

**CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY WORKING COMMITTEE
MEETING NO. 10
MINUTES**

Thursday, April 15, 2004
Allan Reuter Seniors' Centre, 507 King Street, Cambridge (Preston)

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

Others Present: Ron McKitrick (alternate for Charlene Schiedel (MGWA)), Mary Hammer (landowner)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Rick Cowsill.

2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

None

3. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved by Brian Cunningham Seconded by Charlene Schiedel

THAT the Minutes of the Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee meeting held April 1, 2004 be amended as follows:

- Page 2, 5th paragraph – Add “(15 metres)” after the words” warmwater watercourses”;
- Page 3, 4th paragraph – Add “Ian Rawlings agreed with Erich Ritzmann that buffers should be context sensitive.” after the first sentence.
- Page 3, 4th paragraph – Delete second sentence and replace with “Erich Ritzmann pointed out that 7 metres (as shown in the presentation for ESPAs) seems reasonable as a buffer, not 30 metres.”
- Page 4, 1st paragraph – Add sentence at the end “There was also discussion about consideration of buffers taking place at the time of a comprehensive zoning by-law.”
- Page 4, Item d) – Add sentence at the end “Charlene Schiedel offered to call landowners wishing to be contacted before anyone comes on their property if the City does not have the resources to do this.

And adopted as amended.

CARRIED

John Vasiga questioned a comment made by Ken Cornelisse in the minutes regarding determination of wetland boundaries, but Ken was not present at the time to clarify his statement.

4. Presentation – Natural Heritage System Enhancement and Stewardship Areas – Wendy Wright/April Souwand, City of Cambridge

Wendy Wright, Commissioner of Planning Services, City of Cambridge gave a presentation on Natural Heritage System Enhancement and Stewardship Areas (attached). There was discussion about the appropriateness of showing enhancement areas crossing roadways which are planned to be expanded to 4 lanes. Wendy Wright and Ken Cornelisse explained how wildlife crossings are being designed for roadways such as the Can-Amera Parkway to accommodate this to some degree. There was discussion about a poorly drained area on Middle Block Road which is not shown as a constraint area in the HWSS. It was explained that it is likely a local drainage problem which could be addressed with culverts or filling.

Cathy Murphy inquired where in the Provincial Policy Statement does it say enhancement is necessary for protection? Wendy Wright responded that the PPS is a general statement regarding protection of natural heritage features and the Regional Official Policies Plan talks about enhancement areas. She indicated enhancement can mean many things and be implemented in many ways – plantings, buffers, etc. We rely on specialized consultants to tell us what is the appropriate amount of enhancement. Erich Ritzmann questioned if the core feature is already reasonably wide, do you need an enhancement area? Wendy Wright responded yes and no. Enhancement is to maintain corridors. There was discussion about what bird and wildlife species are to be served by enhanced corridors and whether or not this is desirable.

John Vasiga questioned what science was behind the change to the enhancement areas shown on the August 2002 map. The size of the enhancement area in some cases was reduced and in other areas was added. The shifting of the enhancement area on the east side of Fountain Street from the mis-identified wetland to the south was also questioned. Staff will look into this and report back. Erich Ritzmann pointed out an enhancement area shown on the southwest corner of the Arriscraft manufacturing facility which does not seem to make sense. Wendy Wright agreed that this one does not appear to be logical.

Cathy Murphy pointed out that north of Maple Grove Road, enhancement areas appeared to follow floodlines in some cases. She questioned if floodlines change, will enhancement areas change? Wendy Wright indicated that this would have to be considered, as well as how the countryside line affects enhancement areas. It was also pointed out that north of Maple Grove Road, the core features provide more than a 500-

metre corridor, but there are still enhancement areas identified beyond the core features, resulting in a corridor greater than 500 metres. Wendy Wright indicated she will check into this. In response to an inquiry from Cathy Murphy, she responded that she will be recommending that the conceptual trails be dropped from the subwatersheds study, as the timing is not appropriate.

