

Christina Coulter

From: Rob West <rob@oakridgeenvironmental.com>
Sent: March 8, 2024 12:43 PM
To: Don Husack
Cc: Christina Coulter
Subject: Re: FW: A-04-23 (1076 Duck Pond Lane - Husack)

Hi Christina,

Please see my comments in red font below, which will hopefully answer some of the questions posed by Stantec in their review...

There are three specific comments from Stantec's peer review that I am seeking clarification on:

1. Page 3, paragraph 4:

"Overall, the purpose for the sEIA was stated, and the scope of the report appeared generally appropriate for the Proposed Development. However, the sEIS did not appear to address the recommendations in the PCN to provide a suitable planting plan. Some White Pine tree plantings were included on the Site Plan in Appendix A of the sEIS which appear to conflict with the Proposed Development; however, Stantec assumes that there is anticipated to be an enhanced planting plan associated with the project. In the absence of an enhanced planting plan which provides a clear objective for enhancement including potential offsetting impacts from the Proposed Development (if necessary), Stantec cannot provide a response if Section 4.2.4.5 of the GPGGH and 2.1.8 of the PPS are suitably addressed."

ORE provided an enhanced planting plan that illustrated where the plantings should be situated, the types of trees and/or shrubs to be planted are based on what tree species would survive in the shallow soil conditions on the subject property. The majority of the property contains connected/linked tree and/or shrub cover, therefore, the plantings to enhance the overall site conditions had to be focused within two (2) open areas. The primary open area corresponds to the area that may be impacted by machinery around the perimeter of the proposed dry boathouse structure. ORE presumes this area will require filling and grading to address the drainage in and around the proposed boathouse. The exact location of the tree stock would be subject to the depth of soils and moisture regime. A final as planted location can be forwarded to the Municipality and/or confirmed on-site by the Township's Building Inspector.

As for the secondary planting area to the north, this is meant to infill one of the two (2) openings in the tree canopy and improve/enhance the vegetation buffer between the developed areas and Stoney Lake, which still complies with the Growth Plan requirements.

2. Page 4, last paragraph:

“ORE indicated in Section 12.1 (Development Envelopes and Constraints): *“It should be possible to construct the storage building, while avoiding any nearby mature trees. If any trees have to be removed due to their health, ORE staff recommend planting three (3) new native trees/shrubs between the shoreline and proposed storage building to offset the tree loss.”* In Appendix A, on the figure it indicates: *“5 White Pine Trees to be Planted in Area of Boathouse Where Soil Depth Permits It”* However, the proposed boat house appears to be within the drip line of the proposed plantings which may potentially compromise the success of the trees.”

Alternatively, the proponent could plant Eastern White Cedar in the area of the proposed Boathouse if the stock has to be positioned closer to the boathouse whereby the property owner could trim the trees so the dripline does not overlap the building. However, based on my knowledge of the site, it should be possible to situate the pine trees (once the soil depths, moisture levels, etc. have been taken into account) a sufficient distance for the proposed building for the dripline not to overlap the proposed building.

3. Page 5, summary paragraph:

“It is Stantec’s opinion that without the planting plan Stantec cannot conclusively agree with ORE’s concluding statement regarding impacts and conformance with the GPGGH and the PPS as outlined in the PCN. Some further information as outlined in this review is recommended.”

The proposed planting plan and areas to be planted will enhance/improve the overall condition of the site and offset the impacts by the proposed boathouse. Therefore, complying with the GPGGH.

Based on the Revised Planting Plan, are you able to provide any additional commentary to address the concerns noted by Stantec in order to achieve conformity with the GPGGH and PPS?

The two areas where the stock are proposed to be planted are the only areas where there are existing openings in the canopy on-site. The plantings in these proposed locations and number of stock to be planted will: 1) infill those openings resulting in an overall net benefit to the site’s vegetation cover, 2) improve the ribbon-of-life (riparian zone) buffering capacity between the development and shoreline, and 3) Offset the footprint of the proposed boathouse structure. It is therefore my opinion that the proposed planting in the primary and secondary areas applies a best effort approach to enhance the site conditions which complies with the Growth Plan requirements.