RIDEAU VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY
Box 599, 3889 Rideau Valley Drive
Manotick, Ontario, K4M 1A5
(613) 692-3571, 1-800-267-3504

APPROVED MINUTES

Executive Committee Meeting May 12, 2022 7:00 pm #3/22

Present:	Judy Brown	Brian Dowdall
	Victor Heese	Pieter Leenhouts
	Anne Robinson	
Staff:	Sommer Casgrain-Robertson	Terry Davidson
	Marissa Grondin	Matt Jokiel

---

1. Hearing of Applicant:

File Number: RV3-88/21 and RV3-89/21
Date Received: December 17, 2021

Name: Kathleen and Greg Kelly, Tom and Emily Kelly
Address: 2248A River Road, Osgoode, ON
2234 River Road, Osgoode, ON

Purpose of Development Application:

1. To request permission to raise the grade of a portion of 2248A River Road, so that it is removed from the regulatory floodplain, as delineated by the RVCA. Commensurate to the placement of fill, a cut will also be undertaken at 2234 River Road, to balance the floodplain area and volume that will be removed at 2248A River Road.

Legal Description of Property:

1. 2248A River Road, Lot 16, Concession 1, Osgoode, City of Ottawa
2. 2234 River Road, Lot 16, Concession 1, Osgoode, City of Ottawa

Motion 1-220512 **Moved by:** Brian Dowdall
Seconded by: Victor Heese

That the RVCA Executive Committee sit as a Hearing Board.

Motion Carried

The Chair, Pieter Leenhouts, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The General manager conducted a roll call and asked for a round of introductions from the applicants and agents.

Chair Leenhouts, outlined the purpose of a hearing under Section 28 (12) of the *Conservation Authorities Act*, R.S.O. 1990 as amended to Kathleen and Greg Kelly, Tom and Emily Kelly.

The Kelly's Agents, Tim Eisner, Planner, Jocelyn Chandler, Land and Water Resource Planner and Project Manager, and Johnathan Burnett, Water Resources Engineer all from JFSA were affirmed. Greg Kelly, Kathleen Kelly, Tom Kelly and Emily Kelly were affirmed. Matt Jokiel representing the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority was affirmed. Terry Davidson representing the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority was sworn in.

The following exhibits, slides and information were presented by Matt Jokiel:

Exhibit 1 - Case Overview:
- File 1 (RV3-88/21) Municipal address 2248A River Rd., Osgoode. Owner Kathleen and Greg Kelly.
- File 2 (RV3-89/21) Municipal address 2234 River Rd., Osgoode. Owner Tom and Emily Kelly.
- Development proposal, to request permission to raise the grade of a portion of 2248A River Road, so that it is removed from the regulatory floodplain, as delineated by the RVCA. Commensurate to the placement of fill, a cut will also be undertaken at 2234 River Road, to balance the floodplain area and volume that will be removed at 2248A River Road.

Exhibit 2 – Site Location:
- Map of area depicting the location of the two subject properties, represented by a red star. The Rideau Valley Conservation Authority building is represented by a blue star.

Exhibit 3 – RVCA Hazard Map [slide 1/2]:
- RVCA Regulations Limit Map for File 1, 2248A River Road, Osgood depicts area of reduced flood risk, highlighted with an orange outline, within the 1:100 floodplain. Approximately 1 acre in total, accessed by private roadway off River Road.

Exhibit 4 - RVCA Hazard Map [slide 2/2]:
- RVCA Regulations Limit Map for File 2, 2234 River Road, Osgood area of reduced flood risk is highlighted with orange outline. The property contains a waterfront, is situated partially in the floodplain, and is within the Regulation Limit, depicted by a black dashed line. The property contains an existing dwelling, storage structure and one structure closer to the waterfront within the floodplain.

Exhibit 5 - Existing Conditions [slide 1/2]:
- File 1, 2248A River Road, Osgood. A photograph facing west towards the Rideau River depicts a vacant area. Mr. Jokiel stated there is a non-habitable structure located on property. Photograph was taken on March 11, 2022.

Exhibit 6 - Existing Conditions [slide 2/2]:

- File 2, 2234 River Road, Osgood. A photograph facing west towards the Rideau River depicts a vacant area with tree line. A second photograph facing north from private roadway depicts area of proposed development. Photograph was taken on March 11, 2022.

Exhibit 7 – Project Description: Two separate projects.

- Proposed Fill
    - Total proposed fill volume of 471 cubic metres
    - To be placed at 2248A River Road. Site situated completely within the 1:100 year floodplain
    - No fill placement proposed within 30 metres of adjacent Rideau River
- Proposed Cut
    - Total proposed cut volume of 483 cubic metres
    - To be cut from 2234 River Road – site situated partially within floodplain, but cut proposed within Regulation Limit
    - Proposed cut is 12 cubic metres greater than fill amount proposed within floodplain

Exhibit 8 – Cut and Fill Figures [slide 1/3]:

- The green area on the map is the portion of fill area that meets RVCA policy. Fill elevation less than 0.3 metres below 1:100 year floodplain elevation.
- The red area on the map is the portion of fill area that does not meet RVCA policy. Fill elevation greater than 0.3 metres below 1:100 year floodplain elevation.

Exhibit 9 – Cut and Fill Figures [slide 2/3]:

- The gray area represents the location of the private roadway for the two properties.
- The dotted line represents the property line, accessed from the smaller waterfront property of 2234 River Road.
- The cross sections A, B and C depict property elevations of 2248A River Road, including the existing grades as well as gradient showing the projected fill lines.
- To the right of dashed line, the approximate location of the private roadway is depicted.
- Existing property elevations of 2234 River Road depict the projected cut area on the property.

Exhibit 10 – Cut and Fill Figures [slide 3/3]:

- The area on the slide circled in green are the areas that meet RVCA policies.
- The area on the slide highlighted in red are the areas that do not meet RVCA policy.
    - Exceeds depths allowable under Ontario Regulation 174/06
    - $174m^3$ is approximately 36% of total cut volume
    - $135m^3$ is approximately 28.6% of total fill volume

Exhibit 11 – Flood Storage Loss

- 1:100 Year Flood
    - Measured at 87.10 metres geodetic

  - Fill amount (471m^3) offset by compensating cut
  - Total cut volume (483m^3) exceeds total fill volume (471m^3)
  - Existing elevation of culvert under roadway provides water flows during 100 year event
- 1:10 Year Flood
  - Measured at 86.59 metres geodetic
  - Compensating cut area inaccessible during 10 year event
  - Invert elevation of existing culvert (86.7m) under roadway situated above 10 year event
  - Proposed fill results in less storage of 17m^3

Policy implications:

- The information received in the application was reviewed under RVCA's Development Policies which the Conservation Authority administers under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act
- Specifically, the application was reviewed under:
  - Section 1.1 *General Principles*
  - Section 1.2 *Development within a One-Zone Regulatory Floodplain of a River or Stream Valley*
  - Section 2.0 *Policies Regarding the Placing of Fill*
- Certain aspects of the development proposal **do not meet** criteria outlined in Section 2.0 of RVCA's Development Policies

- RVCA Development Policies [slide1/3] – Section 1.1 General Principles:
  a) *New development must result in no significant impact on expected flood levels or velocities, taking into consideration the direct and cumulative effects of the development on floodplain conveyance capacity and storage capacity.*
- RVCA Development Policies [slide 2/3] – Section 1.2 Development within a One-Zone Regulatory Floodplain of a River or Stream Valley:
  1. *Development within the 1:100 year regulatory floodplain shall not be permitted except as allowed by specific policies elsewhere in this document. This includes:*
     iii) site grading and filling
     iv) development associated with flood hazard protection and bank stabilization works to allow for future / proposed development or an increase in development envelope or area within the 1:100 year regulatory floodplain
- RVCA Development Policies [slide 3/3] – Section 2.0 Policies Regarding the Placing of Fill:
  2.1. Exceptions may be considered for the minor removal or placement of fill / minor site grading / minor site alteration in the floodway where flood depths in the floodway are shallow, flow velocities are minimal and the proposed development or site alteration is considered to be minor in nature with no impact in terms of its effect on the control of flooding, pollution, erosion and the conservation of land such that:
  i) the site alteration (cut and fill operation) is confined to lands toward the edge of the flood plain with ground elevations that are at present no more than 0.3 metres lower than the estimated 1:100 year water surface elevation of the river or stream

Exhibit 12 – Notification Letter:

- Issued by Matt Jokiel to Kathleen and Greg Kelly, for 2248A River Road, notifying the property owners of the inability to be approved by staff on February 17, 2022.
- The applicants were notified that a hearing could be requested at their discretion.

