June 24, 2022

Trent Ridge Farms 4131 County Road 32 Douro, Ontario K0L 2H0

Attention:

Mr. Gary Bolton

Re:

Response to Concerns, ORCA Comments

Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE)

Proposed Two (2) Lot Severance

4131 County Road 32

Part of Lot 12, Concession 8 (Douro)

Township of Douro-Dummer, County of Peterborough

ORE File No. 21-2882

Dear Mr. Bolton:

# 1.0 Introduction

As requested, we have completed our response to the review comments provided by Otonabee Region Conservation Authority (ORCA) of March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022 (Plan Review and Permitting Services Memo) regarding the Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE) we completed for your property, dated December 2021.

Our response addresses the ORCA comments in the order they appear in the Memo.

# 2.0 Response

## 2.1 Hydrological Features – Wetlands

#### 2.1.1 ORCA Concern Stated:

"1. The NHE Figure 4 illustrates the ELC ecosites and wetland boundaries for Roll #1522-010-003-14620 – subject to these Planning Act Applications and Roll #1522-010-004-03505 – small lot to the south (wetland boundaries on the retained parcel were not confirmed in the NHE). Technical staff note that NHE Figure 7 is not consistent with NHE Figure 4 – the wetland boundary is not consistent with that of wetland ecosite SWM1-1 and excludes wetland ecosite SWT2 (see Figures A & B). The accuracy of mapping should be verified with ORE given the discrepancies."

Page 2

## **ORE** Response:

With regard to the on-site wetland mapping inconsistences, we have included a revised Figure 4 (referred to as "Figure 4r") illustrating the boundary of the wetland ORE and ORCA confirmed in the field together. The version of Figure 4 that was submitted with the NHE report, inadvertently included some layers containing "suspected wetland" from the winter season inspection with the owner. This area was reviewed during the spring and summer period and confirmed, not to be wetland. The attached Figure 4r illustrates the wetland boundary confirmed with ORCA during the spring/summer inspection.

## 2.1.2 ORCA Concern Stated:

"2. The Consent Applications as proposed do not appear consistent with the NHE mapping and recommendations or provincial and regulatory policies. The severed parcels should be relocated out of the wetlands and the 30-metre buffer/VPZ to demonstrate consistency with ORE confirmed wetland boundaries and applicable policies that prohibit development and site alteration within hydrologic features."

#### **ORE** Response:

Figure 4r and Figure 7r (revised lot areas, attached) are now consistent, and the proposed development will be located entirely outside the 30 m setback of the wetland identified on the subject property. Consequently, the proposed severances should now be consistent with regulatory policies.

Figure 7r illustrates the revised proposed lot layout. The proposed lots are each approximately 0.4 ha in area, which is the minimum lot size the municipality requires. However, the lot sizes should be verified by an Ontario Land Surveyor (OLS). Both the wetland boundary and the 30 m setback should be demarcated on each lot prior to any proposed vegetation clearing/disturbances.

## 2.2 Species at Risk Comment

#### 2.2.1 ORCA Concern Stated:

"Ontario' Make a Natural Heritage Map suggests the property is traversed by threatened species and special concern/significant wildlife species. The NHE confirms potential habitat

Page 3

for these species on the retained parcel (NHE Sections 5, 6 & 9, and Appendix D).

Given the proposed blasting and proximity of regulated threatened species, the landowner is responsible to demonstrate compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) prior to commencement of any on-site development (grading, roads, buildings). "

## ORE Response:

The threatened, special concern and significant wildlife species would utilize the woodland and adjacent farm fields on the retained lands. Considering, this is an application to create two (2) lots, blasting should not occur until the Building Permit stage.

To mitigate for potential blasting impacts, the Site Plan for the proposed new lots should include the following stipulations to prevent the blasting from disturbing SAR:

- Blasting shall occur outside the peak wildlife period during the spring and summer seasons that could potentially disrupt Threatened, Special Concern and other wildlife species. Conducting the blasting outside this sensitive period will avoid the peak breeding and fledging period for most wildlife. As for the SAR, these are migratory birds and would not be present during the blasting window.
- The above-mentioned mitigation measure should be included in the Site Plan for the lots and the Building Permit application. The following dates with respect to blasting should be included in both Site Plans. No blasting shall occur between April 1<sup>st</sup> to September 30<sup>th</sup> each year.

The above-mentioned dates/period would ensure that the agricultural threatened species, the special concern species and other wildlife utilizing the woodland, are not impacted by the blasting.

The agricultural-related threatened bird species is the only species regulated by the Endangered Species Act. The avoidance measures to conduct the blasting while this species is migrating south and not present on-site complies with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) requirements under the ESA to protect this species from harm, harassment or cull. In addition the proposed blasting will not occur within the habitat of the threatened species. Therefore, it will also be unharmed, which satisfies the ESA requirements.

## 3.0 Closure

Updated Figures 4r and 7r are included at the end of this response and identify/confirm the boundary of all Natural Heritage Features on the subject property.

Figure 7r illustrates that the development will adhere to the Policy requirement of remaining outside the 30 m setback distance from all on-site hydrologic features.

In regards to the blasting and ESA requirements, the "no-blasting window" mitigation measure provided above is consistent with the requirements outlined by the MECP for similar projects ORE staff have completed. Provided the blasting occurs outside the prime season when the threatened and special concern species are present, and that the blasting does not directly impact the habitat of the species, the ESA requirements should be satisfied.

It is our opinion that the majority of the Natural Heritage related comments provided in ORCA's March review letter have been addressed. We appreciate ORCA's comments and trust that our responses and revisions will allow the proponent to move the application forward to the detailed design phase.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Oakridge Environmental Ltd.

Rob West, HBSc., CSEB

Senior Ecologist

cc: file

Figure 4r - Vegetation

Figure 7r - Constraints

Attachments



