

**CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY WORKING COMMITTEE  
MEETING NO. 20  
MINUTES**

Tuesday, September 28, 2004  
Cambridge Room, Historic City Hall, Dickson Street, Cambridge (Galt)

---

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

**Others Present:** Mary Hammer (landowner), Mary Stevens (landowner)

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. by Brian Cunningham for Rick Cowsill who was delayed getting to the meeting.

**2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest**

None.

**3. Confirmation of Minutes**

Moved by     John Vasiga                    Seconded by   Cathy Murphy

THAT the Minutes of the Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee meeting held September 23, 2004 be amended as follows:

- p. 2 – first sentence – add the word “only” after “be received for information”
- p. 2 – second paragraph – 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence - e-mail was dated September 14, 2004 not September 24, 2004 and change “the necessary” to “a”.

And adopted as amended.

**CARRIED**

There was clarification about Hans Madan’s declaration of pecuniary interest with respect to property that is in the community plan study area, but not in the subwatersheds study area.

There was discussion about the listing of changes in the PEIL September 2004 report. It was pointed out that these are outlined in Appendix K of the September 2004 report.

Copies of Appendix J for the PEIL September 2004 report were distributed (they were missing from the report that was distributed the week before).

#### **4. Review of HWSS Final Report (Draft #5)**

Wendy Wright indicated that edits related to major changes in the document are bolded. Edits that have been done for consistency/clarity are not bolded. It is proposed to bind Appendix A and B separately. The list of maps and figures will be pulled up to the front of the report as well. Charlene Schiedel requested a glossary of acronyms. She offered to give her list to Wendy Wright tomorrow.

The committee proceeded to conduct a detailed review of the draft report, page by page:

Page 2, paragraph 2 – change “eight” property owners to “seven” property owners.

Page 3 – Daryl Hawes-Jones should be Daryl Howes-Jones – and add “Dr.” in front of his name, as he has a PhD.

Page 3 – there was concern about persistent mistakes in the September 2004 PEIL report that are not updated/corrected by the Summary Report (e.g. mapping of boreholes). Erich Ritzmann suggested a footnote that the information in the PEIL 2004 report may be out of date. Charlene Schiedel and John Vasiga indicated that there should be something in the Summary Report that indicates that the Working Committee has not reviewed the PEIL 2004 Report to ensure that all errata have been thoroughly addressed. This will be added as a footnote to this page.

Page 3 – Wendy Wright indicated that something should be added to Section 1.2 indicating that the committee discussed all the issues and the summary report shows the changes to the major ones which are addressed in detail and the rest are found in the minutes. Erich Ritzmann indicated he would revise the wording of Section 1.2 to reflect this.

Page 6 – Cathy Murphy raised a discussion about compensation for expropriation under the last bullet point of the community concerns. Wendy Wright and Ken Cornelisse clarified that no lands are being expropriated or being taken as a result of the Subwatersheds Study. No change.

Page 6 – Section 1.3 – add which corrected “some” of these errors.

Page 6 – Section 2 – Key Changes – John Vasiga felt that Appendix K should be part of the appendices of the Summary Report. Wendy Wright will add this as a new Appendix A.3.4 November 2003 Changes/ November 2004 Changes.

Page 5 – Charlene Schiedel indicated that she thought the last bullet on Page 5 had not been addressed. Wendy Wright indicated that the socially and economically sustainable recommendations are for the public good, not for private individuals, so that PEIL did do what was expected of them in a study of this nature. No change.

Page 7 – John Vasiga queried how Polygon 2.11 got removed from the wetland. Ken Cornelisse indicated that he did a field review and noted that it was inappropriately classified as wetland and did not have wetland plant species. There was no change required to the report for this explanation.

Page 7 – second last paragraph – Polygon 2.01 inclusion add: through hydrology “through a 90 cm (900 mm) storm sewer and may take some water in significant storms.

It must be noted that 0.89m<sup>3</sup>/s from this polygon flows to Freeport Creek through a 30 cm (300 mm) storm sewer.” Erich Ritzmann wanted to add a note that the 900 mm sewer picks up water from roadside ditches before it goes into the sewer and that this is legitimate from a wetland complexing point of view. Wendy Wright will propose some wording to deal with this.

Page 8 – last paragraph – “corrected culvert data”, add “some” before this phrase and add “April 2004” after “floodline mapping”. Change the last sentence to, “This “work” is included in the HWSS (PEIL) Report (September 2004).”

Page 9 - first paragraph – add after “private catchbasin”, “and its 300 mm storm sewer connection to Freeport Creek”. Add “to TSH” after, “There was new information available”.

