

## Kaitlyn Graham

---

**From:** Sasha Von Kursell  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 2, 2019 11:22 AM  
**To:** Kaitlyn Graham  
**Cc:** Jillianne Velina  
**Subject:** RE: \*Request for Comments\* City File # D02-19011, D03-19003, D05-19005 and D06-19041 - 18 Elm Grove Avenue - Robert Grabarczyk PNHP Comments

Kaitlyn,

The Parks and Natural Heritage Planning Section reviewed the circulated materials in support of these applications and have the following comments for your consideration:

### D02-19011 Zoning By-law Amendment

*Natural Heritage Evaluation, GEMS – July 4 2019*

1. The consultant's findings conclude that there is a wetland on the abutting property to the east (16 Elm Grove Ave). We note the consultant did not evaluate the wetland or assess the wetland in context with the applicable policy regime to determine its significance or applicable protection and preservation measures. In this regard, the submission does not provide enough detail about the wetland, its preservation and protection measures, or the impact the development proposal will have on the feature. The applicant's consultant will need to revise the Natural Heritage Evaluation and reassess this feature in accordance with the Greenway Policies of the City's Official Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. The Natural Heritage Report will need to capture the wetlands full extent and provide recommendations for its preservation and enhancement, and determine an appropriate buffer where required. The recommendations of the revised report may have an impact on the development proposal.
2. The revised Natural Heritage Report will also need to address the findings of the Geotechnical Report. The Geotechnical Report indicates that there may be a hydrological connection between the applicant's lands and the abutting wetland and/or a hydrological feature within the applicant's property. The Geotechnical Report also eludes to hydrolytic soil conditions and the presence of fill, which may be an indication that portions of the wetland have been filled in within the applicant's property.
3. Once the limits of the feature(s) have been defined, the Zoning By-law Amendment will need be revised to zone these features as OS, or equivalent, and Schedule "A" will need to be revised accordingly.

*Engineering Submission, Site Servicing Plan, Grading Plan, etc., CANTAM Group, July 2019*

4. The site engineering should be cognizant of the natural heritage and hydrological feature and the site should be engineered to eliminate any site works and servicing within the feature and its associated buffers.
5. The applicant's engineer will need to confirm that the soil conditions will support infiltration galleries.

### Site Plan D06-19041, Subdivision D03-19003 and Condominium D05-19005

6. As noted above, the applicant's consultant has identified a wetland, the presence of which may impact the layout, servicing, grading and configuration of the development proposal. Once the issues surrounding the wetland have been addressed, we will be in a position to provide further and more detained comments on the site plan, subdivision and condominium applications. In the interim however, we note the following:
  - a. We agree in principle with the findings of the arborist (*Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan, Thomson Watson Consulting Arborist, July 15, 2019*). Tree removals and compensation will be negotiated through the site plan application process.
  - b. Once the wetland and associated features are defined, the draft plans of subdivision and condominium will need to be revised to show the feature(s) and its associated buffer as separate blocks on the plan.

- c. The applicant should convey the feature and its associated buffer to a public agency.

Should you require further information regarding these comments, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

**Sasha von Kursell MURP, MCIP, RPP**  
*Parks Planning & Policy Coordinator*  
Parks & Natural Heritage Planning  
Planning & Regulatory Services

