

61(9)



COUNTY OF WELLINGTON

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GARY A. COUSINS, M.C.I.P., DIRECTOR
T 519.837.2600
T 1.800.663.0750
F 519.823.1694

ADMINISTRATION CENTRE
74 WOOLWICH STREET
GUELPH ON N1H 3T9

August 6, 2013

BY E-MAIL klandry@puslinch.ca

Ms. Karen Landry, C.A.O/ Clerk
Township of Puslinch
R. R. 3 (Aberfoyle)
Guelph, Ontario N1H 6H9

Dear Ms. Landry:

**Re: PUBLIC MEETING- Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment # P3/2013
Andrea Clarke
Part Lot 20, Concession 9 (7632 Wellington Road 34), Township of Puslinch**

As requested, we have prepared a draft amending by-law for the above-referenced proposal and attached a copy for Council's consideration. Our previous report to the Planning Advisory Committee dated June 17th, 2013 provides a comprehensive policy review of this application.

Background

This zoning by-law amendment has been filed to satisfy a condition of consent application B146/12. This request to sever a vacant 0.52 ha (1.28 ac) residential lot was granted provisional consent by the County Land Division Committee February, 14th 2013. The purpose of this application is to rezone the subject property to allow for a reduced frontage of 96 m; and also address the MDS1 compliance by restricting livestock within the existing barn on the subject property.

County Official Plan

According to Schedule A7 (Puslinch) of the Official Plan, the property is designated SECONDARY AGRICULTURAL, CORE GREENLANDS and GREENLANDS. The Greenland designations recognize lands within the provincially significant Mill Creek wetland Complex. The Official Plan allows for consideration of the creation of one residential lot by consent subject to the applicable policies, including those of Section 10.4.4.

Township Zoning By-law

According to Schedule 'A' of Zoning By-law 19/85, the subject property is zoned Agricultural (A) and Natural Environment (NE). This application would rezone the subject property to a site specific zoning category which would acknowledge the reduced frontage and restriction livestock on the retained property. The (NE) Natural Environment zone would remain unchanged.

Summary

In our opinion, the proposed rezoning of the subject lands to restrict the housing of livestock and acknowledge a reduced frontage is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the policies of the Provincial Growth Plan and County Official Plan. We are satisfied that the amending by-law when executed is appropriate and represents good planning.

We trust that these comments are of assistance and that the attached by-law is satisfactory. Staff

will be in attendance at the Public Meeting to address any questions or concerns related to this application.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jameson Pickard". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jameson Pickard
Junior Planner

Attachments: Draft Amending By-law
cc. Jeff Buisman, Van Harten Surveying Inc.

6.2(a)



COUNTY OF WELLINGTON

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GARY A. COUSINS, M.C.I.P., DIRECTOR
T 519.837.2600
T 1.800.663.0750
F 519.823.1694

ADMINISTRATION CENTRE
74 WOOLWICH STREET
GUELPH ON N1H 3T9

August 6, 2013

BY E-MAIL klandry@puslinch.ca

Ms. Karen Landry, C.A.O/ Clerk
Township of Puslinch
R. R. 3 (Aberfoyle)
Guelph, Ontario N1H 6H9

Dear Ms. Landry:

**Re: PUBLIC MEETING- Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment #P2/2013
Rockway Holdings Limited (Roszell Pit)
Part Lot 1, Concession 3 (6492 Roszell Road), Township of Puslinch**

As requested, we have prepared a draft amending by-law for the above-referenced proposal and attached a copy for Council's consideration. Our previous report to the Planning Advisory Committee dated May 10th, 2013 provides a comprehensive policy review of this application.

Background

This zoning by-law amendment has been filed to satisfy a condition of consent application B105/12. This request to sever a vacant 1.4 ha (3.5 ac) residential lot was granted provisional consent by the County Land Division Committee October, 13th 2012. The purpose of this application is to rezone the subject property to appropriate agricultural zone categories to remove zoning provisions which were applied to allow for aggregate extraction (Roszell Pit). A 1.4 ha (3.4 ac) section of the Roszell pit license has been surrendered which had covered the parcel to be severed; approval for the surrendering was given by the Ministry of Natural Resources on March 5th, 2013.

County Official Plan

According to Schedule A7 (Puslinch) of the Official Plan, the property is designated SECONDARY AGRICULTURAL, CORE GREENLANDS, GREENLANDS and is within the Mineral Aggregate Area overlay. The Greenland designations recognize lands within the floodplain of the Speed River and a pond on the property. The Official Plan allows for consideration of the creation of one residential lot by consent subject to the applicable policies, including those of Section 10.4.4.

