

## 545 Fanshawe Park Road West

Scoped EIS Dated October, 2013

Reviewers: N. Bergman, S. Levin, Dr. C. Smart  
January, 2014

EEPAC agrees with the p. 5 of the EIS to expand the OS to include the gully and to protect the wooded slope and ravine. EEPAC agrees that by constraining this ravine community from development the ravine slope, meadow marsh inclusion (1b) and drainage feature (fish habitat) will be protected [Figure 6].

### **THEME #1 – Erosion Access Allowance**

As stated in Section 4.3 of the Exp submission, the Erosion Access Allowance as specified in Section 3.4 of the MNR Technical Guide is a distance of 6 m from the top of the slope. This allowance is required in order to provide access for repairs to the slope and channel from the top of the slope. The proposed development is outside of the Recommended Development Limit Setback. This is very important as the structures will also put a heavy load on the ground. Structures should not encroach.

**Recommendation 1:** EEPAC agrees with Exp that a distance of 6 m for the erosion access allowance be provided on the table land. No permanent structures should be constructed within the 6 m of the erosion access allowance.

**Recommendation 2:**

The proposed development must be outside of the Recommended Development Limit Setback as shown in EXP's drawings 1 and 2.

### **THEME #2 – Geotechnical and Hydrogeological**

EXP recommends a site specific geotechnical investigation is required to determine the bearing capacity and foundation design option.

**Recommendation 3:** EEPAC agrees with EXP. EEPAC also recommends a hydrogeological study as the parking garage/podium as shown in Figures 8 and 9 as extending below the top of slope set back.

### **Theme #2 – Run off from the site post development**

There is no obvious way to retain runoff on the site, and the drop down to the stream will need significant engineering. Attention should be paid to the compound impact of the proposed development and existing Storm Water Management facility to the north of the site. The latter facility does not appear to be capturing all runoff and may pose

some threats to the stream below. The state and resilience of the engineered channel (armouring) should be assessed and assured.

The site should be graded such that surface water is directed away from the slope. No water from the table land should outlet down the slope. EXP recommends that water from downspouts and perimeter weeping tile etc. should be collected in a controlled manner and directed away from the slope and EEPAC agrees.

**Recommendation 4:** EEPAC agrees with EXP that no run off from the site should be directed towards the water course.

**Recommendation 5:** The city investigate the construction of the SWM facility on the Drewlo lands and the outlet to the watercourse on the York lands to ensure there is no danger of a breach.

### **THEME #3 – Construction Impacts**

EXP recommends spoils from any excavation should be removed from the site. Excavated soils should not be placed over the table land near the crest of slope, unless the soil is placed as engineered structural fill. We disagree with EXP about stockpiles of materials, supplies and construction debris being located on the site at all. Given the scope of the construction for the footings and underground parking, no materials should be left on the site at all, let alone near the slope. A sudden storm, similar to the one that washed stockpiles from the adjacent Amica site during construction, would have an extremely negative impact on the watercourse, the downstream SWM facility and the Medway Creek. While the EIS mentions storing materials 30 m from the feature, given the amount of work required to excavate the site for two 14 storey towers and underground parking, EEPAC recommends no storage of excavated materials on site. There is too much to store on site and too large a risk of it ending up in the watercourse as happened with the Amica site to the east when it was constructed.

**Recommendation 6:** All excavated materials that are not used as engineered fill must be removed from the site each day. If this practice is not a condition of approval, any materials left on site must be covered by heavy tarps to reduce the possibility of a discharge into the water course during a storm event.

**Recommendation 7:** to have some kind of real-time monitoring during rain to see if there is an increase in suspended sediment going down the ravine to Medway

**THEME #4 – Post construction**

**Recommendation 8:** Plantings should be non- invasive native species consistent and appropriate with an area associated with a tributary of a significant stream corridor (Medway Creek). Plants that are drought tolerate are preferred as regular watering could result in runoff.

**Recommendation 9:** EEPAC recommends fencing to keep people and debris out of the ravine. It will be of no benefit to stormwater management or the natural heritage system if flows are changed due to human interruption caused by access or garbage or dumping of landscaping wastes.

**Recommendation 10:** not only should permanent structures be avoided for erosion access allowance but the table land should be completely vegetation-covered in order to mediate gullyng originating from surface runoff (during construction and once the site is intact).

**THEME #5– Other relevant points**

EEPAC does not understand the purpose of the city requested stairwell across the vegetated feature (ravine). It will likely only be used in daylight in good weather. It does not appear to protect the feature.

Figure 1 of the EIS, prepared in October 2013 shows the site as it existed about 5 years ago before the building to the east and the SWM to the north were constructed. While minor, it is suggestive of lack of attention to detail EEPAC has seen in recent EIS work.