



## MINUTES

### **1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER**

The May 10, 2022 Planning & Development Advisory Committee Meeting was held on the above date and called to order at 7:37 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  
Deep Basi  
Paul Sadhra  
Dan Kennedy  
Dennis O'Connor

#### **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

### **4. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

None

### **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Moved by: Deep Basi

Seconded by: Dennis O'Connor

That the Minutes of the Planning & Development Advisory Committee Meeting held Tuesday, April 12, 2022, be adopted.

**CARRIED**

### **6. APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN URBAN DESIGN REVIEW**

None

### **7. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT**

#### **7(a) Zoning By-Law Amendment D14-AUD – Audrey Meadows**

The purpose and effect of the proposed Official Plan Amendment is to add a Special Policy area to Section 9.8 Puslinch Local Policies of the County of Wellington Official Plan and amend Schedule A7 Puslinch to facilitate residential development on private on-site services on approximately 14.5 hectares of lands abutting an existing Country Residential subdivision (Audrey Meadows). The proposed amendment is to amend the Township of Puslinch new comprehensive Zoning By-law 23-2018 to rezone the subject lands

from Agricultural (A) Zone to a specialized zone category (Rural Settlement Residential Zone (RSR)) to establish zone regulations specific to the proposed development.

- Rob Stovel, agent for the applicant, provided an overview of the application.
- Deep Basi asked if there are any plans to increase the number of lots to include lots allocated for more affordable housing.
- Rob Stovel advised that one way more affordable housing can be addressed is through possible rental units within the subdivision and that in order to keep within the character of the neighborhood the lots must be larger in order to handle servicing requirements.
- Dan Kennedy asked what the anticipated completion date is and further noted that there are 9 existing lots to the south and asked if those owners are aware that there would be future houses built to the north of their properties.
- Rob Stovel advised that the owner has had dialogue with the neighbors and noted that the original plan was to put in a higher number of lots and further advised that the owner has been keeping the neighbors of the existing lots updated as the subdivision evolves.
- Dan Kennedy asked if there are any plans for a buffer to be placed between the existing lots and the new lots that will be created.
- Rob Stovel advised that rear lot buffering has been discussed and that there will be design input from the owner's landscape architect as to what options are available for a buffer between the properties.
- Dennis O'Connor asked if the Environmental Assessment will confirm that there is enough water in the aquifer to accommodate the proposed subdivision.
- Rob Stovel advised that the owner is working with the hydrogeologist to evaluate the water supply and is confident that the proposed subdivision site can be serviced adequately.
- John Sepulis asked if the one kilometer setback from the City of Guelph boundary requires an Official Plan amendment.
- Rob Stovel advised that it is part of an Official Plan Amendment application with the County of Wellington.
- John Sepulis noted that as part of Mr. Stovel's presentation he cited several sites that have development closer than one kilometer.
- Rob Stovel advised that there are several sites to the west and he will document those sites to Council's satisfaction.
- John Sepulis noted that the owner is proposing to add a rural residential settlement area designation to the zoning by-law and asked if that is a term familiar within the industry.
- Rob Stovel advised that different municipalities have different names for similar zones.
- John Sepulis asked if they are complying with all of the Provincial policies that are in currently in place.
- Rob Stovel advised that yes, they are, subject to the special policy that the owner has proposed will be consistent with the policies.
- John Sepulis noted that the lots to the north and to the west show wooded areas and asked if the plan shown is the current one.
- Rob Stovel advised that the plan shown to the Committee is the current one and that the original plan put forward was not received well by the peer reviewers and it was recommended to move away from the wood lots and resulted in the plan that the Committee was shown on the screen.
- John Sepulis noted that the report cites limited commercial space and asked for clarity.
- Rob Stovel advised that they weren't sure if there is a need for limited commercial space and would need feedback from Council to determine if it would be suitable.
- John Sepulis asked if the road system can support the increase in traffic in the area.
- Rob Stovel advised that Triton Engineering did a traffic study and looked at site lines and they felt that the site line was appropriate.
- Paul Ziegler from Triton Engineering advised that they have checked the site lines for the entrance to the proposed subdivision and there are no issues from a geometric perspective. He further noted that a recent traffic count has not been done but they can update the traffic counts and part of draft plan approval and a turning lane can be added if one is needed.
- Dan Kennedy asked if a new traffic study has been done.
- Paul Ziegler advised that the traffic counts will be done as part of draft plan approval.

- There were no further questions or comments from the Committee.

The Committee has the following comments:

The Committee approves the application in principle, subject to the following:

1. Hydrogeological Study
2. Traffic Study
3. Consideration for rear lot buffering from adjacent development
4. Conformance with provincial legislation

**CARRIED**

## **8. LAND DIVISION**

- 8(a) Severance application B43-22 (D10-MCF) – Allan McFee –** Part Lot 12, Concession 10, municipally known as 4677 Watson Rd S., Township of Puslinch.

Proposed lot line adjustment is 0.18 hectares with no frontage to be added to abutting rural residential lot – Travis, Laura, Robert and Pamela Bothwell.

Retained parcel is 10.7 hectares with 172.2m frontage, existing and proposed agricultural use with existing dwelling and accessory buildings.