Township Zoning By-law

According to Schedule 'A' of Zoning By-law 19/85, the subject property is zoned Agricultural (A), Agricultural Exception (A-46) and Natural Environment. This application would rezone the proposed severance to (A) Agricultural from (A-46) Agricultural exception zone, as well as rezone the retained parcel to A-54 to permit a reduced frontage of 104 m on the retained parcel. The (NE) Natural Environment zone will remain unchanged.

Summary

In our opinion, the proposed rezoning of the subject lands to permit the proposed severed lot and which acknowledges a reduced frontage on the retained parcel is consistent with the provincial Policies and conforms to the County Official Plan. We are satisfied that the amending by-law when

executed is appropriate and represents good planning.

We trust that these comments are of assistance and that the attached by-law is satisfactory. Staff will be in attendance at the Public Meeting to address any questions or concerns related to this application.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jameson Pickard".

Jameson Pickard
Junior Planner

Attachments: Draft Amending By-law
cc. Jeff Buisman, Van Harten Surveying Inc.

From: Nathan Garland [mailto:ngarland@grandriver.ca]
Sent: July-23-13 11:58 AM
To: Greg Scheifele; Karen Landry
Cc: Robert Messier
Subject: RE: Puslinch Community Centre - Parkland Trail

Hello Karen and Greg,

1. Regarding the possibility of relocating a trail closer to Mill Creek, while it is possible the proposed surface treatment (Boardwalk or Hard Surface in the none wetland portions), grading and fill would likely trigger the requirement for a permit and therefore would need to go through a more detailed design and evaluation.
2. As for a potential spur option, we agree that a spur to the confluence area of the North Tributary and Main Channel would be a feasible location.
3. Education information and signage was discussed briefly, there are some Butternut on the property which could have signage, additionally Robert Messier with our office assists in Coordinating the Mill Creek Ranger Program which has been active at providing enhancement projects for Mill Creek, and he may be able to provide an additional source of education information for the area. Also, if there were proposed plantings adjacent to the edge of the trail near the field area, I would recommend contacting Robert as he may be able assist with providing some resources for such work. His email address is included below.

Robert Messier <rmessier@grandriver.ca>

It was felt that the proposed trail was intended to be a fairly passive low impact trail, and the location compiled by Greg meet that criteria and was low impact in design and material to be under the permit process and didn't amount to a lot of additional costs or site prep. Locating closer to the Watercourse would bring in additional concerns with Hazards and Erosion.

Should you have any further questions please feel free to call or email.

Regards,

6:3(b)

From: Greg Scheifele [<mailto:gwsefs@sympatico.ca>]
Sent: July-22-13 5:07 PM
To: 'Karen Landry'; Nathan Garland
Subject: RE: Puslinch Community Centre - Parkland Trail

Karen,

I don't believe it is feasible to construct the trail any closer to the creek for the following reasons.

1. The wetland occupies much of the forest area and it is characterized by poorly drained soils that are unsuitable for trail development. Although a wooden boardwalk could possibly be constructed through this area it would be very expensive to build and subject to GRCA approval.
2. The area in close proximity to the creek is subject to occasional flooding particularly during winter thaws and/or spring snowmelt. During flood events sections of the trail would become unusable and surface treatments such as stonedust or wood chips would be washed away and potentially deposited in the creek channel.
3. If the trail was aligned in close proximity to the creek it would be necessary to remove substantially more trees than is the case with the recommended route which has a minimal impact on the forest. Furthermore, there would be more grading requirements and hence more potential for soil erosion and sedimentation within the creek channel.

Although there are several constraints on trail development it may be possible to construct a small spur trail to the creek. In my opinion, The most feasible location would be where the northern tributary connects to the main channel.

Please call me if you require further clarification on this matter.

Regards,

Greg

6.3(c)

5.2(a)



RECEIVED

JUN 14 2013

Township of Puslinch

File:3301
By: Email & Hand

June 13, 2013

Township of Puslinch
7404 Wellington Road 34
R.R.# 3
Guelph, Ontario
N1H 6H9

Attention: Mrs. Karen Landry
C.A.O./Clerk

Dear: Mrs. Landry

Re: Puslinch Community Centre – Parkland Trail

CLERK'S DEPARTMENT	
TO	<i>DL</i>
Copy	
Please Handle	
For Your Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Council Agenda	<i>July 17/13</i>
File	

1.0 Introduction

As requested, I inspected the recently acquired woodland area at the Puslinch Community Centre. This woodland was inspected during winter and spring conditions to determine the feasibility of establishing a recreational trail in the woodland which surrounds an existing hay field. It is my understanding that the agricultural land is to be converted into a soccer pitch, including lighting for evening play.

