

Britannia Village Flood Control Project - Working Group meeting # 2 – September 2011

[As recorded by S. Karanikollas (Councillor Taylor's office) with input from RVCA staff]

Introduction by Councillor Taylor outlining that a set of Planning & Design Objectives had been put forward last meeting (March 23, 2011)

Presentation by Dave Yeager on refined design:

- Intent is to attempt to keep existing walls etc where they can be appropriately incorporated into the overall design
- From Rowatt to Jamieson, the flood control berm would be located on Crown Land near the water's edge, for the most part, except where the width of the Crown Land (formerly natural riverbed) will not accommodate it. Property owner preferred to have the flood works in this location.
- The materials from the previously attempted shoreline protection works performed by the property owner, such as rebar and other materials will be removed from this area.
- Along Kehoe Street townhomes:
 - foundation walls do not come up high enough, so one option is to excavate in front and build additional height onto the existing foundation wall to the design elevation of 61.1 metres; this so-called "corbel" option would not have a significant impact on the look of the property, but would be a very labour-intensive installation due to constrained space. Estimating contractor's prices for implementing such a unique installation is difficult.
 - A second alternative for the Kehoe Street townhomes is to install an earth berm within the townhome property boundaries, incorporating it as much as possible into the existing landscaping in the patio areas at their ground level entries; located here, the berm would be less visually intrusive than if it was located on the adjacent Crown Land (filled river bed); this alternative would involve the removal of existing vegetation and a small number of trees which could be replaced, albeit with smaller planting stock
 - for either option, a permanent easement agreements would have to be completed with each and every townhome property owner (15 in total), to ensure the integrity of the flood control system, in either of these
- Storm sewer drainage would be required for any wind driven overtopping spray, rain and snow runoff. It is a requirement to drain/remove water from between buildings and the flood control system
- For townhomes there is a possibility for landscaping to be done on top of the wall if desired (note: access is still required for ongoing maintenance). Wall will eventually tie

into existing wall heading to the park A “stepped armour stone revetment” is required for Sipolins property at Jamieson (due to space constraints between the shoreline and the existing apartment building. This will tie into the existing Jamieson street concrete wall.

- Jamieson Street boat launch concrete wall will be raised.
- Rowatt Street Concrete wall is correct height currently.
- Correct height is 61.1 meters.
- 170 Kehoe wall is low by 1 meter. It will be raised.
- The seawalls at 156 and 164 Kehoe are not suitably built. They are made of concrete and concrete block. Concrete block must be removed and wall must be rebuilt. New concrete wall will be placed on top of current concrete wall.
- Drainage is proposed behind concrete wall and to connect to existing storm sewer on Kehoe.
- 174 and 176 foundation walls are considered sufficient

Questions:

- Q - Height of Berm near town homes? A - low impact from view of home
- Q - Will work need to be done in the Park? A - Yes berm within the park will need to be raised and path be redone (it was indicated that the City would pay 100% of the cost of this section as it is on City property)

Comments from Councillor Taylor:

- Protects against the 1:100 year flood occurrence
- Ties into existing infrastructure
- Incorporates new project design into existing community feel

Q - Who will cut the grass in the Crown Land area adjacent to the rental garden home property described legally as Block A of registered Plan 40 ½ ? A – The Province (Ministry of Natural Resources) is responsible for maintenance of Crown Lands in however RVCA advocates leaving the area as natural as possible (also handled same way by Province)

Permanent easement acquisition agreement will have to be negotiated and signed prior to calling for tenders; these agreement would set out the terms under which the landowners agree to a) have the flood control system built on their properties, and b) convey a permanent easement interest over part of their property to enable the RVCA to maintain the flood control system. the permanent easement lands would be surveyed after the project is built followed by execution and registration of the easement documents

Re: Two proposals for 180-208 Kehoe with existing foundation wall too low:

- Proposal 1 (Corbels at the foundation wall). Involves hand digging at foundation wall and building new concrete wall in front of foundation wall. It would require all decks and patio to be removed and reinstated. It would have the effect of there being no change to current landscape. This first proposal was immediately rejected.
- Proposal 2 - Earth berm at edge of hedges which would raise land by 200mm (8 "). Grass could go right over the raised land. Easement required to ensure that flood works were intact. At 208 Kehoe flood works would go around shed.
- Flood works are shaped to avoid existing structures. One tree (182 Kehoe ?) would probably not be able to stay. Most trees are avoided. (would have to be confirmed) property owner said that slab they are trying to tie into was not part of her foundation. There is a discussion required as to how 170 Kehoe wall ties into their foundation.
- 174 and 176 Kehoe's foundation walls are accepted as flood control and existing easement agreements would probably have to be revised and negotiated with landowners.
- The second proposal seemed to be acceptable to the group

Costs:

Earlier estimate was \$650k (max budget \$670k as approved by Council)

Current estimate for the total project is approximately \$840k (includes 15% contingency allowance = \$75k)

\$112k for engineering and \$50k for survey have already been spent to date (usable project budget \$670k – (\$112K + \$50k)= \$508k is the remaining project budget)

Cost of proposal 2 from above = \$674,187

Project over budget \$200k approximately (as proposed project stands)

Councillor Taylor: Where does extra money come from?

- Confirmed that there is no appetite around Council to increase approved budget
- We would need firm community approval that no one will seek additional compensation which would increase budgetary pressure
- Need to explore other options - Disaster Planning, 2 zone planning etc. or what alternative funding methods that could be used (Council likely not to approve additional funding)

We run the risk of losing goodwill in finding cost cutting options that do not address other property owners.

Comment - Can additional funding be sought from other levels of government? It is possible however it is up the each level individually (Federal and or Provincial)

Options discussed about budget numbers - how to trim items from budget, who pays for what items etc.

Budget includes \$22k for reimbursement of legal fees to land owners who need to provide easements on their property.

Cost / Benefit analysis is currently past the breakeven point (comment that there are concerns with the validity of the C/B analysis and what it covers and takes into account)

How does 2 zone application work?

- in the Provincial Policy Statement under the Planning Act, it's a flood plain management policy option that is available for the municipality to consider; to implement the option would require a formal amendment to municipal planning documents (Official Plan and Zoning)
- There are 10 factors that have to be evaluated by the municipality in consultation with the conservation authority and MNR , to determine if the two zone concept is applicable and, to delineate a boundary between flood fringe and floodway, and to formulate appropriate limitations and conditions for development that would be acceptable with in the flood fringe
- This would address building restrictions but not safety concerns during flood emergencies (safety concerns could be addressed through emergency management planning)

Councillor Taylor: If the project is agreeable to everyone (i.e. does it address your concerns?). Once this has been determined then we can attack funding issue.

This had to be a group decision (has to work for everyone or no one)

Risk of losing goodwill if project is cut to the point where we lose features desired some homeowners (i.e. risk is we trim budget in construction costs it is possible another party may request compensation).

Cllr. Taylor's suggestion to adjourn for today and confirm if we have agreement if this is a project we can support. Then we can determine where do we go.

Is this really the compromise solution or are there further compromises. Are we opening the door to going back.