIED

5. Review Draft Final Report Re: Buffers/Enhancement Areas/Stewardship Areas/ Implementation

Wendy Wright presented a draft section from the Summary Report on the protection of natural heritage features. She pointed out the table that summarizes other Subwatersheds studies in Cambridge and a table that shows what Council has approved where there was

an EIS used to establish a buffer. This is background to show how the EIS process can work to establish buffers in a context-specific way that reflects the natural heritage feature as well as the development proposed.

She discussed on page 5, a proposed buffer policy in terms of how it might be implemented. The following items were discussed with respect to the proposed buffer policy on Page 5, with the understanding that more comments could be made due to the lateness of the committee getting the information:

- 15 m buffers for the creeks are o.k.
- no buffers where there is a road in between is o.k.
- existing estate residential - Erich suggested a definition of intensification of development for the estate residential component – Wendy Wright suggested “serviced” development would have a buffer, but if the area continued on septics, no buffer would be required. It was suggested that the following example could be given: the severance of a single property on private services would not require a buffer, but multiple severances made possible by servicing would.
- “other” high constraint areas buffers would be looked at during the community plan (change to terms of reference to the community plan).
- 30 m buffers around PSW, ESPA, LSW – MGWA is still looking for 15 m due to flat, permeable nature of land surrounding wetlands in the area and advice from their consultants – Ken Cornelisse indicated that a site-specific reasonable study could be used to reduce the buffer (an EIS at the development stage) – the study already allows for this – Ken Cornelisse reminded the committee that an EIS is automatically required within 120 m of PSW by the Province – the study has scoped it to 30 m based on connectivity, hydrology, etc., until you try to encroach within the 30 m – Cathy Murphy expressed a concern about trails being allowed within the outside 15 m of the 30 m wetland buffer -there was discussion about the buffering requirements from upland ESPAs and Chris Gosselin explained that an EIS at the time of development is required - he also indicated that although wetlands may be more sensitive habitats, from his experience, upland woodlots can be more vulnerable to trespass impacts because they are not as undesirable to go into - John Vasiga indicated that the problem is not buffers, but enforcement or policing - Wendy Wright thought maybe the word buffer is incorrect, maybe it could be called an “area of interest” – Erich Ritzmann indicated that it is not the wording, but the principle of requiring extensive buffers from upland woodlots when EISs that have been done in the past have recommended buffers as small as 3 metres - there was continued discussion about the overlap of ESPAs on PSWs and overlapping buffers resulting in excessive buffering.

Nancy Davy left the meeting.

Rick Cowsill indicated that the discussion could go on forever, and suggested that the discussion come to a close, recognizing that the MGWA needed more time to review it. Wendy Wright asked for any other comments to help her finalize this section. John Vasiga expressed a concern with the linkage language around Middle Creek on Page 7.

6. Other Business

- a) Follow-up List – Page 4 of 5 – Wendy Wright is getting the information on the servicing approvals for the City’s Industrial Subdivision Phase II. Nancy Davy is looking after the fill placement on the island in the Speed River. Ken Cornelisse is working on the impact of the Arriscraft extraction on the Maple Grove PSW. Regarding the wetland west of Fountain St., he indicated that he understands that hydraulically it is connected to the wetlands along Middle Creek and it falls within 750 m of them and he intends to leave it in the Maple Grove Wetland Complex. Upon discussion, clarification was needed from the floodline consultant with respect to the final determination on the subcatchment boundary around this wetland. Ian Rawlings questioned the “rules” used for complexing wetlands. Ken Cornelisse explained that it is a matter of scale and function and indicated that these areas could be complexed with the Speed River Wetland complex, but he didn’t think this was the intent of the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System. Rick Cowsill asked for an e-mail or written verification of Ken’s decision here. Chris Gosselin has been asked to hold off on the field work for the ESPAs until the community plan (2005).
- b) List of Topics for Upcoming Meetings – There was discussion about the format of the September 9 public meeting. John Vasiga asked if the agenda could be discussed before it is set. That was agreed to.
- c) Wendy Wright pointed out the report outline attached to the addendum agenda. As much of the text for the key changes and findings as possible will be sent to the committee by the end of the day Wednesday, August 11th. She also pointed out that we do not have the list of erratum for PEIL from the MGWA. This will affect final timing for PEIL to correct their report. Erich indicated that this may just be a list of errata, not requiring changes to the final PEIL report. It was decided that the final PEIL report should indicate that it is followed by the Summary Report and provide better detail on changes made from the Nov. 2003 version than the simple list in the Nov. 2003 document.

Rick Cowsill motioned to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Next meeting – Allan Reuter Centre – 3:30 pm to 5:30 pm – Thursday, September 2, 2004