- Jeff Buisman, agent for the applicant, provided an overview of the application.
- There were no questions or comments from the Committee.

The Committee supports the application in principal with the **following condition** 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.

- 8(b) Severance application B47-22 (D10-DAL) – Teresa Dallan –** Part lot 9, Concession 9, municipally known as 935 Watson Rd S.

Proposed severance is 50m fr x 125m = 0.6 hectares (severed 1 on sketch), vacant land for proposed rural residential use.

Retained parcel is 106m fr x 125m = 1.3 hectares (retained 1 on sketch), existing and proposed rural residential use with existing dwelling, shed and old barn.

- Jeff Buisman, agent for the applicant provided an overview of the application.
- Jeff Buisman, agent for the applicant, provided an overview of the application.
- Lynne Banks advised that Committee that a desktop review of the proposed entrances has been completed, however safe site lines can't be confirmed until the locations of the proposed site lines are staked out.
- Deep Basi asked if the barn is still active or has it be decommissioned.
- Jeff Buisman advised that the barn was deactivated a long time ago.
- Deep Basi asked if the second barn shown on the plan is active.
- Jeff Buisman advised that MDS will not impact the neighboring properties.
- Dennis O'Connor advised that with respect to prime agricultural lands, will Jeff be following the boundary and keeping all of the prime agriculture together.

- Jeff Buisman noted that the lands to be severed contain a small portion that is prime agricultural. He further noted that in the lands to be retained 40 percent is secondary agriculture and 60 percent is prime agriculture.
- Dennis O'Connor asked if the 60 percent prime agriculture can be developed.
- Jeff Buisman advised that if the severance is granted, it would be for the whole parcel.
- Dennis O'Connor asked if the soil should be typed in order to find the line for prime agriculture and noted that he is concerned that some prime agriculture land could be severed and built on.
- Meagan Ferris advised that the lot was created in 2002 by consent and at the time planning staff determined that all of the land was secondary agriculture and that planning staff were satisfied at that time. She further noted that the County is confident that the designation line is between prime and secondary agriculture.
- Dennis O'Connor asked if the lands to be retained can be built on or is it prime agriculture and can only be farmed.
- Meagan Ferris advised that this will inadvertently create a building lot.
- John Sepulis asked if the applicant can demonstrate that the majority of the lands to be retained are mostly secondary agriculture, would the County be willing to approve the severance.
- Meagan Ferris advised that the information the County has is that the retained land is mainly prime agriculture land.
- Deep Basi asked if it can be built on.
- Meagan Ferris advised that they can build on it because the zoning would allow a house to be built on it but what makes it complicated is how the policy is reviewed, and noted that it's a little better if you switch it around and it does make it challenging from a severance perspective but if approved by the Committee that the newly retained land that is vacant could be built upon.
- John Sepulis noted that he thought Meagan Ferris mentioned that if the land is Prime Agricultural it can't be built on.
- Meagan Ferris advised that based off the zoning both lots have an agricultural zone which allows a single family dwelling but the issue is with policies with respect to severances and that there is no policy support for severances that are in the Prime Agricultural area.
- John Sepulis confirmed that theoretically you can't get a severance in Prime Agricultural land to build on it.
- Meagan Ferris confirmed that you can't get vacant lot severances and that the type of residential lot severance is for surplus farm dwelling in the Primary Agriculture area.
- Paul Sadhra noted that it is a unique situation and they could be creating a precedent.
- Dan Kennedy noted that Jeff Buisman mentioned in his presentation that the land would never be farmed.
- Jeff Buisman advised that the parcel is 2 hectares and that not too many farms survive on a 2 hectare parcel.
- Dennis O'Connor noted that this is a way around to sever a prime agriculture lot.
- There were no further questions or comments from the Committee.

The committee does not support the creation of a lot in prime agriculture land, however if the Land Division Committee approves that application then they are requesting that the **following conditions**

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 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 owner obtain zoning conformity for the two existing accessory structures located on the retained lands.

**8(c). Severance application B48-22 (D10-DAL) – Teresa Dallan – Part lot 9, Concession 9, municipally known as 935 Watson Rd S.**

Proposed severance is 50m fr x 125m = 0.6 hectares (severed 2 on sketch), existing agricultural land for proposed residential use.

Retained parcel is 19.2 hectares with 219m frontage (retained 2 on sketch), existing and proposed agricultural use.

- Jeff Buisman, agent for the applicant, provided an overview of the application.
- John Sepulis asked planning staff if a condition can be imposed on another property if it is owned by the same owner
- Meagan Ferris advised that it would be difficult to do, and further noted that the County can make a condition if the application is approved at Land Division for zoning compliance.
- There were no further questions or comments from the Committee.

That the Committee supports the application with the **following conditions** to be 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 both the retained and severed parcels 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 owner transfer a road widening across both the retained and severed parcels along the frontage of Watson Rd. S. to the Township of Puslinch and that the Township file with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Planning and Land Division Committee a letter of clearance of this condition.
4. That consideration be given to the MDS calculations for the barns, active and inactive, in the area and 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, June 14, 2022 @ 7:00 p.m.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by: Paul Sadhra

Seconded by: Dan Kennedy

That the Planning & Development Advisory Committee is adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

**CARRIED**



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 10, 2022

7:00 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION