However, there are movements of birds in the area and the risk that the building poses to them should be considered further.

3.2.7.3 Rare or Specialized Habitat

None present on the Daniels site.

3.2.7.4 Species of Conservation Concern

None present on the Daniels site.
### 3.2 Feature and Functions: Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature or Function</th>
<th>High Park &amp; Adjacent</th>
<th>Daniels Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant</td>
<td>o Grenadier Pond ESA</td>
<td>o None, no further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local and riparian</td>
<td>o Spring Creek pockets and riparian corridor o Rennie Park</td>
<td>o None on site, consider off-site impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered and Threatened Species</td>
<td>o Chimney Swift Blandings Turtle, o Snapping turtle in Grenadier Pond o Common Nighthawk o Redheaded Woodpecker</td>
<td>o None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fauna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flora</td>
<td>o Butternut</td>
<td>o None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities</td>
<td>o Black Oak Tallgrass Prairie, including 40 indicator species.</td>
<td>o None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Habitat</td>
<td>o Warm water, pollution tolerant species o Warm water pollution tolerant species</td>
<td>o None, no further consideration o None, no further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grenadier Pond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spring Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Woodlands</td>
<td>o High Park woodlands, including the Oak Savannah would be significant</td>
<td>o No woodland present on site, consider impact on adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest</td>
<td>o 136.4 hectares of tree canopy</td>
<td>o .33 hectares of tree canopy, consider impact of loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Valleylands and Landform</td>
<td>o Lake Iroquois Sand Plain</td>
<td>o None present, no further consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on this analysis, there are five issue areas of potential impact, highlighted above in yellow, which will be carried forward for further analysis and mitigation in Section 5.0.
4.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Daniels site is a relatively flat parcel of 6535 m² (1.62 acres) with a frontage on Bloor Street of 91 metres and depth of from 77 to 82 metres. It was occupied by 13 two to three-storey residences. Bloor Street is one of the City’s principal streets and a major east-west arterial and has been identified in the Official Plan for redevelopment with increased density as it in an Apartment Neighbourhood designation and is on an “Avenues” designation. Bloor Street in this vicinity currently has residences and low rise buildings fronting on it with high rise apartments (to 30 floors) to the north of the site. The Bloor subway line runs underneath the Daniels site.

The proposal for redevelopment consists of a mixed-use, mid-rise-type building with retail at grade. The design of the building focuses both the massing and height toward the north end of the site away from Bloor Street and High Park. The rear portion of the building is 12 storeys stepping up to 14 in the middle. There are two wings to the building of 8 storeys that step down towards Bloor Street and a courtyard in the middle of the Bloor Street frontage. A site plan and perspective are shown below.
SITE PLAN:
The building will contain approximately 405 residential apartment units and 1373 m² of ground floor retail space. It will have 3 levels of below grade parking, with entrances/exits off Pacific Avenue and Oakmount Road.

An important aspect of the proposal is that a “green” roof of 1520 m² will be provided. This is described later.

The proposal is consistent with the policies and provisions of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan and the City of Toronto Official Plan, all of which support and encourage such intensification within urban built-up areas. The Ontario Municipal Board approved the requested amendments to add the retail uses and increase the density on the site, subject to completing this report.

The proposal details are found in various reports supporting the application, the principal of which with an environmental component are summarized below.

### 4.1 Site Services

Services for the development have been study in engineering reports on transportation, water, sewage and stormwater management. The first three aspects were determined to have sufficient capacity and are not dealt with here as they did not have natural environment implications.

Stormwater does require consideration as the character of the site is changed and discharges potentially move through High Park through the Spring Creek drainage when the capacity of the combined-flow collection sewers are exceeded. GHD Consultants prepared an analysis (August 18, 2012) that was part of the submissions package. The table below summarizes the stormwater management proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Stormwater</th>
<th>Pre-development</th>
<th>Post-development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uncontrolled roof</td>
<td>o 4120 m²</td>
<td>o 1915 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-green roof</td>
<td>o 0 m²</td>
<td>o 1520 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-impervious lane, pavement</td>
<td>o 0 m²</td>
<td>o 1685 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-landscaped/pervious</td>
<td>o 2415 m²</td>
<td>o 406 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Total</td>
<td>o 6535 m²</td>
<td>o 6535 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year Storm Flow</td>
<td>105.6 l/s</td>
<td>113.4 l/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year Storm Flow</td>
<td>157.8 l/s</td>
<td>169.5 l/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year Storm Flow</td>
<td>299.8 l/s</td>
<td>321.9 l/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Flow</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>80 l/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis shows that the basic proposal will result in slightly increased storm flows (7.4%) from the site. However, policies require that the release rates be controlled to meet an 80 l/s standard. This will be done by installing storage capacity on the site with controlled discharge rates. Thus, the development actually brings an improvement to the discharges from the site in this respect and will reduce the incidence of combined sewer overflows through High Park to the Western Beaches Storage Tunnel.

The proposal also must meet a water retention objective of 5 mm. of rainfall on the site through infiltration, evapotranspiration and re-use. There was no standard for the pre-development condition. On-site infiltration was considered, but was not permitted by the TTC due to conflicts with the TTC Subway tunnel that runs underneath the rear portion of the site.

Additional on-site treatment through oil/grit separators will improve the quality of discharges.

Erosion control measures will prevent the escape of sediments during construction.

### 4.2 Tree Conservation

A study of the existing trees on the site has been completed by The Tree Specialist Inc. (October 9, 2012) and is appended, including the tree inventory and site survey.

The redevelopment requires the removal of all 26 of the regulated trees on site (seven of them were dead or in serious decline) and five regulated trees on private property, adjacent to the property. There are also 22 trees on City property with 17 of those requiring removal. The result is a 48 tree reduction. Tree protection measures will be provided for the residual retained trees using City standards for protection. Replanting of trees in the courtyard, on the roof amenity areas and along the boulevards adjacent will put 48 trees back, achieving a balance in numbers but not in canopy due to a more limited size of tree.

### 4.3 Landscape Architecture

A landscape design (LAND ART DESIGN INC., 2013) for the site accompanied the submissions and is shown on a following three pages.

The proposal is to include two Black Oaks (100 mm caliper) in the building courtyard and 34 trees (as requested by the City) in the boulevards around the site. Twelve trees will be planted in the outdoor amenity areas, for a total of 48 trees to be planted. An additional 1132 shrubs will be provided. This will provide as much vegetation coverage as possible on site, consistent with the proposed building. Green roofs of 1520 m² will provide 23% coverage of the property along with 406 m² planters and pervious pavers. This comes close to matching the pre-development lawns and driveways (2415 m²). The green roof will be designed to be insect and wildlife attractive with a mix of grasses and wildflowers giving height, structure and species
GROUND FLOOR LANDSCAPE PLAN:
ROOF GARDENS FIGURE:
LEVEL 10 AMENITY TERRACE Figure:
diversity. While not in the current design for the roof, the attractiveness for birds could be enhanced by including small fruit-bearing shrubs in the plantings.

4.4 Building Design

The design of proposed building meets the Toronto Green Standard Tier 1 for Mid-Rise to High-Rise development, including Ecology standards for:

- Automobile infrastructure
- Cycling infrastructure
- Pedestrian infrastructure
- Urban heat island reduction
- Minimum energy performance
- Systems commissioning
- Construction activity
- Stormwater retention
- Water quality – stormwater runoff
- Water efficiency
- Urban forest: tree protection
- Urban forest: encourage tree growth
- Natural heritage site
- Soil quality and planting conditions
- Glass and other design features for migratory birds
- Light pollution

Some of these factors have been addressed above. The bird-friendly design of the building requires further explanation.

The bird-friendly design standard results from studies undertaken by the City with others:


The primary objective is to ensure that best efforts are made to minimize collisions between birds in flight by making the buildings more visible and less misleading to them. Standards are required in building design to achieve this objective. For the Daniels building, this includes the following elements that are illustrated for the south-facing façade of the building facing High Park (the other views are also available in the submission package):

- The form of the building is broken up by solid elements and by recessed balconies
- All glass balcony guards will have a “frit” pattern with a density no more than 100mm apart
SOUTH ELEVATION GLASS FIGURE:
• All vision glass in the first 12 metres of the building will have a frit pattern (5mm dots spaced at 100mm) to provide a visual marker for birds

• All vision glass adjacent to the green roofs and vegetated outdoor amenity areas is treated to a height of 12 metres with the same frit pattern as above

• All spandrel glass panels are low reflectance glass (<8.5%)

• Outdoor lighting will be downcast

The applications were also supported by shadow studies and a pedestrian-level wind report that showed no significant impacts on these elements of compatibility with the local neighbourhood. An environmental site assessment was completed showing only minor contamination requiring remediation when the site is to be excavated. See:

• RWDI, 2011, Pedestrian Wind Study, 7p. Appendices
• Barenco, 2008, Phase I and Phase II Site assessments

The proposal will meet the Toronto Green Standard (TGS) Tier 1 level, as discussed.

A Planning Act cash-in-lieu contribution will be made in order to meet parkland dedication requirements and a Section 37 contribution will be made for capital improvements to High Park, including monies specifically set aside for improvements to the High Park Straw Bale Teaching Kitchen.
5.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

In this section, we examine the potential impacts from the proposed redevelopment as described above. The redevelopment proposal is considered in two stages. First, the conversion of the existing single family residential use to the higher density apartment use that meets the current Official Plan and Zoning on the property and, then, a consideration of the additional retail use and density.

In this analysis, the proposal does not involve any changes to the environment outside of the Daniels site. Thus, there will be no potential direct impacts on the features or functions in High Park. The analysis in this section considers direct impacts on the ecology of the Daniels property and any indirect effects due the changes that this may bring.

The first step in the impact assessment is to identify the potential impact issues based on the screening that was undertaken in Section 3.0 of this report. Based on the analysis presented there, the five potential impact areas that require consideration are discussed below and that are identified on Figure 3.0 that follows.

5.1 Local Wetlands

In the description of the ELC vegetation types in High Park, it was noted that there are moist, cooler communities along the Spring Creek drainage and swamp and marsh communities along the valley bottom. During the OMB hearing, it was also stated in evidence that small seeps sites were evident.

The ELC map for the Park is presented in Section 2.2.1. It shows the Fresh-Moist Lowland Deciduous Forest on the east side of Howard Pond. Thus, it is 250 metres from the Daniels site and topographically isolated by the valley. The Swamp and Marsh communities are small and below Spring Road, some 350+ metres distant. There are no specific sensitive features identified for the communities.

The general area contributing to the pond (surface and groundwater) is developed so the changes that might impact the communities have already occurred some time ago. In the area of the Daniels site, this included the deep tunnel for the Bloor Street Subway.

The re-development of the Daniels property will bring a slight change to the contributing area to Spring Creek. The basic re-development will bring a minor change to area infiltration (the site is small compared to the watershed), but rainwater harvesting will be used on site – thus, conserving water. The increased retail and height for the building do not introduce any additional concerns.

Services are available for the property, particularly the stormwater management and disposal system which is a combined sewer. When it overflows, the discharge is taken down the Spring Creek drainage and flows through the lower pond into the Humber Bay stormwater tunnel for
FIGURE 3.0 POTENTIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS/BUFFERS
sedimentation and chlorination prior to discharge to Lake Ontario. The redevelopment of the property brings a slight improvement to the performance on the SWM system as the site attenuates follows from the current situation. Oil-grit separators will protect water quality.

5.2 Significant Woodland

A major focus at the OMB hearing was the potential for impact on the significant Oak Woodland in High Park. There are three areas of concern identified for consideration.

The first area of concern is potential physical impact on the woodland. Such an impact can occur through changes to the environment supporting the trees, including water, light and wind. The significant woodlands in High Park primarily occur on the dry, warm, upland sites where prairie plants occur under the canopy. The redevelopment will not bring any changes to water supply to the woodlands nor will it alter wind or light patterns. The effect of the glass surface on light was mentioned as an issue, but such impacts (even if a concern) are generally very local, occurring very close to buildings or lighting. The glass on the building will be low-reflectance, for other reasons, and provides a mitigation component. The wind study (RWDI) of the building was related to pedestrian considerations. However, it shows that the building will not funnel wind and produces only very local changes.

As a part of this report, Figure 3.0 was produced that illustrates the standard impact zones around woodland features. The first zone is 10 metres from the tree dripline and is generally regarded as sufficient protection from direct impacts. The second zone is 30 metres in width and is required by policy in the sensitive rural situations in the Greenbelt and on the Oak Ridges Moraine. For the High Park Woodland opposite the Daniels site, most of this zone (27 metres) is occupied by Bloor Street. The other two zones (120 metres, 240 metres) show the surround to the Park has already been developed to the same degree and the Woodland survives.

The second issue is the potential loss of the Black Oaks on the Daniels property to the viability of the Oaks in High Park. Nine Black Oaks are found on the property and cannot be retained. Given the large population of Oaks protected in High Park (there are several hundred in the northern part of the Park opposite the Daniels site); this will not reduce the genetic viability of those trees. For Oaks, both male (pollen) and female flowers (fruiting) occur on any tree and the pollen is wind disseminated. We can identify no unique characteristics to the trees on the Daniels site. Thus, the genetic pool of the Park is widely available to each individual. The Oaks (Red and Black) frequently hydridize producing mixed progeny.

Finally, as discussed in the introduction, there was once a large Oak Savannah in west Toronto. High Park is the remaining large portion of it. There was debate on whether the oaks on the Daniels site were a remnant of this savannah or of more recent origin. In either case, there are not the prairie associates on the Daniels site that make the Oak Woodland in High Park significant. The 13 properties have been residential lots for about the last 100 years.
There are larger oaks in High Park and there is no specific association of any of the Daniels oaks with events or historic personalities so that they are not considered “heritage trees”

5.3 Urban Forest

In the analysis of potential impacts, a reduction in the urban tree canopy on the site was identified as an impact to be addressed. There is currently .33 ha of canopy on site that will be removed, but replaced by the planting of 48 smaller trees on site including the courtyard and roof plantings and adjacent on City property. The estimate (Section 2.0, Table 2.1, Page 18) is that a net loss of .26 ha of tree canopy will be the result.

The resulting reduction of canopy in the High Park area (Park and Adjacent) from 136.4 hectares is a very minor .19% reduction in the canopy over the larger area.

There is no difference in impact on the urban forest canopy between the basic redevelopment and the proposal with the retail and additional density/height (the footprints would be the same site coverage) and result in the same .26 ha (.19%) reduction in canopy.

In spite of the small extent of the loss, this issue is carried forward for further mitigation consideration.

5.4 ANSI Impact

The identified ANSI feature is the High Park Oak Woodlands Life Science ANSI (Provincially significant). The significant features and functions of the ANSI are the Prairie communities under the open canopy of the woodland. Based on the review of potential impact pathways, there is no likelihood of direct physical impacts due to root damage or drainage changes, light, wind, etc. The communities are well separated from the proposal and co-exist now with the adjacent Bloor Street and urban development.

It should also be noted that the redevelopment required a cash-in-lieu contribution to the City to offset the increased recreational parkland demands by the extra residents. In addition, a Section 37 contribution can be used by the City for capital improvements to local parks, including High Park.

There are two areas that do deserve comment as they arose during the OMB hearing. First, the development will increase the use of the Park as additional residents will be in the vicinity. However, the Park now receives a million visits a year (City of Toronto, 2008) and has a management plan (City of Toronto, 2002) to protect and manage its features, including a trail system and delimited sensitive zones where foot traffic is discouraged. The Park is urban and
for people and the additional local population from the redevelopment should not be an impact issue.

Secondly, it is necessary to periodically burn the prairie areas to reduce plant competition, kill invasives and encourage those special species (prairie plants are resistant to fire). This has caused local concern despite best efforts when it occurs. This issue is carried forward for additional consideration in mitigation.

5.5 Bird Hazard

We have identified that the Daniels site is of limited attraction to both breeding and migratory birds in its present condition.

Taller buildings do pose a potential risk to birds due to collisions, particularly with reflective surfaces. Toronto has prepared guidelines to minimize this risk and the design of the Daniels building complies with and exceeds these standards as follows:

- The form of the building is broken up by solid elements and by recessed balconies
- All glass balcony guards will have a “frit” pattern with a density no more than 100mm apart
- All vision glass in the first 12 metres of the building will have a frit pattern (5mm dots spaced at 100mm) to provide a visual marker for birds
- All vision glass adjacent to the green roofs and vegetated outdoor amenity areas is treated to a height of 12 metres with the same frit pattern as above
- All spandrel glass panels are low reflectance glass (<8.5%)
- Outdoor lighting will be downcast

The building is not in a particularly high risk location, although it is adjacent to High Park. It is in a neighbourhood in which there are groupings of taller buildings and removed from the areas of highest activity.

This is not to conclude that there will not be bird collisions, but that the steps to minimize the result have been taken.

Thus, the bird hazard issue is not carried forward for further mitigation. The risk from the building designed to the required standard is accepted as a residual impact for the proposal.
5.6 Endangered and Threatened Species

The inventories for High Park found the six species that were Endangered, Threatened or of Special Concern.

- Butternut (Endangered) is recorded in the Park, but not observed near or on-site;
- Chimney Swift (Threatened) is recorded as possibly breeding in the Park, but no suitable habitat is found near or on-site
- Blandings Turtle (Threatened) is in Grenadier Pond at distance from the site
- Snapping Turtle (Special Concern) is recorded in Grenadier Pond at distance from the site
- Common Nighthawk (Special Concern) is recorded as possibly breeding, but no suitable habitat is found near or on site
- Redheaded Woodpecker (Special Concern) utilizes dead tree with cavities. No such trees were noted on or near the site.

At the OMB Hearing, it was entered that the Nighthawk has been viewed foraging in the air over the neighbourhood that includes the Daniels site. This area is not viewed as a substantial producer of flying insects and this activity is not normally treated as a critical part of the species life cycle. Thus, the observation does not fall under a factor requiring further consideration.

A request was made to the Ministry of Natural Resources with respect to their information on Species at Risk. The response is included as Appendix 5. It includes mention of two additional species (Short-eared Owl and Barn Swallow) that did not show up in the Park inventories (section 2.0), but are recorded for the general area. The Short-eared Owl is unlikely in the Park and certainly not to be found on the Daniels site as it requires extensive grassland areas for nesting. The Barn Swallow is possible for High Park, but not for the Daniels site. It requires suitable structures to nest in. Thus, there is no concern with these two species from the redevelopment proposal.

Consequently, it is concluded that the development will not affect any of these species and the potential concern has been addressed.

5.7 Summary and Conclusions on Impacts

The following table summarizes the analysis in this section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Site Redevelopment</th>
<th>Additional Retail and Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Local wetlands</strong></td>
<td>o Minor change to infiltration for site, no impact likely</td>
<td>o No additional concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water available through seeps</td>
<td>o Reduces combined sewer overflows bringing a benefit</td>
<td>o No additional concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Stormwater flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Significant Woodlands</strong></td>
<td>o Substantial buffer provided by Bloor Street, no impacts</td>
<td>o No additional concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Physical impacts</td>
<td>o High Park contains a large protected population</td>
<td>o No additional concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Population impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>o No additional concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Historic character</td>
<td>o Site not savannah, no historic associations</td>
<td>o No additional concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Urban Forest</strong></td>
<td>o .26 ha reduction in canopy</td>
<td>o No additional reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Loss of tree canopy</td>
<td>o Recommended for additional mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. ANSI</strong></td>
<td>o Additional Park use not an issue</td>
<td>o No additional concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Impact on significant features and functions</td>
<td>o Objections to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bird hazard</td>
<td>prescribed burns. Recommended for additional mitigation.</td>
<td>o No additional concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Hazard to migrating birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Entrapment in courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Building location in lower hazard area</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Taller building poses slightly more risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Design meets TGS Tier 1 Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Not recommended for further mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Not recommended for additional mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Not a factor, open courtyard, treatment to glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>o No additional concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Endangered and Threatened Species</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Endangered/Threatened Species</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Site unsuitable or not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Rare Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o None identified in the Park as close to the Daniels site- buffered</td>
<td>o Not present, no impacts to High Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Carry forward for additional mitigation

➢ Treat as consequence of redevelopment
6.0 MITIGATION

In the previous sections, the potential impacts of the redevelopment have been reduced down to two areas where mitigation measures additional to the design of the site and building and the efforts to meet the TGS Tier 1 Standards seem appropriate. In both cases, the issues do not seem major, but could be further reduced.

The first potential impact is in the reduction of the tree canopy by .26 hectares at the site. The building occupies the entire site and does not allow for additional trees.

One suggestion that has been made is to transplant the large oaks across the street to High Park. The Tree Specialists Inc. looked at the possibility and prepared a memo that is included as Appendix 4. This letter included the consideration of a cost estimate for the work which was very substantial ($450,000 plus for three trees). There are issues with the site that complicate the possibility:

- The trees are growing between the foundations of the 13 residences that are still on the site, making it difficult to capture the roots of any of the trees;
- Black Oak is a deeply rooting tree, particularly with a central tap root, and the soils on the site are sandy (permitting deep root penetration) – so that it is unlikely to be able to capture them;
- The trees are in poor to fair condition only. No guarantee of survival can be given. They would need substantial pruning and expensive aftercare;
- Costs of utility relocates and other costs are unknown.

Our assessment is that there is a low probability of success for a major expenditure and transplanting the large trees is not recommended.

However, Daniels is willing to spend the effort to recover small oak seedlings or saplings on the site that can be removed with hand equipment and to transplant them to High Park to location(s) acceptable to the City. This will have the added benefit of preserving the genetic diversity of the trees found on the site.

Two Black Oaks are included in the site landscape plantings. It is recommended that these be trees from High Park seed sources. This may mean a temporary planting until the required stock can be grown for use on site.

Finally, it is recommended that an additional compensatory contribution be made to the Toronto Parks and Trees Foundation sufficient to offset the .26 ha loss of the canopy on site through the planting of trees elsewhere, preferably in location(s) within the same district of the City. This will provide the same tree canopy benefits to the area and to the City, also creating additional habitat suitable to birds.
The second concern is with new residents objecting to the prescribed burning in the Park. It is recommended that the documents (leases, agreements of purchase and sale, etc.) for the building contain an information clause on this activity and that the building manager cooperates with the City is advising its residents when this prescribed burning will occur.

A third issue in the Table (brought forward from table 5.1) is the increase in risk to birds associated with the taller building.

The Table below summarizes the position on this final impact result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1 Final Mitigation</th>
<th>Site Redevelopment</th>
<th>Additional Retail and Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree canopy reduction</td>
<td>o Compensatory plantings elsewhere through the Toronto Tree Foundation</td>
<td>o Compensatory plantings elsewhere through the Toronto Tree Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Transplant seedlings and saplings</td>
<td>o Transplant seedlings and saplings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed burning</td>
<td>o Notice to residents/owners</td>
<td>o Notice to residents/owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird hazard</td>
<td>o Building meets TGS Tier 1 Standards, but some collisions are expected.</td>
<td>o Building meets TGS Tier 1 Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Slight increase in bird risk due to a taller building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue highlighted above of a taller building posing slightly more risk to birds is a residual that would need to be accepted for the redevelopment. This is concluded to be acceptable in balancing the potential environmental impacts from the redevelopment with the other planning objectives in the City Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement and other documents, including the objective of intensification.
7.0 POLICY ANALYSIS

As outlined in the introduction to this report, it is intended to satisfy the Ontario Municipal Board’s condition that a document be prepared to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

A Terms of Reference was prepared and agreed to with the City in order to direct the preparation of this Natural Heritage Impact Study (NHIS) and to meet the Board’s Condition #140.

The planning policies applicable to the approval of the Daniels’ applications include the following.

The Provincial Policy Statement (2005) provides the overall direction in considering natural environment factors in planning decisions, including:

2.1.3 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in:

b) significant habitat of endangered species and threatened species,

and

2.1.4 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in:

......
(e) significant areas of natural and scientific interest

Unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the features or their ecological functions.

and

2.1.6 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

This report demonstrates that there are no Provincially Significant features on the Daniels site so that PPS policies 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 above are satisfied.

The property is within 120 metres of a Provincially Significant Life Science ANSI (High Park Oak Woodland). It is separated from the northernmost part of the ANSI by a 27 metre wide Bloor Street. No direct or indirect impacts on the features and functions for which the ANSI was identified were found. Thus, the proposal conforms to the PPS policies on Natural Environment.
The City also has its own specific policies for the protection of natural features that are set out in Section 3.4 of its Official Plan (December 2010 Consolidation). Of relevance to this report are the following.