Cathy Murphy asked for very specific information regarding what types of wildlife you are looking to protect. Wendy Wright responded that type of detailed information does not exist. Cathy Murphy wants strong reasons for the enhancement areas north of Maple Grove Road, as they are affecting property values. Wendy Wright responded that these are not no development areas, these are just enhancement areas. Based on the Region's growth management strategy, this area would be industrial/commercial, which can work well with the enhancement area concept. Ian Rawlings said that parkland dedication can be part of enhancement areas. Wendy Wright clarified that PSWs, LSWs, ESPAs and floodplains are not accepted as parkland dedication..

Regarding the East Creek enhancement corridor, Erich Ritzmann commented that it seems wider than 50 metres. John Vasiga noted that there was no enhancement area shown on the map in 2002, but in the 2003 map, it is there. The scientific rationale behind this change and the timing with respect to Steering Committee review was questioned.

Brian Cunningham and Ian Rawlings left at 5:35 p.m..

Cathy Murphy commented that once wildlife leaves the area due to development, the enhancement area would be just for birds. Wendy Wright responded that the idea is not to have animals leave. Cathy Murphy talked about a big enhancement area on her mother's property that needs to be looked at, as well as other enhancement areas that are on private property, not City property.

Charlene Schiedel indicated she is not against enhancement, but if crossing major roads, there is no use in having enhancement areas unless wildlife-crossing culverts are provided. Erich Ritzmann pointed out that wildlife crossing bridges may be needed. Ken Cornelisse used the example of the Can-Am Parkway where we are looking at dry and wet culverts where animals can cross the roadway.

5. Other Business

- a) Follow-up List – Wendy Wright went over the list with the committee and explained that she has tried to slot follow-up items in the upcoming topics list.
- b) List of Topics for Upcoming Meetings – Wendy Wright distributed an update of the list of topics for upcoming meetings. The scope of field visits will be discussed at the next meeting.

R Cowsill motioned to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

**Next meeting – Galt Room, Farmers’ Market Building – 3:30 to 5:30 p.m., May 6,
2004**

HWSS

Protection of Natural Heritage Features After Development

WC Review of HWSS

- Reviewed the science for identification of :
 - PSW (Provincially Significant Wetlands)
 - LSW (Locally Significant Wetlands)
 - ESPA (Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area)
 - Floodplains

Purpose of HWSS – In Summary

- Determine areas where development can and cannot occur while continuing to protect the environmental features and functions within subwatersheds
- Use a system wide approach in order to sustain the whole natural system after development occurs not just individual features
- Implement the requirements of PPS/ROPP/COP

Development Defined by the PPS

- Development means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures, requiring approval under the Planning Act; but does not include activities that create or maintain infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment

Creation of a new lot

- New lots are created by plan of subdivision, plan of condominium or severance
- Usually lots created by severance already front on an existing road and are few in number
- Subdivisions create new streets and new lots
- Condominiums create new 'lots' within a multiple unit development

Change in Land Use

- Land use policy is established in an Official Plan
- Land use is implemented by the Zoning Bylaw
- Land use is changed by an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw and/or the Official Plan
- If the change to the Zoning Bylaw is minor, it can be done by obtaining a variance rather than a rezoning

Construction of Buildings

- Construction of buildings is only considered to be development for the purposes of the PPS if it also requires an approval under the Planning Act
- Building Permit applications must conform to the zoning bylaw for the use and for the regulations (setbacks, parking etc.)
- If they don't conform, they require an approval under the Planning Act and would be considered 'development' in this context

No Development Areas Due to Natural Features

- PSW (Provincially Significant Wetlands)
- LSW (Locally Significant Wetlands)
- ESPA (Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas)
- Other Constraint Areas (Woodlands, Groundwater Discharge, Steep Slopes)
- Floodplains (including Fisheries Habitat)

Protection Requirements for 'New' Development

- Requirement by PPS to ensure that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on the ecological functions because of urban development
- Requirement by PPS that the diversity of natural features in an area, and the natural connections between them be maintained, and improved where possible

Protection Requirements for 'New' Development

- Requirement by the PPS to ensure that the quality and quantity of groundwater and surface water and the function of groundwater recharge/discharge areas, aquifers and headwaters will be protected and enhanced.
- Requirement by PPS to direct development to areas outside of hazardous lands due to flooding, erosion or steep slope

