

# OLD OAK PROPERTIES: 2300 Richmond St.

## EIS Prepared By: BioLogic Inc.

Reviewed by: Lauren Des Marteaux, Peter Ferguson, Meaghan Murphy, and David Hiscott

---

### General Comments

- The status of the northern wetland is inconsistent throughout the document. Why is BioLogic challenging the North wetland PSW designation? If the MNR have considered this to be a PSW, then it should be referred to as and treated as such.
- Despite a number of adjustments to the building plan, no figure with an adjusted development overlay exists. Please include the original development overlay figure in addition to an adjusted development overlay figure.
- The drastically reduced buffers proposed for wetlands are inappropriate and go against the City of London's Environmental Management Guidelines. Even with the reduced buffers they propose, the proponent encroaches upon them during construction, and post-construction with permanent structures.
- As the two evaluated wetlands (north and south) are already close to urban designated land use, studies should be taken to understand the devaluation of land from continuous development and encroachment. Both wetlands (designated Arva Moraine Complex – PSW) should be studied in conjunction with the Pedestrian Pathway connection study. As this land is already adjacent to multi-family high density and multi-family medium density designations, the ecological resilience of the PSW should be properly evaluated for ecological function and stability if proposed development on either side is to be accepted by the City of London Planning Department. Jeopardizing the quality of a PSW should be avoided at all cost. Primary data on populations and threshold numbers should be given to EEPAC.
- Very little effort appears to have been put in for wildlife surveys. The amphibian surveys are incomplete, the aquatic survey is based on preexisting data from 2012, breeding birds were only surveyed for 1 year etc.
- Many of the figures have extremely poor resolution making interpretation of the site and figure legends difficult. Figure 4 has no legend. Some figures are so pixilated that it is difficult to put the site in context with adjacent space. Many figures are tables were not titled.
- The appendices need page numbers, and the figures/tables within should have titles for reference. Organization of the appendices should be improved.
- The document was poorly referenced throughout and did not commit to a singular report style. Consider merging varying documents from subcontractors properly.

Vague information on drainage, storm water management, and groundwater recharge despite indicating importance of site as water source for two PSW areas.

---

## Specific Comments

- 1) Section 1.1 “Report Objective”
  - a) The plan is aimed at rezoning the site, yet there was no detailed concept design for the proposed development. The designation is low-density residential, and open space 5 (OS5), as shown on Figure 4. As limited information was given on the actual building, will we see an updated building proposal?
  
- 2) Section 1.4 “Consultation”

Where is the information from the Pedestrian Pathway study, and why was that not incorporated before you decided to design the residential area?
  
- 3) The “Meta-corridor”
  - a) What are the implications of building across this meta-corridor? If the developers are able to ignore it, then this meta-corridor concept has been ineffective. At some point, the idea of “a corridor” is understood by the proponents, as they plan to amend the original design to allow a north-south corridor on the eastern edge of the property to link the north and south PSWs. Not sure how effective this will be, and does not mitigate the reduced buffers they envision.
  
- 4) Sections 2.2 – 2.4 have conflicting terminology for the northern wetland. It was labeled under “Environmental Review”, but it is now also Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW). The terminology when referring to this wetland jumps between “wetland” and “PSW” (Pg. 2)
  - a) Please use the term PSW.
  - b) Northern Wetland is within the City of London boundary on Figure 3 and 5, but Figure 2 does not show PSW (as identified by the MNRF).
    - i) The follow up should state: As of August 2014, the north boundary is part of the London Natural Heritage System and therefore should be a stewardship opportunity, as the meta-corridor is not delineated. The MNRF should be invited to assess and comment on this meta-corridor for boundaries, especially considering that it includes a PSW.
  
- 5) Section 4.1.2 “Soils” - The data from EXP is written as though it were a reference; this is hard to follow because the names of the figures were not given in the BioLogic report. Please cite as: (Appendix #, exp 2015), and title the documents in the appendices.

- 6) Section 4.1.4 - Rainfall is not appropriately referenced in the East and West divide. Please revise and clarify to the reader what the implications are for rainfall.
  - a) Referenced Appendix E – Hydrology Assessment: Please number the pages
  - b) The checklist does not assess the information appropriately
  
- 7) Figure 3 clearly shows a watercourse within the southern wetland to the east of Richmond St., but Figure 2 only shows the watercourse on the west side of Richmond. Figure quality is poor and the legend is difficult to interpret. Better GIS images are required
  
- 8) Section 4.2.1
  - a) Help the reader by defining the OWE “50% rule”, based on vegetation found in the area.
  - b) Communities in the wetland function and water attenuation were conducted by Development Engineering.
    - i) When was this survey completed?
  - c) In “Summary”, considering you are requesting a revision of the MNRF wetland boundary, proper photographic documentation and labeling should be provided.
    - i) Regardless of the fact that the wetland community to the south is mostly below the property, the impacts could be greater based on construction near the PSW. Consider studying the PSW again for encroachment and public usage to determine what buffer would be appropriate, or if fencing is needed.
    - ii) They recommend revision to the MNRF wetland boundary, but state two paragraphs earlier that their boundaries agreed with the MNRF. Why revise?
  
- 9) Section 4.2.2: Wildlife Habitat
  - a) Where are the photos to confirm these candidate habitat areas?
  
- 10) Section 4.2.3: Aquatic
  - a) No ‘significant’ aquatic species were found as of a 2012 survey, but what about now? We would prefer if BioLogic actually did a survey.
  