3.4.10 Development is generally not permitted in the natural heritage system illustrated on Map 9. Where the underlying land use designation permits development in or near the natural heritage system, development will,

c) recognize natural heritage values and potential impacts on the natural ecosystem as much as is reasonable in the context of other objectives for the area; and

d) minimize adverse impacts and when possible, restore and enhance the natural heritage system.

3.4.12 All proposed development in or near the natural heritage system will be evaluated to assess the development’s impacts on the natural heritage system and identify measures to mitigate negative impact on and/or improve the natural heritage system, taking into account the consequences for:

g) terrestrial natural habitat features and functions including wetlands and wildlife habitat;

h) known watercourses and hydrologic functions and features;

i) significant physical features and land forms;

j) riparian zones or buffer areas and functions;

k) vegetation communities and species of concern; and

l) significant aquatic features and functions including the shoreline of Lake Ontario.

To assist this evaluation, an impact study will be required in accordance with guidelines established for this purpose.

This report meets the requirements of these policies by analyzing the potential negative impacts of the Daniels proposal that is outside of the significant features and outside but near to the City’s natural heritage system and meets the City policy with respect to this consideration.

3.4.13 Areas of land or water within the natural heritage system with any of the following characteristics are particularly sensitive and require additional protection to preserve their environmentally significant qualities:

e) habitats for vulnerable, rare, threatened or endangered plant and/or animal species and communities that are vulnerable, threatened or endangered within the City or Greater Toronto Area; or

f) rare, high quality or unusual landforms created by geomorphological processes within the City or Greater Toronto Area; or
g) habitats or communities of flora or fauna that are of a large size or have an unusually high diversity of otherwise commonly encountered biological communities and associated plants and animals; or

h) areas where an ecological function contributes appreciably to the healthy maintenance of a natural ecosystem beyond its boundaries, such as serving as a migratory wildlife stopover or concentration point, or serving as a water storage or recharge area.

Development will not occur on lands within the natural heritage system that exhibit any of these characteristics. Activities will be limited to those that are compatible with the preservation of the natural features and ecological functions attributed to the areas. An impact study, as referred to in Policy 12, will be required for any proposed undertaking in those areas not already the subject of an Environmental Assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act.

Finally, the City Policy also protects Provincial features:

3.4.14 Provincially significant natural heritage features will be protected by:

c) prohibiting development or site alteration in provincially significant wetlands or significant portions of the habitat of threatened or endangered species;

d) only permitting development in the following locations if it has been demonstrated, through a study, that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or functions for which the area is identified:
   i. lands adjacent to provincially significant wetlands or significant portions of the habitat of threatened or endangered species;
   ii. in or on lands adjacent to fish habitat; and
   iii. in or on lands adjacent to provincially significant woodlands, valleylands, wildlife habitat, and areas of natural and scientific interest.

This Natural Heritage Impact Report demonstrates that these policies in the City’s Official Plan have been satisfied.
8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this Natural Heritage Impact Assessment, I have identified the potential issues with the proposed site redevelopment by the Daniels HR Corporation for their Bloor Street West/High Park property. The study has refined the mitigation for the proposal so that there is only a very minor residual impact issue due to the risk that the building poses to birds. The proposal meets all the applicable standards, particularly the TGS Tier 1 standards as well as the applicable Provincial and City policies. The Report satisfies the Ontario Municipal Board Condition #140 that such a report be prepared.

For purposes of clarity, the following are the additional elements that are recommended for inclusion in the proposed redevelopment’s approval:

- transplant of oak seedlings and saplings from the site to an acceptable (to the City) location in High Park;
- landscape planting of two Black Oak trees grown from local seed sources. This will require time and the utilization of temporary trees;
- a contribution to the Toronto Parks and Trees Foundation to offset the .26 hectare reduction in tree canopy. Planting caliper size stock at a 10-metre spacing, allowing for growth of the trees over time, would create a nice forest of 100 trees per hectare. This means 26 trees are required to offset the reduction in tree canopy.

It should be noted that, as a result of this review and report, the Daniels redevelopment proposal has been improved.

Derek J. Coleman, PhD., R.P.P.
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