



MINUTES

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

The April 12, 2022 Planning & Development Advisory Committee Meeting was held on the above date and called to order at 7:48 p.m. via electronic participation.

2. OPENING REMARKS

The Chair advised that the following portion of the Committee meeting will be for the Committee to review and provide comments on development planning applications.

3. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Councilor John Sepulis, Chair
Dan Kennedy
Dennis O'Connor
Deep Basi
Paul Sadhra

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Lynne Banks, Development and Legislative Coordinator
Courtenay Hoytfox, Municipal Clerk
Meagan Ferris, Manager of Planning and Environment, County of Wellington
Joanna Salsberg, Planner, County of Wellington

4. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- March 8, 2022

Moved by: Paul Sadhra

Seconded by: Dennis O'Connor

That the Minutes of the Planning & Development Advisory Committee Meeting held Tuesday, March 8, 2022, be adopted.

CARRIED

6. APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN URBAN DESIGN REVIEW

None

7. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

7(a) Zoning-Law Amendment D14/ARU – Township of Puslinch.

The purpose and effect of the application is to amend the Township of Puslinch Comprehensive Zoning By-law 23-2018 as the Township has undertaken a review of the existing zoning provisions related to Accessory Apartments. The proposed amendment is to update the provisions for Accessory Apartments to bring the Township Zoning By-laws into conformity with

the Planning Act, the County of Wellington Official Plan, and best practices for Additional Residential Units [ARUs]. This is a Township initiated amendment that **affects all lands** in the Township of Puslinch.

- Joanna Salsberg, County Planner, provided a Power Point presentation to the Committee outlining the changes that are being proposed.
- Dan Kennedy asked what the difference is between an ARU and a Garden Suite.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that a garden suite is a temporary unit and can only be established for a period of time and then must be removed, and the ARU is a permanent structure that is permitted by a building permit. She further noted that garden suites are temporary and only for specific time and are established by a zoning by-law amendment.
- Dan Kennedy asked if this will eliminate garden suites.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that there are restrictions on garden suites that make them more difficult to establish on a property so it's possible that ARU's are more favorable and that property owners will most likely use those units more often.
- Dan Kennedy asked if an ARU can be severed off or sold as a separate entity in the future.
- Joanna Salsberg noted that the intent is that they aren't to be severed off and are meant to provide different housing opportunities on the same lot. She further noted that they will be subordinate to the main use and not independent.
- John Sepulis asked if there is any thought to permitting two ARU's within the residence instead of one inside a residence and one separate from the residence.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that policies direct for one unit within the residence and that to have both units within would require additional planning approvals.
- Meagan Ferris advised that the County Official Plan policies direct that one ARU is to be permitted in the residence and one can detached from the primary residence.
- John Sepulis noted that a separate entrance is required for the ARU within a primary dwelling and asked if consideration can be given if the residents are inter-related and living together, would a separate entrance still be needed.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that the intent is to allow for independent movement of the unit either from outside or a shared entrance. She further noted that if that if is within a unit and you have to pass through one to get to the entrance, then the by-law would require relief from the by-law.
- John Sepulis further asked if a trailer would be considered an ARU.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that ARU's are intended to be permanent buildings and that the temporary aspect is more related to garden suites. She further noted that the intent is for the ARU to be within a permanent structure.
- John Sepulis asked if that can be made clear in the proposed by-law whether a trailer would be an option, and if it isn't an option, then it should be indicated in the proposed by-law.
- Joanna Salsberg stated that they can take a look at the proposed by-law and make sure that it is clear.
- John Sepulis also stated that it should be clear in the proposed by-law that severing the land would not be permitted.
- Joanna Salsberg noted that it has been included in the proposed by-law.
- Paul Sadhra asked if a septic review will be done at the time the ARU is applied for due to the additional kitchen and washroom fixtures that will be added.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that a general provision is being proposed to include wording that appropriate individual on-site sewage and water services are approved for the lot and that there is adequate capacity for additional residential units and other uses on the lot. She further noted that the building department would be reviewing the building permit application to ensure that the septic is adequate for the amount of fixtures that are being proposed.
- There were no further questions or comments from the Committee.

The Committee has the following comments:

1. The Committee supports the zoning by-law amendment.
2. That adequate servicing can be accommodated at the time of zoning and building permit review.
3. That trailers are not to be permitted as ARU's.

CARRIED

8. LAND DIVISION

8(a) **Severance application B22-22 (D10-MCC) – Robert and Elizabeth McCrindle** – Part Lot 7, Concession 2, municipally known as 6661 Wellington Rd 34, Township of Puslinch.

Proposed severance is 0.4682 hectares with 36.11m frontage, vacant land for proposed residential use.

