



July 13, 2022 Regular Council Meeting

July 13, 2022

Addition to the Consent Agenda Item 6.1.6 Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the July 13, 2022 Council agenda items.

Responses Appreciated Prior to Meeting

6.8 Town of East Gwillimbury - Resolution -Summary and Implications of Provincial Bill 109 More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022 and

6.9 Township of West Lincoln - Summary and Implications of Provincial Bill 109 - More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022

I would like to move the following motion:

Whereas the Township of Puslinch is in receipt of correspondence from the Town of East Gwillimbury, dated June 15, 2022, and from West Lincoln Township Council dated June 28, 2022 requesting the Government of Ontario to revisit the provisions of Bill 109 and work with all stakeholders, including municipalities represented by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario to deliver legislation that allows municipalities to plan, grow and deliver communities that adhere to local, provincially-approved Official Plans, rather than strict statutory timelines; Be it resolved that Council receives and supports the request and, That, a copy of this Motion be sent to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, MPP Caroline Mulroney, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Regional Chairs in Ontario, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and all Ontario municipalities

Staff will have motion ready

6.10 Shadow Minister for Rural Economic Development and Rural Broadband Strategy - Request for Federal Funding

-what do staff believe are the three most important issues impacting our economic development as a rural community?

The following are generally the most common challenges expressed:

- *Availability of appropriately zoned lands or existing buildings (preferably serviced)*
- *Access to high-speed internet and /or funding to assist with service/connection costs*
- *Proximity/availability of local workforce*



6.20 Letter from Puslinch High-speed to Minister Surma

I would like to move the following motion:

Whereas Council is in receipt of correspondence from Glenn James to Minister Surma dated June 24, 2022

Be it resolved that the correspondence be received and supported and that a copy of this motion be sent to MPP Ted Arnott for his support

Staff will have motion ready

9.2.1 Report FIN-2022-020 - 2021 Commodity Price Hedging Agreements

-what were the typical annual street lighting electricity costs prior to installation of LEDs?

Approximate range of \$45K to \$55K (includes both electricity costs and repair costs for streetlights)

9.2.2 Report FIN-2022-026 - Cancellation Reduction or Refund of Taxes

-p. 88 what does SFD denote?

Single Family Dwelling

9.3.1 Report ADM-2022-043 – Concession Road 2 Aggregate Review:

Do we know if the Site Plans reviewed by each consultant are known to be the latest versions or are they just the latest versions in our records?

Staff requested the site plans from the Ministry and crossed checked them with Harden Environmental and they appear to be the most up to date available.

9.3.2 Report ADM-2022-044 – Municipal Street Naming Policy – Final Draft

5.2.4 Names that could be construed deliberately advertise for, but not limited to, current operating businesses and industries Possible Option:

5.2.4 Names that are deliberately intended to advertise existing businesses, industries or other commercial ventures;

Staff can make this change in the approved version.

Section 8.6 and 9.6 both indicate that “Residents of the street proposed to be renamed may choose to opt into the aid distribution by way of written notice to the Township.”

However, the policy does not indicate how these residents will be notified of this option or of any potential deadline to do so.



For example sections 8.12.4 and 9.11.4 regarding notices that will be sent to affected residents two weeks prior to the Council meeting where the matter will be considered , state that the notice will " inform the recipient about their option to indicate an objection to the re-naming" but does not indicate that this notice will inform residents that they may choose to opt into an aid distribution program.

How and when will residents be notified of the option to opt in to the aid distribution program?

Staff suggest an addition to Section 8.12 and 9.11 as follows:

8.12.5 The notice shall include the option to opt into the aid distribution; the confirmation to opt into the aid distribution must be provided to the Township in writing within 30 days of the date of the notice;

And

9.11.5 The notice shall include the option to opt into the aid distribution; the confirmation to opt in to the aid distribution must be provided to the Township in writing within 30 days of the date of the notice;

Section 9.6 indicates that "Costs associated with renaming a street that does not comply with the Naming Standards in this Policy shall be be paid by the Requester(s) as set out in Section 10.2."

Yet 10.2 is for "Application Requirements to Rename an Existing Street that complies with the Naming Standards".

Should the reference in 9.6 point to 10.3 which is for "Application Requirements to Rename an Existing Street that does not comply with the Naming Standards" instead?

This will be corrected in the approved version.

Item 9.4.3 Zoning by-law Amendment Application D14/HUT: There appears to be an error in a lot reference regarding the Zoning by-law Amendment for James Hutton and Sharon Hutton. In the Planning report and bylaw the proper lot reference is used being, Rear Part Lots 2 & 3, Concession 2 with a civic address of 6547 Wellington Road 34.