Exhibit 13 – Notification Letter:
- Issued by Matt Jokiel to Tom and Emily Kelly, for 2234 River Road, notifying the property owners of the inability to be approved by staff on February 17, 2022.
- The applicants were notified that a hearing could be requested at their discretion.

Exhibit 14 – Notice of Hearing:
- Notice of hearing was issued by Matt Jokiel to applicants on April 4, 2022.
- Details regarding the time and location of the hearing were outlined.

Conservation Authorities Act:
- Regulations by authority re area under its jurisdiction
- *Right to hearing*
  (12) Permission required under a regulation made under clause (1) (b) or (c) shall not be refused or granted subject to conditions unless the person requesting the permission has been given the opportunity to require a hearing before the authority or, if the authority so directs, before the authority's executive committee. 1998, c. 18, Sched. I, s. 12.

Summary:
- The development proposal cannot be approved at a staff level due to the following reasons:
- The proposed development exceeds the depth threshold permitted for a Cut and Fill operation, per Section 2.1.(i) of RVCA's Development Policies
- After careful review of the application, the application would meet all other relevant RVCA Development Policies. Therefore, RVCA staff are comfortable with the approval of the application subject to certain conditions.

Next steps:
- Approve the application
- Approve the application with conditions
- Deny the application

Potential Conditions [slide 1/2]:
- Any decision to approve the proposal should consider the following conditions as part of their direction to staff for administration of permission issuance:
- A finished grading plan be submitted upon completion of the proposed works to confirm the as-built grades of the development envelope and culvert elevations. A refundable deposit of $1685 is required to be submitted prior to commencement of the work. Satisfactory review of the finished grading plan and compliance with other conditions will result in the return of the deposit (less 10%).

- Sediment control be established to ensure no sediment migration from the site. All grubbing and equipment storage and operation be limited to the development envelope. All areas located outside the development envelope will be left untouched.

Potential Conditions [slide 2/2]:
- A Conservation Easement Agreement be registered on 2234 River Rd. prior to the commencement of the proposed works to ensure no future development and alteration to grades within the “cut” area of the subject lot.
- That the invert of the existing culvert located under the right-of-way be lowered to an elevation of 86.50 metres geodetic and remain draining away from 2234 River Rd.
- No fill placement or grades changes are to occur within 30 metres of the Rideau River.
- Remain subject to all other applicable RVCA standard conditions.

Chair Leenhouts thanked Mr. Jokiel for his presentation. He stated that questions regarding the presentation will be held until after the applicant has had their opportunity to present.

Agent Jocelyn Chandler shared a slideshow presentation prepared by Tim Eisner and Jocelyn Chandler from JFSA.

Ms. Chandler stated that the proposed application is to create a development envelop for a modest size dwelling, and dry access driveway to the property. Ms. Chandler stated that she has two main points to make. Point 1 is that this application had to come before the Executive Committee because it did not meet the 30 centimetres threshold outlined in RVCA policy. She stated that when she was formerly employed by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority she remembers when the 30 centimentre threshold was implemented into policy and that the reason why it was 30 centimetres was so that large applications would need to be brought forward to the Executive Committee. She stated that she recalls no engineering reason for the 30 centimetre threshold. Ms. Chandler also recalled previous comments from RVCA staff indicating that no hydraulic analysis would be required if the proposed fill measured less than 500 cubic metres in volume.

Ms. Chandler asked her colleague, Johnathan Burnett, in regard to floodplain modelling, is the 30 centimetre number used in any technical guidelines, and what is the significance of the 30 centimetres? Mr. Burnett answered that there is no engineering reason for landing on 30 centimetres, and that there are other mechanisms used to determine velocity to indicate how much water flow would need to move through. He stated that there is no reason for the 30 centimetres that has been adopted into policy.

Ms. Chandler asked a second question for Mr. Barnett. In terms of floodplain management, engineering, and modelling, is there a number that would determine if hydraulic analysis is required? Mr. Burnett replied that yes there is, however, it is not applicable in a flood fill such as this as velocity is quite small. Mr. Burnett stated that while it does not meet RVCA policy, there is no reason for the 30 centimetres to cause concern from a flood perspective.

Ms. Chandler moved on to her second point, the culvert.

Ms. Chandler referred to the PowerPoint presentation that depicts a GIS presentation based on the topography of what happens when the water comes up and down on this property.

Slide 1 depicts an aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary.