Page 10 – Change “Maple Grove Wetland” to “Maple Grove Wetlands”.

Page 10 – There was continuing discussion about the buffers being proposed in the Subwatersheds Study. It was decided to come back to this once the Chairperson and Chris Gosselin arrive, under Item #5.

Page 11 – Section 2.5, end of paragraph. Is there a memo to this effect? Ken Cornelisse has not yet done the detailed work for this, but will work on it with Margy Degruchy and Karl Konze from Dougan and Associates, but he is pressed for time. Wendy Wright indicated that some outstanding items will be pointed out to Council at the time the report goes to them on October 26<sup>th</sup>.

Page 13 – bolded area – John Vasiga and Charlene Schiedel questioned the statement that the 30 m buffer width was identified independent of the trail considerations. Wendy Wright assured them that this was the case. There was no change to this section.

Brian Cunningham left the meeting.

Page 15 – Section 3.1.1.1 Fisheries Habitat – there was discussion about the classification of the watercourses as fish habitat. No change was required.

Page 16 - first paragraph, last sentence – John Vasiga questioned the word “generally”. It was decided to leave it.

Page 16 - Section 3.1.1.3 ESPAs - second paragraph – Table 5 is not yet available.

Chris Gosselin arrived at the meeting.

Page 17 - Section 3.1.1.5 Regulatory Floodplain – John Vasiga questioned the last sentence in the last paragraph. Nancy Davy offered to add to this statement. “New areas of development considered a one zone policy area are not permitted in the Regulatory Storm Floodplain. Minor additions or expansions to existing uses, etc. may be permitted if a permit is obtained from the GRCA.”

Page 8 - Section 2.2 add, “Through a review of data presented by the consultants and discussed with the Working Committee”. Change “Environmental Planner” to “Manager of Environmental Planning”. Add “in the appropriate field seasons”. There will also be a reference to A.4.6 for a definition of the Hurricane Hazel storm.

Rick Cowsill arrived at the meeting.

Page 19 – last sentence, change “this”, to “there”.

Page 21 – fourth paragraph - development of the City’s industrial lands north of Maple Grove Road – add “that was formerly a LSW and subsequently identified as PSW”.

Remove “used to balance”. Remove the word “some” after “rerouting of”.

Page 23 – last paragraph – remove the word “compromise”.

Page 24 – last full paragraph – Erich Ritzmann indicated that the feedback from affected landowners at the public meeting was supportive of the MGWA buffer proposal as a balancing statement. Add, “Many of the landowners do not support the above noted buffers but do support the buffers proposed by the MGWA.” Change buffer “area” to “width”.

Page 25 - fourth bullet - consolidate forest interior habitat, add “minimum” 100 m from any edge. Third paragraph, add “agricultural use constrains wildlife movement less than urban land uses”.

Page 25 – the confusion around the wording “Enhancement Corridors/Linkages” versus Enhancement Areas was resolved by removing the word “Enhancement”.

Page 27 – footnote 6 – typos “immediately” and “upland”.

Page 28 – East 5 (Bullet 9) – change the word “buffer” to “protect water quality and quantity of the headwater wetlands” – Middle 5 (Bullet 10) – reword to say, “Rehabilitate using natural channel design principles”

Page 28 – 3.2.1 Groundwater Recharge – Remove the word “both”. Gus Rungis to clarify if the groundwater aquifer contributes to Freeport Creek.

Page 31 – middle paragraph – “They are now both part of the Maple Grove” add, “Wetland Complex” before “PSW”.

Page 34 – last paragraph – change after “current policies” to federal, provincial, regional, agency and city policies and regulations. Also, add a sentence that current official plan designations and zoning remains in place, unchanged. – second paragraph add “usually” identified as Open Space.

Page 37 – first paragraph - change “contiguous with” to “contiguous to”

Page 39 – first paragraph – add “at a commercial scale (30 logs or more) in writing” to the first partial sentence. Add “Does not apply to lands approved for development under draft plan of subdivision or site plan approval”.

Conclusions – Wendy Wright indicated that there are 3 outstanding items: Subcatchment 2125; Gus’ response to the inquiry about the aquifer contributing to Freeport Creek; Ken’s analysis of the final impact to the PSW status of the Maple Grove Road Wetland Complex if the licensed pit area of wetland is removed. If these are not answered by the time the report goes to Council, they will be told these are outstanding items.

