

## **PROPOSED REDRESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT 2473 OXFORD ST WEST, LONDON**

**EIS (MTE, May, 2023) and Geotechnical (LDS, Feb 2023) reports received by ECAC after its July 2023 meeting.**

**Reviewed by S. Hall and S. Levin for August 2023 ECAC meeting**

### **RECOMMENDATION #1**

**The pool not be permitted until additional detail as to what steps can be implemented to avoid/prevent a release of water down the slope. Any release of water will almost certainly be down the slope which has the likely result of damage to the natural feature and possible future slope failure.**

Neither the Geotechnical report (LDS) nor the EIS directly address this matter.

LDS does raise the issue of surface flows on page 22. Other than water from the pool, it is unclear what other concentrated surface flows there would be:

*p. 22 - Concentrated surface flows should not be directed towards the slope crest or over the face of the slope, to help minimize the potential for surface erosion, which can lead to rilling and the formation of gullies on the slope.*

The EIS indicates there is a 4 m difference between the front and back yards. The EIS also mentions (p. 22) that the pool will be raised. This is not explained and may require additional borehole testing. Also, if engineered fill is used, the Geotechnical report page 12 raises a caution about exposed subgrade soils. ECAC cautions that calculations may also need to consider the extra weight of water in the pool.

Further, there is no storm sewer on site and the site slopes down from the road as noted on page 4 of the Geotechnical report:

*“The grade of Oxford Street West is set slightly above the private roadway, and it appears that stormwater run-off from the boulevard area sheet flows towards the site. The site is located at the top of a well vegetated slope, on the south side of the Thames River. From a topographical perspective, the ground surface exhibits a relief of approximately 3 meters from the site entrance on the south end of the property to the back of the existing residence at the top of the slope, and a relief of approximately 14 meters from the top of the slope to the north/northwest, towards the Thames River. Any minor surface flows which occur at the site under existing conditions, are generally expected to follow the topography of the site.”*

It is also unclear where the septic bed is and if it will be relocated which may also conflict with any release of water from the proposed pool.

## **RECOMMENDATION #2**

**Additional information regarding drainage, “existing drains” and the “drainage feature” is required before a permit**

*LDS p. 20 - In the event that existing drains are exposed during the excavation and site grading works, the drains should be re-routed to ensure continued controlled flows into an appropriate discharge location away from the slope face.*

If rerouting of drains is recommended during construction, it is unclear to ECAC why no mention of pool drainage is included in LDS.

It is also unclear which drains are being referenced. Other than the water course on the property, none are delineated.

## **RECOMMENDATION #3**

**The city be required to inspect the demolition and construction work that takes place adjacent to the “drainage feature” which is a tributary of the Thames. As noted in the EIS (page 13), this feature contributes to the fish habitat in the Thames. Page 20 also notes the possible alteration of the feature.**

It is unclear how the “open drainage feature” that outlets into the Thames can be unaffected by the demolition and/or construction work, particularly grading.

## **RECOMMENDATION #4**

**A clear plan for this feature must be presented to the Conservation Authority for a Section 28 permit.**

This issue is highlighted on page 11 of the Geotechnical report.

*Based on existing site conditions, it is expected that some grading activities will be required to accommodate the new building and removal of the existing structures. Vegetation removal and topsoil stripping is anticipated throughout the area to be developed. In general, this is expected to require the removal of about 250 mm of surficial topsoil. Thicker topsoil areas may also be present between the borehole locations, in proximity to existing wooded areas, and where local depressions are present at the site. Surficial topsoil may be stockpiled on site for possible re-use as landscaping fill.*

ECAC concurs that topsoil should be stockpiled on the southern part of the property given the amount of grading that may be required as noted on page 11 of LDS.

#### **RECOMMENDATION #5**

**The Significant Woodland as noted in the EIS on page 15, be added to Map 5 as ESA, replacing the potential ESA designation. The City should initiate an Official Plan Amendment as well as include this feature as Green Space in the ReThink Zoning.**

#### **RECOMMENDATION #6**

**The monitoring plan (page 23, EIS) must be approved by a City Ecologist and be approved prior to the issuance of the Building Permit. Plan must include triggers for remedial actions both biological as well as any impacts to the slope from surface water run off. It is ECAC's opinion that the City must retain funds or put a lien against the property to be able to ensure remediation takes place. The hold or lien should be in place until the completion of the monitoring period.**

ECAC also concurs with LDS on page 23:

*Consultation with the municipality and Conservation Authority is recommended to confirm inspection, monitoring, and reporting requirements, required for approval.*

#### **RECOMMENDATION #7**

**Signage to demarcate the naturalization area be required. This signage should also include a statement about avoiding the use of pesticides and herbicides in the naturalization area**

#### **RECOMMENDATION #8**

**The owner consider a conservation easement on the Significant Woodland as there are tax benefits in doing so.**

#### **RECOMMENDATION #9**

**Approval of issuance of a permit during the period April 1 to Sept 30 be subject to review by a City Ecologist.**

It is noted in Recommendation 10 and 17 that there are construction windows to consider for bats and for nesting birds. It is unclear how it will be determined if construction can proceed during the periods outlined.

#### **RECOMMENDATION #8**

**A city ecologist or UTRCA biologist provide information to the construction lead on identification of species at risk as noted in Recommendation 12 of the EIS. The cost (time and travel) be paid by the proponent.**