Slide 2 depicts the same aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary. The blue area represents a 2 year return period of 86m.

Slide 3 depicts the same aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary. The blue area represents a 2 year return period of 86m. The lavender area represents a 5 year return period of 86.38m.

Slide 4 depicts the same aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary. The blue area represents a 2 year return period of 86m. The lavender area represents a 5 year return period of 86.38m. The mid blue area represents a 10 year return period of 86.59m with proposed grading. Ms. Chandler stated that if we lower the culvert, this is what happens to the water flow. This is 17 cubic metres of water.

Slide 5 depicts the same aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary. The blue area represents a 2 year return period of 86m. The lavender area represents a 5 year return period of 86.38m. The mid blue area represents a 10 year return period of 86.59m with proposed grading. The dark blue area represents a 20 year return period with 86.77 with proposed grading with or without the culvert change.

Slide 6 depicts the same aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary. The blue area represents a 2 year return period of 86m. The lavender area represents a 5 year return period of 86.38m. The mid blue area represents a 10 year return period of 86.59m with proposed grading. The dark blue area represents a 20 year return period with 86.77m with proposed grading with or without the culvert change. The purple area represents a 50 year return period of 86.97m with proposed grading.

Slide 7 depicts the same aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary. The blue area represents a 2 year return period of 86m. The lavender area represents a 5 year return period of 86.38m. The mid blue area represents a 10 year return period of 86.59m with proposed grading. The dark blue area represents a 20 year return period with 86.77m with proposed grading

with or without the culvert change. The purple area represents a 50 year return period of 86.97m with proposed grading. The darkest blue represents a 100 year return period of 87.1m with proposed grading.

Ms. Chandler explained that the low area being created will capture the additional water. She stated that there are three properties further down the access road, that may be disrupted by the construction of lowering the culvert.

Slide 8 depicts the same aerial view of property 2248A River Road, with a black dashed line representing Property lines and a red dashed line representing the Fill Boundary. The blue area represents a 2 year return period of 86m. The lavender area represents a 5 year return period of 86.38m. The mid blue area represents a 10 year return period of 86.59m with proposed grading. The blue hatched area is the volume loss if the culver is not moved.

Slide 9 depicts images of two people standing next to cardboard boxes, stacked to represent 2x10 cubic metres. Ms. Chandler stated that it is not meaningful to lower the culvert, however the property owners will do so if required.

During the 10 year event the proposed fill results in a reduction of 17 m^3 storage if the existing culvert were to remain as-is. The proposed cut provided 21m^3 storage for the 10 year event.

Ms. Chandler asked Johnathan Burnet what the 17 m^3 means in relation to a flood event. Mr. Burnett responded that 313 metres cubed per second, 17 metres cubed divided by 313 means that the area would be filled in 0.05 of a second, which becomes quite insignificant.

Slide 10 depicts the same information from Mr. Jokiel's PowerPoint presentation, of 2248A River Road balanced cut and fill. The green area represents the cut area, and the red area represents the fill area. The darkest shades of green are below the 30 centimentre cut and fill.

Ms. Chandler stated that although the application does not meet RVCA policy, it does not change the validity of this application, and suggested that perhaps lowering of the culvert is not necessary.

Mr. Burnett recalled the information shared in Mr. Jokiel's presentation that approximately 28% of the proposed fill does not meet policy.

Chair Leenhouts thanked applicants for their presentation and opened the floor to questions.

Chair Leenhouts asked if the applicants and/or agents have questions for staff. No questions were asked by the applicants or agents.

Summary of Considerations:

Application for Development

- Fill placement (2248A River Road) within the 1:100 year floodplain measuring 470.77 cubic metres in volume over an area of approximately 1,238 square metres located at 2248A River Rd., Osgoode.
- A commensurate cut (2234 River Road) measuring 483.18 cubic metres in volume over an area of approximately 1,454.63 square metres located at 2234 River Rd., Osgoode.