However in the EXPLANATION OF the BY-LAW in both the staff report and the bylaw to be passed by Council the reference in the explanation of the bylaw is to Front Part of Lot 16, Concession 2, municipally referred to as 6547 Wellington Road.

Staff will have this corrected prior to signing the final by-law subject to Council approval.



9.7.1 Report REC-2022-011 Tender Results for Sports Lighting Upgrades

-how much has been raised to date from Fundraising and if remainder is to be from Cash in Lieu how much is left in Cash in Lieu?

A fundraising subcommittee was formed at the May 17th Recreation Committee Meeting. Council's direction at the October 13, 2021 Council Meeting through Council Resolution No. 2021-299 regarding the fundraising components is outlined below:

That Council request that once a detailed list of components for the projects with associated costs is finalized, the Recreation Committee liaise with community groups in order to facilitate fundraising efforts for the Puslinch Community Centre Park Renovation and Upgrade and the Replacement of the Lights and Upgrading of Washrooms at the Old Morrison Park; and That the Recreation Committee's and community groups coordinated fundraising efforts be prioritized as a goal/objective for 2022/2023 with final funds provided to the Township by December 1, 2023.

The next steps are to finalize the detailed list of components in order to commence sending correspondence to the various community groups and organizations to raise funds for these projects. This initiative will be led by the Recreation Committee with staff support.

It appears that the Cash in Lieu of Parkland Restricted Reserve will not be in a deficit position after completion of these projects (under both Concept A and Concept B scenarios). The audited balance in the restricted reserve as of December 31, 2021 was \$914K. The amount in this restricted reserve as of December 31, 2022 and over the forecast period is subject to change depending on the following:

- *Actual tender results associated with these projects*
- *Actual funds raised through fundraising efforts*
- *Any new unexpected projects that come up*
- *Actual cash in lieu of parkland contributions received*

Therefore, the fundraising efforts from the Recreation Committee are appreciated and essential to moving these projects forward.

Please note, the Township received \$20K from the Puslinch Minor Soccer club in 2021 for the construction of the back soccer fields at the Puslinch Community Centre. The Township has also received \$31K from the former Puslinch Tennis Club. The Township agreed to use the funds from the former Puslinch Tennis Club exclusively for the rehabilitation of the tennis courts.

9.7.2 Report REC-2022-012 Puslinch Community Centre Park and Boreham Park Landscape Concept -if there is an operating budget impact for either concept what is it on an annual basis?

Yes there is. Quantifying it at this stage would be a rough estimate only. Current allocated budgets are extremely tight and sometimes lacking for the current approved levels of service at the existing operating facilities. The current budget of \$10,000 will need to increase during the



upcoming budget cycle to accommodate desired service levels at the current facilities. It is estimated at this time that this would need to be increased to the range of \$25,000. A further refined budget estimate will be provided during the upcoming budget cycle once more operations details on the selected options are firmed up as these represent additional and expanded facilities.

-assuming approval of either concept what is the timing for start and end of construction?

If concepts were approved (for example) this week, SDG sees no reason that our schedule submitted in our proposal could not be adhered to. Construction starting in November 2022 and finishing next fall 2022 (pending contractor schedule approval).

-Concept B for PCC under cost item 3.0 has an extra cost of about \$150k I assume is for a larger Central Gathering Area Plaza; please explain why it is advantageous to have this?

A main focus of each concept was to create a destination space/ plaza in the rear of the site. Concept B allowed for an increased size and scope of this gathering area.

-Concept B for PCC under cost item 12e has an extra cost of about \$10k I assume for an enhanced shelter; please explain why it is advantageous to have this?

See answer above

-Concept B for Boreham Park has an increased cost of 20k over concept A for I assume for larger play area and shelter; please explain why it is advantageous to have this?

Concept B would allow for a larger play space and therefore more play equipment and opportunities for play. A larger structure would allow for more shade relief from a permanent structure.

-PCC playground area in concept B seems smaller than Concept A; if so why?

Both play spaces were intended to be the same size

-who will be selecting types of playground equipment ie. will Whistlestop be consulted?

Consultant team will engage several play and shade vendors in conjunction with the Township

-comparing Boreham and PCC playground areas what is the size of areas for each for concepts A and B?



Boreham A: 150m2. Boreham B: 250m2. PCC is approx. 450m2

-how much was raised to date from Fundraising for each of soccer field, PCC Park Renovation and Boreham Park?

See answer above re 9.7.1

-assuming concept B for PCC and Boreham is selected and remainder is from Cash in Lieu how much will be left in Cash in Lieu?

See answer above re 9.7.1

10.2 Dufferin Aggregates Aberfoyle Pit 2021 Annual Monitoring Report prepared by Harden Environmental Peer Review

-already addressed at previous Council meeting

This was an administrative error and has been removed in the Agenda Addendum