Fieldwork confirmed that woodland conditions were suitable for trail development and a proposed route was flagged in advance of a site meeting with Nathan Garland and Robert Messier of the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) on May 21, 2013. GRCA staff confirmed that the proposed trail location was acceptable from their perspective, subject to a minor modification in order to avoid a wet area. The following discussion describes existing conditions in the woodland, constraints on trail development, and the recommended trail design and use.

2.0 Existing Biophysical Conditions

Mill Creek flows along the north and west boundaries of the subject property. A small cold water tributary discharges into Mill Creek at the northwest corner of the property. The location of these streams was inaccurately mapped by the GRCA so their actual alignments were recorded using a hand held GPS unit. According to the Soil Survey of Wellington County¹ this woodland is characterized by the slightly stony, imperfectly drained Brisbane loam which occurs on smooth level topography. Fieldwork confirmed that the Brisbane soil type is most prevalent in this forested area and adjacent agricultural field, but the poorly drained Gilford loam occurs along the west boundary of the property in the vicinity of Mill Creek. GRCA mapping identifies a wetland within this forested area and it is part of the Mill Creek Swamp Wetland Complex, a Provincially Significant

¹ Hoffman, D.W> et. al. 1963. Soil Survey of Wellington County Ontario. Report No. 35 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Research Branch Canada. Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural College.

Wetland (PSW). This wetland was also verified by site inspection although the wetland limits are somewhat different than shown on the GRCA map.

Vegetation communities on the subject lands were initially identified through interpretation of aerial photography available on the GRCA website. Vegetation mapping was done in accordance with the Ecological Land Classification (ELC) system for southern Ontario. Fieldwork confirmed the presence of three naturally established vegetation communities, as well as an old field meadow, a coniferous hedgerow and a dug pond. Figure 1 illustrates the spatial distribution of these vegetation communities.

A fresh-moist cedar coniferous forest (FOC4-1) occurs along the northern property boundary and it extends southward around the hay field. It is characterized by a pure, dense stand of immature white cedar that is approximately 1.7 acres in size. Most trees are of poletimber size being 4 to 9 inches in diameter at breast height (dbh). Tree regeneration and shrub growth are sparse in the understory of this community. Groundflora are also negligible due to the dense overstory. A small man-made pond occurs within this cedar stand. A small stand of upland cedar about 0.4 acres in size also occurs along Maple Leaf Lane. Two small meadow communities (CUM1-1) totalling 0.2 acres occur adjacent to FOC4-1 and the hay field.

The balance of the agricultural land is bordered by a fresh-moist ash lowland deciduous forest (FOD7-2) and a dense white cedar hedgerow (H). The ash stand is 0.8 acres in size and it is characterized by a moderately dense mixture of deciduous trees, including white and black ash, trembling aspen, white and yellow birch, red and sugar maple, black cherry, basswood, Manitoba maple, butternut and black walnut. Most trees are immature in age/size being 4 to 14 inches dbh. The understory is moderately dense and consists mostly of ash and aspen regeneration as well as shrubs such as dogwood, white elderberry, common buckthorn and red raspberry. Groundflora are uniformly distributed throughout the stand and consist of common woodland wildflowers, ferns, asters, goldenrods and grasses. Butternut is an endangered species and must be protected from disturbance. Immature butternut trees 6 to 13 inches dbh are found in this stand, as well as regeneration which mostly occurs along the forest edge. Most of these butternuts appeared to be cankered but would still be considered retainable trees.

A white cedar-hardwood mineral mixed swamp (SWM1-1) is found along the west boundary of the property and it covers about 2 acres. Hardwoods growing in association with cedar include yellow birch, red maple, sugar maple, black ash and butternut. Most dominant and codominant trees are 10 to 16 inches dbh and represent immature sawtimber. However, a mature butternut about 20 inches dbh occurs near the road. This tree exhibits cankers on its trunk but the crown nonetheless appears healthy. Although several trees have blown down the stand is still fully stocked. The forest understory is sparse and mainly consists of cedar regeneration and shrubs such as red-osier dogwood and white elderberry. Groundflora cover is moderate and mainly consists of sedges, sensitive fern, jack-in-the-pulpit and jewelweed.