Site Description

2248A River Rd., Osgoode – Lot subject to fill placement:

- Vacant lot situated entirely within both the 1:100 year floodplain and Regulation Limit
- Property dimensions measure approximately 233' x 200' (1.008 acres) with approximately 233' of shoreline frontage to the Rideau River
- Subject property maintains a gradual slope from the roadway to the waterfront
- Last remaining vacant lot situated along private roadway
- Existing shoreline is natural and not developed

2234 River Rd., Osgoode – Lot subject to cut:

- Developed lot situated partially within both the 1:100 year floodplain and Regulation Limit
- Irregular shaped property (12.974 acres) with approximately 618' of road frontage to River Road and approximately 172' of shoreline frontage to the Rideau River
- Existing dwelling and storage structure on site near roadway and small structure located near waterfront, but all are situated well outside of cut area
- Proposed cut area is situated on the western portion of the lot and is currently partially vegetated

Consideration

The scope of the proposed development is situated within the Regulation Limit administered by the RVCA. The Regulation Limit is the area to which the Conservation Authority is required to review development and alteration applications under the Conservation Authorities Act (Ontario Regulation 174/06).

The development application proposes that a total volume of 471m^3 be placed within the limits of the 1:100 year floodplain at 2248A River Road, and that a compensating cut volume of 483m^3 be undertaken at 2234 River Road to offset the loss in flood storage. The proposed fill placement would establish a portion of 2248A River Road to be at or above the 1:100 year floodplain elevation. The property noted as 2234 River Road is accessed from the main roadway, while the property noted as 2248A River Road is accessed from a private roadway running along the southern boundary of 2234 River Road. Safe access has been deemed available for both properties. Due to the fact that the depths of both the proposed cut, as well as the proposed fill exceed 0.3 metres in areas, the proposal does not meet the above noted policies and cannot be approved at a staff level.

Policy Considerations

Section 1.1 *General Principles* of the RVCA Policies regarding Development indicates the following*:*

a) *New development must result in no significant impact on expected flood levels or velocities, taking into consideration the direct and cumulative effects of the development on floodplain conveyance capacity and storage capacity.*

Section 1.2 *Development within a One-Zone Regulatory Floodplain of a River or Stream Valley* of the RVCA Policies regarding Development indicates the following:

1. Development within the 1:100 year regulatory floodplain shall not be permitted except as allowed by specific policies elsewhere in this document. This includes:

iii) site grading and filling;

iv) development associated with flood hazard protection and bank stabilization works to allow for future / proposed development or an increase in development envelope or area within the 1:100 year regulatory floodplain

Section 2.0 *Policies Regarding the Placing of Fill* of the RVCA Policies regarding Development indicates the following:

Development involving site grading or fill placement or removal within the floodway is generally not permitted; exceptions may be considered, however, subject to the provisions of Section 2.1 below.

Applications for permission to undertake development including site grading or fill placement or removal in regulated areas shall include detailed plans of the subject property prepared by a Professional Engineer, drawn at an appropriate scale, clearly showing the boundaries of the area upon which the fill is to be placed (with dimensions), the existing and proposed grading in plan view and in cross sectional detail. Grades provided shall be referred to geodetic datum on stamped plans; the source of the topographic information shall be clearly identified.

2.1. Exceptions may be considered for the minor removal or placement of fill / minor site grading / minor site alteration in the floodway where flood depths in the floodway are shallow, flow velocities are minimal and the proposed development or site alteration is considered to be minor in nature with no impact in terms of its effect on the control of flooding, pollution, erosion and the conservation of land such that:

i) the site alteration (cut and fill operation) is confined to lands toward the edge of the flood plain with ground elevations that are at present no more than 0.3 metres lower than the estimated 1:100 year water surface elevation of the river or stream.

Staff Recommendation

A staff approval cannot be made for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development exceeds the depth threshold permitted for a Cut and Fill operation per RVCA's Development Policies. Therefore, the approval of this application would be inconsistent with Section 2.0, subsection 2.1.(i) of the RVCA's Development Policies.

However, after careful review of the application, the application would meet all other relevant RVCA Development Policies. Therefore, RVCA staff are comfortable with the approval of the application subject to certain conditions.

Next Steps:

- Approve the application
- Approve the application with conditions
- Deny the application

Recommended Conditions:

1. A finished grading plan be submitted upon completion of the proposed works to confirm the as-built grades of the development envelope and culvert elevations. A refundable deposit of $1685 is required to be submitted prior to commencement of the work. Satisfactory review of the finished grading plan and compliance with other conditions will result in the return of the deposit (less 10% administrative fee).
2. Sediment control be established to ensure no sediment migration from the site. All grubbing and equipment storage and operation be limited to the development envelope. All areas located outside the development envelope will be left untouched.
3. A Conservation Easement Agreement be registered on 2234 River Road prior to the commencement of the proposed works to ensure no future development and alteration to grades within the "cut" area of the subject lot.
4. That the invert of the existing culvert located under the right-of-way be lowered to an elevation of 86.50 metres geodetic and remain draining away from 2234 River Road.
5. No fill placement or grades changes are to occur within 30 metres of the Rideau River.
6. Remain subject to all other applicable RVCA standard conditions.

