

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

16. Property located on a portion of 120 Gideon Drive (OZ-8365)

- William Bradshaw and Lloyd Johnston, Applicants – responding to questions asked by the Planning and Environment Committee and the public; indicating that it will be approximately twelve and a half years before the land can be used for agricultural purposes; noting that you do not work on the whole site at once, you start at the beginning and you take it out as you go; advising that, since it is a “B” license and given the location of this site, in an area where gravel is very scarce now, there will probably be a fairly ready market for it and the maximum will probably get taken out every year; indicating that it saves trucking it through the city or from far away and it is better for the environment; advising that they will be drilling approximately five metres in depth from the surface; noting that it varies across the site; advising that once the operation has been completed, it will be like a bowl shape and will return to agricultural use; indicating that the land is currently being farmed; advising that studies have been ongoing on this site by hydrogeologists, biologists, etc., for a number of years now; noting that they started this approximately four years ago; indicating that when it gets circulated to the Ministry of Natural Resources, they have a team of biologists and hydrogeologists that review the application and there is back and forth as they raise questions and it is a lot more than it used to be ten or fifteen years ago and it is a pretty extensive review that they do; advising that the Ministry has now signed off on this application; advising that it also gets circulated to the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA) and he believes that the UTRCA has signed off on it as well; agreeing with Mr. Levin that maybe the City could hire some staff to look at kind of thing and oversee the Ministry and UTRCA if they feel that that is necessary; indicating that he believes that they have gone above and beyond for a pit of this magnitude, which is extremely small compared to what they are used to dealing with; advising that, today, their environmental engineer, BioLogic, came to an agreement with the UTRCA for a yearly monitoring; noting that that was what was asked for in their review and in their recommendations and they have agreed to, he thinks it was item b) in their review of yearly monitoring and they will be taking part in that; indicating that that would likely go on their site plan that would be signed by the Ministry; advising that they also do hydrogeological monitoring of the groundwater levels throughout the life of the pit.
- Sandy Levin, 59 Longbow Road – indicating that he is going to be asking three things from the Committee; noting that one is related to the application directly and the other two relate to hopefully helping staff in its work for you; recognizing that the *Aggregate Act* carries a lot of weight; indicating that he always finds it interesting that the Ministry of Natural Resources on one end is an extractive organization and then, on the other hand, which is a little weaker, it deals with protecting the natural heritage of the Province; advising that, in this case, it is trying to strike a balance and unfortunately, aggregate is king; understanding the need for aggregate; pointing out that the Council has the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC); pointing out that Councillor S. Turner sat on this Committee for some time; advising that, at this time, there is a great deal of expertise in hydrology; indicating that, unfortunately, as Mr. Davis mentioned, EEPAC only received a sliver of the information in the back and forth on this application; advising that the current process that is involved only gives EEPAC an opportunity to comment on a limited picture; indicating that this really reduces the EEPAC contribution and its effectiveness in helping your staff; indicating that the challenge in this particular location is that the upper levels of the significant wetland to the west are essentially above the regional groundwater table; advising that, as the proponent mentioned it is actually fairly shallow, he is only going down five metres and staying one metre and a half above the water table; reiterating that it is very shallow; indicating that the buffers are nice but what struck them was that there was a recent letter from the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA), back and forth, that talks about the surface water flows, the hydrology and how that surface water is important for the healthy maintenance of the wetland system; indicating that the question is, how is the monitoring of the activity going to be carried out; realizing that there was

some back and forth between the proponents consultant and the UTRCA that there is at least a verbal in terms of a monitoring plan; asking that the Committee either defer this application or withhold three readings until the Committee has the assurance by the Ministry of Natural Resources that the pit license includes monitoring it; noting that he will specify what in the monitoring he thinks is important; indicating that the recharge areas for wetlands is usually somewhere outside of the buffer so they are vulnerable to development and surface water does not follow zoning very closely; advising that standard groundwater reports are not really well understood unless you have that expertise in hydrology; noting that he does not have the expertise, but the Committee is fortunate that you have got some really strong experts from the University on your EEPAC presently; indicating that the UTRCA commented in 2013 that surface water flows contribute significantly to the health and maintenance of the wetland system, that a water budget was needed, whether or not surface flows were going to be altered as a result of the change, that they disagreed with an assertion, at some point in this process, that there was no surface water inputs; reiterating that the EEPAC did not see all of that so they have no ability at this stage to comment on it; knowing that the Committee is limited in what it can do under the *Aggregate Act*, as Mr. Davis pointed out; reiterating that he is asking three things from the Committee in relation to this application; requesting that the Committee defer the application or withhold the three readings until the Committee is advised by the Ministry of Natural Resources that the monitoring plan is in place as part of the license and it includes monitoring wetland vegetation, water quality and quantity, including hydro period; asking that the reporting period be defined and the City should ask for copies of the reports; indicating that the challenge of the area to the west is that it is all in private ownership, but it is an Environmentally Significant Area and a Provincial Area of Natural and Scientific Interest, which was not even on your maps until this application came forward; advising that the second piece is to have ongoing improvement in your processes and that you ask your staff to develop within the next year, an improved technical review process to take advantage of the expertise available on your EEPAC; noting that that changes from year to year or term to term and he is not saying that you are always going to have to go to EEPAC for more review, but in a case where you have got hydrologists, this would have been a good time for that; advising that the third matter, because hydrology is such a special project or special area of expertise, that the Committee look at, in the Budget, either hiring or retaining on an ongoing basis, a professional hydrologist to review applications that infer the likely effects of development on adjacent wetlands; and, noting that the Council does not have that expertise in house, you are relying on outside consultants primarily, and while you may not need somebody permanently on staff, but to be able to have money in your Budget for retaining, as needed, would be very helpful.