

**4TH REPORT OF THE**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOLOGICAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting held on March 15, 2012, commencing at 5:19 p.m.

PRESENT: D. Sheppard (Chair), D. Cooper, R. Gupta, M. MacDougall, J. Miller, S. Sanford, G. Sass and S. Turner and B. Mercier (Secretary).

ALSO PRESENT: G. Barrett and H. McNeely.

REGRETS: B. Bergsma, C. Creighton, A. Desai and B. Maddeford.

**I YOUR COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

- 3rd Report of the EEPAC
1. (1) That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) reviewed and received the 3rd Report of the EEPAC from its meeting held on February 16, 2012. The following was noted:
- (a) Item #2 - the EEPAC asked its Working Group to finalize its report with respect to the Southwest Area Plan, Official Plan amendments and forward it directly to Staff for their review and consideration by the March 30, 2012 deadline; it being noted that the final report will be placed on the next agenda of the EEPAC; and,
- (b) Item #4 – the EEPAC asked that the attached report, prepared by its Working Group with respect to the application submitted by Drewlo Holdings Inc. relating to the properties located at 130, 136, 146 and 164 Pond Mills Road and 925 Deveron Crescent, be forwarded to staff for their consideration.
- Riverbend South Planning Area
2. (3) That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) reviewed and received a Municipal Council resolution adopted at its meeting held on February 21 and 22, 2012 with respect to the Riverbend South planning area. The EEPAC requested an update on the tree relocation and preservation works related to the Sifton Properties Limited lands in the Riverbend South planning area.
- Encroachments onto City Property Project "Return to Nature"
3. (4) That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) reviewed and received a report, dated March 6, 2012, from the Director of Building Controls and Chief Building Official, with respect to the encroachments onto City property project, "Return to Nature". The EEPAC asked that it be provided with a copy of the Encroachment Enforcement Procedures for its information, noting that the EEPAC had previously provided comments with respect to this matter on October 20, 2011.
- Southwest Area Plan Patch Evaluations and Patch Protection Levels
4. (6) That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) reviewed and received a communication, dated March 6, 2012, from B. Bergsma, Ecologist Planner, with respect to the Southwest Area Plan patch evaluations and the recommended patch protection levels (table 24).
- Protective Measures for Non-Mapped Vegetation Patches
5. (7) That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) heard a verbal update from G. Barrett, Manager, Land Use Planning Policy, with respect to the protective measures for non-mapped vegetation patches; it being noted that this matter is currently item eighty-eight on the Planning Department Project List.
- Species at Risk Public Registry – Recovery Strategy for the Northern Madtom
6. (8) That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) postponed discussion relating to the communication, dated February 24, 2012, from S. O'Neill, with respect to the recovery strategy of the Northern Madtom, to its next meeting.
- Deferred Matters List
7. (9) That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) reviewed and received its Deferred Matters List, as at March 15, 2012.

EEPAC -2-

8. That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC) received and noted the following:

3rd Report of  
the ACE

(a) (2) the 3rd Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment from its meeting held on February 1, 2012; and,

Sifton  
Properties  
Limited – 1551  
Blackwell  
Boulevard

(c) (5) a Notice of Public Meeting, dated February 16, 2012, from A. MacLean, Senior Planner, with respect to an application submitted by Sifton Properties Limited relating to the property located at 1551 Blackwell Boulevard.

Next Meeting

9. That the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee will hold its next meeting on April 19, 2012.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Review of: **Pond Mills Subdivision - Centre St. EIS**

Prepared by Biologic; dated December 2011

Reviewers: M. Macdougall, G. Sass, D. Sheppard; March 2012

Neither the proposed development layout nor the proposed sewer works locations are supported by the conclusions of the EIS. The proposal should be revised to comply with OP Chapter 15, City Environmental Management Policies, as well as the Thames Valley Corridor Plan.

The list of non-compliances with City policy presented by this proposal and EIS is extensive. The application should likely not have been accepted as complete and the EIS should clearly be returned to the applicant as insufficient and technically incomplete.

EEPAC offers a limited number of specific comments based on its limited review of a document which it hopes the City will return to the applicant as incomplete and insufficient thereby negating the need for EEPAC to expend full efforts in detailing the problems with the EIS.

#### 1. Encroachment into the Significant Woodland

The conservation and protection of woodlands has been identified as a priority. The development proposed in the Pond Mills Subdivision EIS encroaches on an identified significant woodland- therefore, it should not be permitted.

It is inappropriate to use the Erosion Hazard Limit (Trow, 2010) as the extent for the proposed development, as it significantly encroaches into the identified significant woodland.

Planning a development within a significant woodland is inappropriate and inconsistent with the policies of the city of London. This development, as proposed, should be rejected.

#### 2. Faunal Inventory

Faunal inventories were conducted on May 16, 2006, May 7, 2009, May 30, 2009, and June 18, 2009). These do not span the required 3 season inventory required to determine the faunal composition of the area.

A three season inventory must be performed as per requirement.

#### 3. Inclusion of Plantation and Other Vegetation Communities in Significant Woodland

Communities 5, 10, 11, 3b appear to be fully contiguous with the significant woodland and should be included within the patch boundary. Some of these communities are FOD and communities which are culturally modified woodlands are not to be automatically

disqualified from inclusion in the significant woodland. Application of boundary delineation guidelines need to re-applied after the proper patch starting boundary is corrected.

For evaluation purposes, the existance of Centre St does not create a sufficiently impassable barrier to connectivity as to create a satellite woodland. Communities south of Centre St. may not be excluded from the woodland on this basis.

Disturbance and human abuse of woodland edges does also not disqualify that vegetation from inclusion in the significant woodland.

Further ground proofing is required to validate the claim of community 24 as being a satellite woodland. The supplied aerial photography does not support this claim.

#### 4. Other

Figure 17- Rear lot lines for lots 127-133, 13, 28-31, and 41-43 encroach on the significant woodland and therefore should be considered to have a direct impact. Any lots that have a direct impact on the significant woodland should not be permitted.

The patch boundary is at the dripline of the trees. The EIS should suggest a development buffer of at least 22m from the patch to rear lot lines. A figure should be provided that describes the patch boundary, buffer zone and revised lot plan.

Section 8.3 discusses the opportunity to construct a trail through the designated open space. The designated open space includes vegetation community 15, which contains rare to uncommon natural communities. Trails should not be constructed in rare or uncommon natural communities.

/end