Discussion

In response to a question from Judy Brown, Ms. Chandler clarified that the lowering of the culvert is not part of the plan, but it is noted by staff as being required given the estimated flood storage loss of 17 cubic metres in a 10 year flood event. She stated that they do not want to touch the right of way, where the culvert is located. Ms. Casgrain-Robertson, General Manager added that the slide depicts the connection between the floodplain and side of the road opposite the floodplain, during which all events above the 10 year event water will flow through. Ms. Brown asked if the purpose of the culvert is to protect the

property, and Ms. Chandler responded that the subject property is currently situation entirely in the floodplain and non-developable without approval.

In response to a question from Anne Robinson, Ms. Chandler stated that RVCA staff are recommending the culvert be lowered 10 centimetres.

In response to a question from Anne Robinson, Terry Davidson informed the Executive Committee that approval of this application would not be considered precedent setting.

In response to a question from Victor Heese, Terry Davidson explained that the storage capacity of rainfall water accumulating in the area would be the same as during a 1:100 year flood event.

In response to a question from Victor Heese regarding the policy standard of 30 centimetres, Mr. Davidson responded that although he was not employed at the RVCA for this policy development, he suggested that there could be multiple reasons for the implementation of the 30 centimeter policy. Mr. Davidson speculated that it could be to align with construction standards or to abide by safe access standards, however, he could not confirm the exact reason at this time.

In response to a question from Brian Dowdall, Matt Jokiel responded that yes there are existing dwellings in the adjacent lots that require access to the private roadway.

In response to a question from Brian Dowdall, Jocelyn Chandler clarified that the certain aspects of the proposal that do not meet policy is the 30 centimentre threshold.

Chair Leenhouts asked if there were any more questions from the Executive Committee for the applicants or staff. No more questions were asked.

Motion 2-220512	**Moved by:**	Victor Heese
	Seconded by:	Anne Robinson

That the RVCA Executive Committee move in camera.

Motion Carried

Motion 3-220512	**Moved by:**	**Anne Robinson**
	Seconded by:	**Judy Brown**

That the RVCA Executive Committee members move out of camera.

Motion Carried

Motion 4-220512	**Moved by:**	**Brian Dowdall**
	Seconded by:	**Victor Heese**

That the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority Hearing Board Approve the application as submitted to the conservation authority but with the following conditions:

1. A finished grading plan be submitted upon completion of the proposed works to confirm the as-built grades of the development envelope and culvert elevations. A refundable deposit of $1685 is required to be submitted prior to commencement of the work. Satisfactory review of the finished grading plan and compliance with other conditions will result in the return of the deposit (less 10% administrative fee).
2. Sediment control be established to ensure no sediment migration from the site. All grubbing and equipment storage and operation be limited to the development envelope. All areas located outside the development envelope will be left untouched.
3. A Conservation Easement Agreement be registered on 2234 River Road prior to the commencement of the proposed works to ensure no future development and alteration to grades within the “cut” area of the subject lot.
4. That the invert of the existing culvert located under the right-of-way be lowered to an elevation of 86.50 metres geodetic and remain draining away from 2234 River Road.
5. No fill placement or grades changes are to occur within 30 metres of the Rideau River.
6. Remain subject to all other applicable RVCA standard conditions.

Motion Carried

Motion 5-220512	**Moved by:**	Judy Brown
	Seconded by:	Brian Dowdall

THAT the Hearing Board sit as an Executive Committee.

Motion Carried

The Chair concluded the hearing and thanked the applicants for their time.

The applicants and agents thanked the Chair, Executive Committee, and staff.

2.0 Approval of Minutes, April 25, 2022

Motion 6-220512	**Moved by:**	Judy Brown
	Seconded by:	Victor Heese

That the Executive Committee Meeting minutes of April 25, 2022 be approved as circulated.

Motion Carried

3.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m. on a motion by Victor Heese that was seconded by Anne Robinson.

_____	_____
Pieter Leenhouts	**Marissa Grondin**
Chair	**Recording Secretary**