

TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011

Time: 7:30 p.m.

The Fourth Regular 2011 Planning Advisory Committee meeting was held on the above date and called to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

ATTENDANCE: All members of the Committee (except Councillor Fielding) and the Secretary Colleen Sutton were in attendance.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

1. Councillor Stokley
2. Kathy White
3. Councillor Roth
4. Bev Wozniak
5. Peter Gates
6. Kim Lang
7. Betty Ferguson
8. Elaine Thorson
9. Aldo Salis

ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES:

Motion No. 1: MOVED by Marilyn Fisher and SECONDED by Barry Lee;

THAT: The Minutes of the Third Regular 2011 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting dated March 28th, 2011 be and are hereby adopted as presented.
CARRIED.

BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES:

Nil.

DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF:

Nil.

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. #P4/2010 – 340268 Ontario Limited (George)
 - a) Gamsby & Mannerow letter dated April 5, 2011 wherein Hans Groh provides his comments following the open house meeting.
 - b) County of Wellington memo dated April 1, 2011 wherein Pasquale Costanzo provides comments following review of the Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Costanzo advises that he would like a copy of the storm water management plan for the site for comment.
2. #P2/2011 - Record
 - a) Grand River Conservation Authority Plan Review Report dated March 10, 2011 wherein Liz Yerex advises that without the benefit of a Natural Heritage/hazard study it is difficult to confirm the limit of the Natural Environment Zone for this site. A portion of the property contains Irish Creek and its associated flood plain. No detailed grading plan with elevations was provided to confirm the floor plain elevation on this property. Irish Creek, its associated fish habitat and flood plain represent the limit of the Natural Environment Zone.
 - b) Township of Puslinch letter dated March 29, 2011 wherein Colleen Sutton advises Jacqueline Zmija of the recommendation made by the Planning Advisory Committee.

inspections have been completed. There is some construction equipment stored on-site at the moment but it will be moving to a job-site shortly.

A number of concerns and questions were discussed by the Committee members as follows:

- Construction materials stored on-site is an issue
 - With the traffic that is being generated, Side road 10 could be an issue.
 - Paved road to office building and gravel road to other accessory building
 - Original building permit allowed for an office and a washroom? Was it anticipated that the business would grow to the size it is now? Not really.
 - The question is – ‘Is it actually good planning to allow this type of commercial zoning at this site in the Township?’
 - Concerned with this commercial zoning in the middle of a residential area.
 - What’s to stop an increase in employees? Or the business itself?
 - Mr. Donaldson noted that Mr. Landry would have to return for additional areas for expansion if this happened.
 - Having trouble seeing that non-agricultural uses, such as this, can be run from an agriculturally zoned property.
 - Mr. Donaldson noted that only the small section as noted would allow the commercial uses to continue.
 - The application is for an accessory use for this property. Section 6.5.4 allows for small scale commercial uses. Is this small scale?
 - Is it going to create a precedent?
 - Aldo Salis noted that the official plan does recognize that there are opportunities for *small* scale uses? He has not heard any justification that this application meets the Section 6.5.4 of the Official Plan.
 - Why apply after the use has already been established? Mr. Donaldson feels that the client is just trying to comply with the by-law.
 - If the zoning was not approved, what would happen to the business?
 - Mr. Donaldson feels he can meet all the requirements being asked for and all the concerns of the neighbours and the municipality.
 - If the application withdrew the application and continued to operation, what would the outcome be?
 - The by-law enforcement officer would probably lay charges. If no charges were laid, the applicant would continue to operate his business.
 - If the zoning is approved, the zoning would remain when and if Mr. Landry left.
 - Mr. Donaldson noted that Mr. Landry might relocate if the business continued to expand.
 - Will we get the reports Mr. Salis requested? Mr. Donaldson feels that the Planning Justification report would be appropriate but all the other reports, he does not feel are justified.
 - Wouldn’t it be easier to withdraw the application and move the business?
 - The reason Mr. Landry is not in compliance is because of the number of employees.
 - Would it be possible to just rezone a limited footprint? Could that be a way of recognizing the existing operation and limiting any growth?
 - The neighbours concerns need to be addressed also – traffic concerns, illegal use, loss of property values, non-compatible use; environmental concerns.
 - If the land receives the zoning being requested, it is very difficult to remove this zoning. Probably makes expansion easier. Just because the use exists now, it does not dismiss the requirements for the studies that were requested. Provincial Policy and County Policy have not been addressed.
 - If this was a brand new application, would the County have supported it? All studies being requested now would have been required.
 - Can the zoning be reverted to ‘Agricultural’ if the property is sold? No.
 - The Committee felt it is important for the Township and the County to receive all technical reports previously requested.
 - Mr. Donaldson was not sure what direction his client would be giving him. The sewage and building compliance issue would be looked at first and then the application could possibly withdraw.
- Mr. Donaldson is to return to the Planning Advisory Committee meeting to be held on Monday, June 27, 2011, at which time the Township would need an answer from Mr. Landry on how he is going to proceed – have all the reports prepared or withdraw his application.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Nil.

REPORTS:

Nil.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. First Town Hall meeting to be held on Wednesday, May 18, 2011 from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Puslinch Community Centre before proceeding to the Township Office for the regular Council Meeting at 7:30 p.m. This meeting is to get input from Township residents.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion #2: MOVED by Beverley Nykamp and SECONDED by Brian Cowan;
THAT: The Puslinch Planning Advisory Committee does hereby adjourn at
8:53 p.m.
CARRIED.

Chairman

Secretary

NEXT MEETING – Monday, June 27th, 2011
7:30 p.m.