Retained parcel is 0.9232 hectares with 55.37m frontage, existing and proposed rural residential use with existing dwelling.

- Nancy Shoemaker, agent for the applicant, provided an overview of the application.
- Dennis O'Connor asked if there is an option to move the house forward and the septic bed behind the house so that it wouldn't impact the removal of trees.
- Nancy Shoemaker advised that the trees at the back of the property were planted by the current property owner and are not part of the maple bush, but are black walnut trees for the purpose of harvesting and that the final design for the house and septic has not been completed. She further noted that if the owner opts for a tertiary system then the septic and tile bed would be considerably smaller than what is shown on the plan.
- Deep Basi asked if the GRCA supports the application.
- Nancy Shoemaker advised that the GRCA has stated that they don't have any interest in the property because it's not within their regulated area.
- John Sepulis asked Joanna Salsberg to respond to Dennis O'Connor's comment regarding the septic bed encroaching in to the maple bush.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that in terms of the environmental impact study, that will be peer reviewed. She further noted that with regard to the septic bed, the building itself would also have to meet setback requirements from the different lot lines.
- John Sepulis asked in relation to the lot line, will the 3 meter setback require a minor variance.
- Joanna Salsberg advised that the property is zoned agricultural and environmental protection and that there is a minimum required setback of 7.5 meters front yard and that the rear yard is also 7.5 meters. She also advised that there are 3 meter interior side-yard setbacks within the agricultural zone so they would have to meet those requirements of the bylaw and that the actual development would be reviewed through the peer review of the EIS.
- There were no further questions or comments from the Committee.

The committee supports the application in principal with the **following conditions** imposed:

1. That the Owner satisfy all the requirements of the Township of Puslinch, financial and otherwise (including taxes paid in full and Consent Review/Condition Clearance fee) which the Township may deem to be necessary at the time of issuance of the Certificate of Consent for the property and orderly development of the subject lands. Any fees incurred by the Township for the review of this application will be the responsibility of the applicant; and further that the Township of Puslinch file with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Planning and Land Division Committee a letter of clearance of this condition.
2. That safe access to the severed lands can be accommodated to the satisfaction of the Township; and further that the Township file with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Planning and Land Division Committee a letter of clearance of this condition.
3. That the submitted Environmental Impact Study (EIS) be peer reviewed to the satisfaction of the Township of Puslinch and the County of Wellington, and that the owner shall be responsible for any Township costs associated with the review of the EIS; and further that Township of Puslinch file with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Planning and Land Division Committee a letter of clearance of this condition.



4. That the owner enters into a Development Agreement with the Township of Puslinch for the purpose of peer review of the Environmental Impact Study to ensure compliance with the EIS including cost recovery, ensuring the building envelope complies with the EIS, mitigation for tree loss and other items deemed necessary by the Township.
5. That the removable garden shed on the severed parcel be relocated to the satisfaction of the Township; and further, that the Township file with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Planning and Land Division Committee a letter of clearance of this condition.

8(b) Severance application B28-22 (D10-CUL) – Judith Cullen – Part Lot 11, Concession 10, municipally known as 4742 Concession 11, Township of Puslinch.

Proposed severance is 50m fr x 158m = 0.8 hectares, vacant land for proposed rural residential use.

Retained parcel is 158m fr on Concession Rd 11 x 158m frontage on Hume Rd = 2.4 hectares, existing and proposed residential use with existing dwelling and pool.

- Haley Keast, agent for the applicant provided an overview of the application.
- Deep Basi asked if a safe entrance is possible.
- Lynne Banks advised that the Township's Public Works Department is satisfied that safe entrance is possible.
- There were no further questions or comments from the Committee.

The committee supports the application with the **following conditions** imposed:

1. That the Owner satisfy all the requirements of the Township of Puslinch, financial and otherwise (including taxes paid in full and Consent Review/Condition Clearance fee) which the Township may deem to be necessary at the time of issuance of the Certificate of Consent for the property and orderly development of the subject lands. Any fees incurred by the Township for the review of this application will be the responsibility of the applicant; and further that the Township of Puslinch file with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Planning and Land Division Committee a letter of clearance of this condition.
2. That safe access to the severed lands can be accommodated to the satisfaction of the Township; and further that the Township file with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Planning and Land Division Committee a letter of clearance of this condition.

9. OTHER MATTERS

- None

10. CLOSED MEETING

- None

11. NEXT MEETING

- Next Regular Meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 10, 2022 @ 7:00 p.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by: Deep Basi

Seconded by: Dennis O'Connor

That the Planning & Development Advisory Committee is adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

CARRIED