

Environmental Review Committee Project Review Form

ERC File# 5280-30/ERC-1250

Locarno Court Subdivision

July 10, 2008

Project Name	ECL Envirowest Consultants Limited
Company Name	Giles Shearing
Phone (Office)	604.451.0505
Phone (Cell)	604.722.7211
Email	shearing@ecl-envirowest.bc.ca
Facsimile	604.451.0557
Address	130 - 3700 North Fraser Way, Burnaby, BC, V5J 5J4
Project Name	Locarno Court Subdivision - Regulatory/Environmental Input
Location	Locarno Court, Lot 253

Lot 253, Locarno Court, Abbotsford. Submission for Environmental Review. (June 25, 2008). Prepared by ECL Envirowest Consultants Limited.

Attendees:

1. Rod Shead [RS]
2. Craig Sciankowy [CS]
3. Carla Lenihan-Lefebvre [CLL]
4. Giles Shearing [GS]
5. Melissa Pryce [MP]
6. Henry Braun [HB]
7. Sandi Berg [SB]

[RS] Noted that we have public observer (Howard Marginson) at today's ERC meeting.

[HB] Provided overview of proposed project. This single lot was part of early 1970s development on Glenn Mountain. At that time, the developer was asked to create a larger lot for emergency access to the upper slopes of mountain. 35 years later, now looking at subdividing the lot. The lot would have been subdivided in the early 1970s had it not been for the access requirement.

[GS] The Brauns approached Envirowest about the subdivision of this single lot into two lots. There is an open watercourse that is bound by pipe both upstream and downstream. Envirowest assessed the watercourse for fish habitat and concluded that the watercourse was not fish habitat. They are proposing to pipe a portion of the watercourse and dedicate the back portion of the lot for greenspace.

- [CS] Asked about fish habitat valuation.
- [GS] Went through the definition of fish habitat and noted that the proposed enclosure would not impacts fish ability to carry out life processes.
- [CS] If it contributes to productive capacity then it is fish habitat.
- [GS] Would piping the watercourse affect the ability of fish to carry out life processes?
- [CS] It would have cumulative impacts. Need to ensure a no net loss of fish habitat. The distance of it to downstream reaches is irrelevant, whether it be 100 meters pipe of 1 kilometre of pipe.
- [HB] Surprised that given development upslope that this wouldn't be permitted as all development will impact on the environment. So why do we allow any development?
- [CS] Understand the comment but noted cumulative impacts.
- [GS] But will that impact on the channel?
- [CS] Yes.
- [GS] Would that be a HADD?
- [CS] Yes, because it is fish habitat.
- [RS] The open section of watercourse has some unique value as it appears to be the only daylighted portion of this drainage on the mountain. It traverses a forested area that will be a source of inputs to the creek. As this is the only daylighted section of watercourse, it represents one of the only areas that will be contributing to downstream reaches. Given the high gradients, these materials will be washed to downstream reaches relatively quickly.
- [GS] Will it have a negative impact on the watercourse?
- [SB] That is difficult to quantify, but it is important to recognize the contribution to fish habitat.
- [GS] Could we compensate?
- [CS] Policy is to conserve the habitat.
- [HB] What is the process now?
- [CS] No formal appeal process for DFO. You would also require a *Water Act* approval for this project as well.
- [RS] Can come up with the development plan without subdividing the lot. If the plan does not meet City bylaw requirements then Envirowest will have to assess setbacks and bring this back to ERC for review.



Project not approved.