3.0 Constraints on Trail Development

The following considerations limited trail development within the woodland area.

- During winter and spring fieldwork surface water ponding was evident in close proximity to Mill Creek even within the upland cedar stand, FOC4-1. This suggested that minor flooding occurs during winter thaws and/or spring snowmelt.

- Poorly drained soils occur in the wetland area and as a result the trees are shallow rooted and prone to blowdown. Several cedar trees have in fact blowdown and now pose an obstruction to pedestrian movement. Elsewhere, the groundflora is sensitive to potential trampling damage due to wet soil conditions. As a result, expensive wooden boardwalk would be needed to traverse wetland areas and this could not be done without some level of vegetation disturbance.
- Endangered butternut trees occur within vegetation communities SWM1-1 and FOD7-2 and care must be taken to protect these trees from potential impacts associated with trail construction. In general, the trail should not be located in close proximity to any retainable butternut trees that could potentially be damaged by trail construction and/or use (i.e. severing tree roots during construction or compacting soil during trail use).

4.0 Recommended Trail Design and Use

Given the above mentioned constraints, it is recommended that a recreational trail should be located around the perimeter of the woodland within vegetation units CUM1-1, FOC4-1 and FOD7-2 as shown in Figure 1. In this constrained woodland environment a trail width of 8 feet (2.4m) is considered most appropriate in order to minimize tree loss and impacts to other vegetation. Either a stonedust or stonedust over compacted granular surface treatment could be used in this setting as per the Wellington County Active Transportation Master Plan (May, 2012). Alternatively, woodchips could be utilized in some sections of the trail. Based on these trail design parameters it is estimated that only about 10 living trees ranging in size from 4 to 10 inches dbh (10-26cm) would have to be removed to accommodate trail construction. However, 7 dead trees would also have to be removed along with cedar and hardwood regeneration (i.e. young trees 1 to 3 inches dbh). This assumes only hand held equipment and small machines are used in trail construction (e.g. chainsaws, bobcats etc.).

During trail construction old barbed wire fencing should be removed from the woodland. Invasive common buckthorn shrubs should also be eradicated from the woodland by mechanical and/or chemical methods (i.e. cutting and spraying stumps with Roundup or spraying the foliage of small shrubs and sprout growth with Roundup) while their abundance is low and potentially controllable. Grape vines that are strangling trees should also be cut at the same time as this ecological enhancement work is being performed. Consideration should also be given to tree planting along open portions of the trail (e.g. in CUM1-1 and other areas in very close proximity to the woodland edge) to screen out the future soccer field and create a more natural setting for trail users. Trees such as white pine, white spruce, red maple, white birch and bur oak should grow well in this area. In this environment passive trail uses are considered most appropriate such as walking, running, cross country skiing, nature viewing and photography.

I trust this information assists the Township in their deliberations about recreational use of this property. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance with this matter.

Yours truly,

GWS Ecological & Forestry Services Inc.



Greg W. Scheifele, M. A., R.P.F.
Principal Ecologist/Forester

cc: Aldo Salis, County of Wellington
Steve Conway, Gamsby & Mannerow
Nathan Garland, Grand River Conservation Authority

Puslinch Community Centre

Figure 1-ELC Vegetation Communities

- Legend**
- Roads-Addressed (MNR)
 - Subject Property
 - Mill Creek
 - Vegetation Type Boundary
 - Proposed Community Trail
 - A Agricultural Cropland
 - H White Cedar Hedgerow
 - CUM1-1 Dry-Moist Old Field Cultural Meadow
 - FOC4-1 Fresh-Moist Cedar Coniferous Forest
 - FOD7-2 Fresh-Moist Ash Lowland Deciduous Forest
 - SAS Submerged Shallow Aquatic (pond)
 - SWM1-1 White Cedar – Hardwood Mineral Mixed Swamp

GRCA Disclaimer

This map is for illustrative purposes only. Information contained hereon is not a substitute for professional review or a site survey and is subject to change without notice. The Grand River Conservation Authority takes no responsibility for, nor guarantees, the accuracy of the information contained on this map. Any interpretations or conclusions drawn from this map are the sole responsibility of the user.

The source for each data layer is shown in parentheses in the map legend. For a complete listing of sources and citations go to:

<http://grims.grandriver.ca/docs/SourcesCitations2.htm>