Page 40 change Ken Cornelisse to “Area Biologist”

Page 41 change Ken Cornelisse to “Area Biologist” Ian Thornton “District Planner” Albert Hovingh “Environmental and Stewardship Planner” and Gus Rungis “Senior Water Resources Engineer”

Page 42 – Table 3 – change “titles” to “buffers”

Page 8 Section 2.2 add “Through a review of data presented by the consultants and discussed with the Working Committee”. Change “Environmental Planner” to “Manager of Environmental Planning” and add “in the appropriate field seasons”.

Page 47 add the word “dripline” and drop the word “upland” in MGWA proposed buffers.

Page 48 – add “breeding birds” under terrestrial resources.

Page 49 – re trails – footnote for trails is a double asterisk, it should be a double asterisk in the table.

Appendices – Ken Cornelisse clarified that he was not intending to re-evaluate the whole wetland if one category remains over 200 points, as the wetland will remain PSW if this is the case. He will confirm this in an e-mail. If there is enough detail that it warrants its own appendix, Wendy Wright would add it to Appendix B.

The TSH floodline report will not be available until the end of next week at the earliest due to discussions Erich Ritzmann and John Vasiga had with Gus Rungis on Friday last week. The report may have to be distributed without it at first and have it added as an addition when it is available.

Appendix A2.3 - the list of Alternate Members is not included – they will be added.

Charlene Schiedel expressed concern with the quality of the appendices document. Wendy Wright will see if there are any better original documents to be copied.

## **5. Discussion – Buffers**

Wendy Wright presented a coloured map showing the buffers adjacent to the different types of natural heritage features. The question has arisen as to whether buffers “contiguous to” potential ESPAs could be less than 30 metres at this time, or could the future field work required to determine whether the identified natural areas warrant designation as new ESPAs also determine the buffer width. Chris Gosselin indicated that extensive monitoring of ESPAs in the west side of the City of Waterloo over the past several years indicates that some species of regionally significant breeding birds appear to have left Forested Hills [ESPA 19] as residential development approaches more closely to the 7.5 to 10 m buffers along the eastern boundary of the ESPA. He said that as a result of a recent conversation with someone involved in the monitoring, he is increasingly uncomfortable at this time saying that even 30 m buffers are enough. Before that determination can be made, it will be essential to determine which significant breeding birds are using a particular habitat, the size of their typical breeding habitat, and their sensitivity to various types of human land use. Applied ecological research in habitat and buffering is now ongoing, and it can be expected that several years from now, when lands contiguous to any potential new ESPAs in the subwatersheds are ready for development, we will have a much better understanding of these requirements. It is also essential to consider the type of contiguous land use proposed. For example, residential areas place significant numbers of people and domestic pets in close proximity to natural areas, and may require wider buffers than industrial development. In the absence of detailed scientific information and future land use designations, he cannot be categorical right now as to what buffer widths are appropriate. He would not want to repeat planning decisions made in the past where land use commitments were made without any

appreciation of the ecological values and sensitivities of the lands in question. He said that he is personally more comfortable with the default “contiguous to” approach in the ROPP which could be wider or narrower than the 30 m buffer depending on site conditions and the proposed land use contiguous to the ESPA. He feels that 30 m is a significant concession at this point. (As a side note, he added that Provincially Significant Wetlands which are within ESPAs are the Region’s jurisdiction).

In response to a question as to whether plantations are included in ESPAs, he said that those that stick out from the body of the ESPA are usually not considered part of the ESPA; where they are imbedded in the natural feature, they are left in because removing them would take a “bite” out of the ESPA. Concerning buffers required around plantations forming part of an ESPA, he said that he would first need to determine what significant features and functions they might sustain. For example, he was recently informed that one such plantation in another part of the Region was discovered to provide mature coniferous breeding habitat to birds not commonly found south of the northern conifer forests. In such a case, the breeding habitat requirements of the significant Breeding bird would be used to determine an appropriate buffer.

Wendy Wright indicated that some of the areas removed from PSW are still potential ESPAs, but may be medium constraint. Chris Gosselin will look at these in detail over the next few days. The potential ESPAs that are medium constraint that remain will be flagged on the Greenspace Management Strategy Map. In the interim, they will be left as enhancement and removed as decisions are made.

Rick Cowsill indicated that Council will need the final report at least two weeks before the Council meeting. This means the report will have to be finalized as of Friday, October 8, 2004.

Outstanding areas will be detailed to Council.

Rick Cowsill thanked the committee for their time and involvement in the process to get this project done.

## **6. Other Business**

- (a) Follow-up/To Do List – distributed at the meeting.

Rick Cowsill motioned to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.