

1176,1200 & 1230 Hyde Park Road, City of London

Environmental Impact Study (EIS)

Prepared for Farhi Holdings Corporation by Stantec Consulting Company, 2019 Feb. 24

Received at EEPAC at its April meeting (without the accompanying documentation that is on the City's web site)

Reviewed by: Susan Hall, Sandy Levin, Suba Sivakumar

2019 May 2

OVERVIEW

The parcel of land is located west of Hyde Park Road near the T-intersection with Sarnia Road and consists primarily of agricultural fields separated by an abandoned railway spur. To the west the Stanton Drain and the associated Kelly Stanton Environmentally Significant Area north flank the Subject lands. The south edge of the site is bounded by the railway.

The key environmental features are located off-site and include. the Stanton Drain flowing through the Kelly Stanton ESA (south) and the Kains Road River Valley (ANSI) to the south of the CN Railway.

The three areas of concern are:

- a. the width of the buffer, bordering the Kelly-Stanton ESA (south) and the plan for a multi-use pathway in the buffer;
- b. the stormwater management strategy. Where development occurs there will be a reduction of water infiltrating to the subsurface due to the impervious surfaces and;
- c. lack of detail regarding the management of invasive species and an the need for enhancement through the planting of native species

Buffer:

On the west side a "15 m Open Space block (Block 9) will be dedicated to the City - Future development to the east of Block 9 will respect a 30 m from the edge of the vegetation (8.1)-will this be taken from Block 6? Will native species be planted?

Recommendation 1: Clearly delineate the 30 m buffer adjacent to the Kelly Stanton ESA on drawings and plans.

Extend the Hyde Park Rotary Link multi-use trail along the eastern boundary of the Kelly Stanton ESA . . . in accordance with the approved but appealed map 4 - "Active Mobility Network" of the London Plan (7.2:). It is further described that when decisions are made as to the pavement of pathways/trails that buffer zones as locations for trails should be considered as it provides for public connection to the natural environment amenity (8:1:)

Is a hardened trail surface planned? p.123 in "Environmental Management Guidelines", City of London, 2007 states that impervious surfaces are not permitted in a buffer.

Recommendation 2: Situate this portion of the Hyde Park multi-use trail outside of the 30 m buffer adjacent to the Kelly Stanton ESA.

Stormwater Management Strategy

Subject site located on an area that is part of the Stratford Till Plain upon the Area Moraine. This area functions as part of a groundwater recharge area; but is not considered to be a notable contributor to groundwater recharge in the region because of the soil type. Groundwater flows into the Stanton Drain from the surrounding landscape and contributes to the base flow in this watercourse (4.1). In terms of vegetation there is an area of “*Fresh-Moist Mixed Meadow* identified in Block 1. Several possible LID measures are described; but the conclusion is reached that the *key constraint in using several of the LID measures is the position of the seasonally high groundwater table (7.1).* The “Geotechnical Report, on-line describes the post-development drainage pattern with most of the area being drained to ditch running along a berm separating the site from the rail line. Information isn’t provided on where the ditch ends and possible problems with erosion. The EIS suggests this will come at detail design.

Recommendation 3: Identify steps taken to prevent erosion from surface water runoff where it is discharged towards the ravine to the west of the site.

Recommendation 4: The proponent be required as a condition of development to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City how it will control flow rates under storm conditions greater than the 2 year storm.

Recommendation 5: The City Hydrogeologist be asked to review the materials provided for in the Stormwater Management Strategy.

Environmental Management Plan

Table 4.1 identifies the growth of buckthorn on the west edge of the site (FODM4) extending up to the buffer. Also, there is no environmental management plan in the EIS nor suggested as part of the development agreement. There is no master plan or trail plan in place for this part of the Natural Heritage System,

Recommendation 6:

- a) **As per London Plan Policy 1436_4, an Environmental Management Plan that includes restoration, mitigation and a monitoring plan be required as a condition of development.**
- b) **The Environmental Management must include removal of invasive species in and around the buffer to be replaced with native plantings including shrubs that will discourage encroachment.**

Other Issues

The EIS indicates that there are western chorus frogs in the ESA to the west of the site as well as in the SWM facility at the southeast portion of the site. There is no consideration given to the connection between the two areas.

Recommendation 7: A vegetated corridor must be maintained between the SWM facility and the ESA.

Recommendation 8: As a condition of development, the proponent be required to provide informational signage to the satisfaction of the City explaining the significance of the ESA and the western chorus frog population

On Map 5 of the London Plan, the lands identified as ESA in the EIS are not named. It is unclear to EEPAC why the EIS calls the section of the Kains Woods ANSI to the south as Kelly Stanton ESA south when it is clearly shown on Map 5 as part of the ANSI. It is also unclear why the area in between the two rail lines is its own ESA.

Recommendation 9: The areas called Kelly Stanton ESA shown on Map 5 be included in the boundary of the Kains Woods ANSI.

MULTI-USE PATHWAY

Recommendation 10: As Council has declared a climate emergency, the materials used for the multi-use trail should be permeable.

Recommendation 11: Please indicate the “end” point (where the pathway is leading to) for the multi-use pathway.

MEMM4-FRESH-MOIST-MIXED- MEADOW ECOSITE

Recommendation 12: Characterize and provide further information such as history, size, seasonal water level pattern and any environmental services provided to the local niche. Tracking record of such small ecosite which are lost due to development may facilitate to make decision regarding collective effect.