- 11) Section 4.2.4: Flora
  - a) Habitat for 17 floral species of provincial interest “may be found within 1 km of the subject lands”.
    - i) The ambiguous statement suggests that further research should be conducted to determine whether the lands **do** have S-ranked species.
    - ii) The habitat for Butternut is evident on Figure 6, and falls within the land parcel. Why was that not listed in this section? What are the impacts to this species?

- b) Butternut has a 25 m buffer, but this decision is missing a reference.
- c) Smooth Aster was observed in Community 1 between 2013 and 2015 and then no longer be present according to AECOM in 2015? What was the cause of its disappearance?

12) Section 4.2.5: Fauna

- a) W. Huys conducted the site-specific bird study in 2013, but what is his relationship with BioLogic (employee, contracted etc.)? What are his credentials?
- b) The appendix for this section gives the wintering raptor surveys first, but they are referenced in the text after the breeding bird surveys. This is an example of sloppy document preparation which makes this EIS difficult to navigate. It would be somewhat less confusing if appendices had page numbers which were referenced in the text.
- c) Bird studies were only conducted for one month over three weeks, and only in one calendar year. The recommendation is two years.
- d) Six breeding birds with conservation concern found within subject lands, but BioLogic indicates that there is no habitat for END, THR, or SC birds. Various excuses are given for why there doesn't need to be any conservation for the bird habitats in the site.

13) Section 9.0: Summary and Conclusions

- a) Table 7 state post construction 'enhanced corridor for wildlife' for south PSW and north PSW, with little expansion on that comment in the EIS.

14) Snakes are listed under "amphibians" as possible foragers for toads. However, this should be listed under the "reptile" section instead.

- a) Section 6 "Environment Management Plan"  
"Natural Heritage Features" A 5 m buffer adjacent to the PSW is inappropriate.
  - i) This feature requires a minimum of a 30m buffer zone between the development and the PSW.
    - (1) Page 39 states that no buffer is required, and therefore a naturalized buffer of 2.5 m along the south end of the wetland is proposed.
      - (a) This is not acceptable for a PSW. Please revise.
    - ii) "South Wetland Boundary": A 10 m buffer is no better, regardless of whether this is a PSW or a wetland, the buffer requirements of the Environmental Management Guidelines (COL, 2007) require a 30 m buffer zone.
      - (1) It is stated that within the 10 m buffer zone there will be construction in this area in the form of ATVs.
        - (a) This is unacceptable activity in the buffer areas and defeats the very purpose of a buffer.

- iii) “Life science data...” this directly contradicts Section 15.4.12 on Page 30.
- 15) Section 15.4.1 water quality and quantity does not refer to Appendix E, which is the water quality assessment and calculations.
- 16) Figure 1 (in Appendix A) show bore holes for the area, with an overlay of the design in subsequent pages. What are the impacts to hydrology? The water distribution information is lacking, as well as the mitigation measures for those.
- a) Figure 9 – Overlay
    - i) The mapping of the overlap is missing information regarding “2.2 Description of the Proposed Development”, Environmental Management Guidelines (2007).
    - ii) Butternut was shown on the map, but where were the other significant wildlife located (i.e. birds)?
      - (1) Why does the butternut have a 25 m buffer? Please reference.
    - iii) The report/figure is missing:
      - o Groundwater recharge areas (implied)
      - o Potential alterations to drainage
      - o Conceptual location of storm water management facilities.

## Appendices

- 17) Appendix A - Page 1
- a) Summary checklist was documented one year before the EIS was issued. Is it appropriate for the documentation to be incorporated? How have they addressed these issues?
- 18) Appendix B – EXP figure “North-South” is monochromatic and you cannot read the text.
- 19) Appendix D – poor labeling
- a) What is this table referring to?
  - b) What is the use of this table?
- 20) Appendix E - Water Balance Calculations were provided by exp Services Inc. Dec 2014. It comprises 7 pages (2 maps, 5 pages of tables and calculations) describing annual rainfall, infiltration and recharge of groundwater, and surface flows of water - yet receives scant treatment in the text of the EIS, save for section 8.3.2 (pg 40-41), which refers to work done by exp in 2015 (sic).

- a) It doesn't direct the reader to the data (the work actually was done in 2014 reported in Appendix E. [Note: Appendix E in the wrong location, being placed after Appendices A and B but before C, D, and F].
- b) Contains water balance assessment for area 01 (about 2.4 ha) pre- and post-development, but the water balance assessment of area 02 (the 0.8 ha strip that runs east west along the southern edge of the subject lands) has the pre-development data listed twice and the data for post-development is missing. We therefore cannot assess the validity of these statements in section 8.3.2: "The water balance calculations specific to the site's overland flow and infiltration contributions suggest there will be an increase in run-off flows to the north and a decrease to the south; and a decrease in infiltration in the north, and a increase in the south." They later opine: "the relative increase and decrease in the water balance to the wetlands is marginal since the water contributions from the subject lands is small." Since they did not provide data on run-off contributions from lands to the west, east, and south of the southern PSW, we cannot assess their conclusions above.

21) Appendix F – Amphibian Surveys were not complete

- a) Frogs were identified, but none were making calls?
  - b) GPS coordinates not given
  - c) Why on the field sheets, were the wildlife features not marked?
  - d) Surveys for Amphibians were conducted in June, which is not an appropriate time window for monitoring and needs to be redone.
- Amphibian surveys are not complete (*e.g.* only garbage is listed as a feature in one wetland, but wetland/marsh/open space isn't checked, the headings in one table are blacked out, June is not a recommended time of year for surveys, some survey times aren't listed, AM/PM not indicated, frog calls listed but "Frogs calling" not checked off).