Protection Requirements for 'New' Development

- ROPP requires that interconnections among significant natural areas should be recognized, maintained, and enhanced to prevent further fragmentation and degradation of the ecological integrity of the landscape
- ROPP requires that development should be viewed as an opportunity for enhancement of the natural features and functions of the Natural Habitat Network

Protection Requirements for 'New' Development

- COP policy is to maintain and improve the City's natural environment, including the linked open space system of the Grand and Speed Rivers and their tributaries, fish habitat, wetlands, woodlands, groundwater and atmospheric resources in the interests of overall ecosystem integrity

Subwatershed Level - Protection/Enhancement Tools

- Greenspace Management (ie Protection) Strategy
 - Buffers
 - Enhancement Areas
 - Complementary Land Uses
 - Stewardship Areas
- Aquatic Rehabilitation Strategy
- Monitoring Program
 - Creek Systems
 - Natural Heritage Systems

Greenspace Management Strategy – System Options

- Options Considered
 - Option 1 – No Buffers
 - Option 2 – 30 m Buffers Only
 - Option 3 – 30 m Buffers, Enhancement Corridor
- Option Recommended – Option 3

Why Enhancement Corridors ?

- Buffers alone inadequate to maintain existing levels of wildlife movement or presence of significant wildlife species
- Agricultural context does not constrain wildlife movements
- Urban development reduces habitat linkages
- Need to maintain habitat corridors and linkages after urban development

Why Enhancement Corridors/ Linkages ?

- Intent is to:
 - Create connectedness among habitat patches
 - Allow plants and animals to sporadically or regularly intermingle and exchange genetic material
 - Allow populations to recolonize should extinction occur
 - Consolidate forest interior habitat (100 m from any edge) and successional meadows and thickets for breeding bird species
 - Reduce heat island effects of urban development

Recommended Enhancement Area Uses

- Active/passive recreation
- Stormwater management facilities
- Complementary land uses such as school yards or large landscaped features associated with industrial/commercial development (e.g. campus style)

Why a Stewardship Program?

- Encourage property owners to plant native species and avoid invasive species
- Make property owners aware of the sensitivity of the Natural Heritage Features to avoid inadvertent impacts
- Create a partnership to maintain and enhance the natural heritage features

Corridor/Linkage Widths

- Recommended corridor widths are:
 - West Creek 50m
 - Middle Creek 200m
 - East Creek 50 m

West Creek

- 50 m corridor/linkage area
- Local feature currently of sufficient width (over 50m) and of an incised nature such that the local linkage function can be maintained by the placement of the 30m buffer outside PSW
- Enhancement uses located east of Boxwood Dr. to link isolated features
- Other connections 50m also desirable to link isolated features and implemented through Enhancement Area uses.

Middle Creek

- Primary corridor/linkage between Speed and Grand Rivers
- Chilligo Creek also considered as a primary corridor/linkage

Middle Creek – North of Maple Grove Road

- 200 to 500m corridor/linkage area
- When considering development:
 - On agricultural lands, enhance habitat cover through 'enhancement area uses' and floodplain revegetation
 - On already developed areas, enhance habitat cover through stewardship programs

Middle Creek – South of Maple Grove Road

- Recognize moderate urban and human proximity resulted in 100m corridor/linkage area
- On already developed areas, enhance habitat cover through a stewardship program
- On agricultural lands, implement corridor/linkages through 'Enhancement Area Uses' and floodplain revegetation when preparing the Community Plan

East Creek

- 50m local corridor/linkage
- Enhance habitat cover between Beaverdale Road and Speed River through a stewardship program to maintain riparian functions and local connectivity
- Enhance habitat cover at Maple Grove Road through 'Enhancement Area Uses' to provide ongoing linkages north and south
- Enhance habitat cover to provide linkages to Middle and Chilligo Creeks north of Maple Grove Road through 'Enhancement Area Uses'

**Benefits of Enhancement
Corridors/Linkages**

- Complies with PPS, ROPP, COP
- When urban development occurs, it minimizes:
 - Impacts to core vegetation communities
 - Fragmentation of natural habitats
 - Impacts to wildlife
 - Impacts to functions
 - Impacts to future urban land uses
