



March 22, 2023 Regular Council Meeting

March 22, 2023

Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the March 22, 2023 Council agenda items.

Responses Appreciated Prior to Meeting

6.18 Municipality of Chatham-Kent - Reducing Municipal Insurance Costs

-is there any outreach by County and Townships to the Province regarding this matter?

Staff are not aware of any outreach from our partners.

6.20 Township of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh - Voters List

-did we have any difficulties?

The Township had a typical number of corrections to the voters list. Staff did outreach with the community leading up to election day to make corrections in advance and had good feedback. This limited voter difficulties on advanced vote and voting day and worked well.

9.2.4 Report FIN-2023-012 Fourth Quarter Financial Report – 2022

-p.186 \$213k is identified as budget remaining. Is this the final surplus amount from the Operating Budget?

This is an approximate amount. Staff will be reporting on this at an upcoming Council Meeting.

10.1 County of Wellington Council Resolution – OPA 120 Recommendation Report

-p.333 in reference to “A change to the Township’s growth forecast is not recommended.” has OPA 120 been approved by County Council?

OPA #120 was adopted by County Council on February 23rd, 2023 and that the amendment package has now been sent to the Province for their review and approval.



-p.333 re “Staff note that the projections anticipate that Puslinch will add 710 housing units over the 2021 to 2051 period, whereas the July 2019 supply of residential units is 431.”; how has this number been determined?

431 Unit Supply of Residential Units from 2019

The County maintains inventories of residential and employment land across the County. The residential supply inventory is vacant land that is designated for residential use in the Official Plan. The supply figure of 431 units is based on current Official Plan policies and land use designations and does not include future growth in areas that are not designated. Available supply on residential parcels is estimated using a unit density calculation or is based on unit yields proposed in active development applications. In addition, the County also accounts for unit supply in the rural area using estimates of severance potential based on the current secondary agricultural land base and lot creation policies. The residential supply is updated regularly through monthly building permits to adjusted inventory records as they build out or if demolitions occur.

710 Housing Unit Forecast from 2021 to 2051

As part of Phase 1 of the municipal comprehensive review, Watson and Associates Economists Ltd. (Watson) prepared population and housing growth forecasts by municipality (Final Phase 1 MCR Report: Urban Structure and Growth Allocations as amended January 31, 2022). The municipal allocations are based on a broad range of considerations set out in the technical report (this includes trends identified through building permit activity). In determining the rate of growth for each municipality, Watson also factored in the availability of full municipal services as we are required to place a priority on directing growth to these areas. The information above has led to the forecasted value of 710 units.

We look forward to working with Township staff, Council and members of the public on rural Phase 3B of the municipal comprehensive review.

Delegation – there is a delegation request that mentions the costs of the large blue rebranding signs in Puslinch. If memory serves correct, this rebranding stemmed from the Parks Master Plan and Aubs and Mugs assisted the township with a multitude of public consultations. The blue signs and other branding were grant funded over several years. Would it be possible to provide a brief summary of the public consultation that was done to develop the logo/signage as well as a summary of the funding that was used to roll-out the program?



This rebranding stemmed from the Township's 2015 Business Retention and Expansion Plan, 2015 Recreation and Parks Master Plan, 2016 Community Improvement Plan, 2016 Community Based Strategic Plan, and the 2016 Wellington County Signage Plan. Many of these plans involved a number of stakeholder engagement opportunities. Through the extensive stakeholder engagement, common themes identified included:

- *Lack of signage/awareness of amenities is a barrier that Township businesses identified.*
- *A Communications and Branding Strategy is required to promote local parks and recreation opportunities through the creation of signage to easily identify municipal assets and branding and to provide consistent messaging.*
- *The need to develop branding and marketing materials is apparent.*
- *The creation of a Puslinch Identity" through destination marketing/branding is essential.*

Aubs & Mugg was the successful consultant retained by the Township through a Request for Proposal process for the creation and implementation of a Township logo/brand. The development of the new logo and brand design by Aubs & Mugg involved significant community and industry input including consultation with the established Steering Committee. Steering Committee members included community members, the County of Wellington's Economic Development department, industry representatives, and Township staff. Input was also obtained through surveys, attendance at community events, and presentations to Township Council.

The total costs for the fabrication and installation of signage amounted to approximately \$130K from 2020 to 2022. The cost includes fabrication and installation of approximately 16 signs (including wall signs at our recreational facilities) and 10 vertical gateway banners. The cost also includes design costs from Aubs & Mugg, electrical and the required permit fees. The project was funded as follows:

- *\$50K - County of Wellington Business Retention and Expansion Plan Funding*
- *\$24K - Provincial Rural Economic Development Funding*
- *\$44K - Provincial Main Street Revitalization Initiative Funding*
- *\$12K - Township Funding*



Report 9.2.2 – The grant is applicable to costs from Jan 2022 to September 2023, but the expenses were budgeted in 2020 and 2021. Will the full \$50,000 be received? How does everything get re-allocated from previous years?

Yes the full amount of grant funding of \$50K will be received as the project commenced in January 2022 after approval of grant funding was obtained in August 2021. The Township recently received the grant agreement in early 2023. This is a capital carryforward project so the budgeted funds have been appropriately carried forward to be spent in the applicable year (ie. 2022 and 2023). The grant funds will be received from FCM once the final report is submitted after project completion.

Report 9.3.4

1. The staff report indicates that both the MNRF and MECP have responded to indicate that the use is not permitted or included in the permissions of the ARA license. Why would they take the position of stating “no enforcement action would be taken”? Under whose jurisdiction is it to enforce? Is the enforcement the responsibility of the township or the ministry?

The property has an active ARA license over a portion of the property. The MNRF is responsible to ensure activities within the licensed area are permitted by the ARA and the specific permissions of the license. The MECP is responsible to regulate the liquid soil importation to the property through an Environmental Compliance Approval. The Ministries are responsible for enforcement relating to their legislation and approvals – staff are not able to comment on the actions of the Ministries. The Township is not able to enforce its Site Alteration By-law where an active ARA license is in place and so relies on the Ministry for regulation through their processes and permits. The Township is able to enforce violations relating to its zoning by-law. The zoning by-law amendment application is in response to non-compliance with the Township Zoning By-law.

2. Planning staff indicate in their report that the pit license would need to be removed to allow the use on the property. The pit license is issued to Capital Paving. Has the township received any correspondence from Capital Paving that they would support this?



Capital Paving was circulated on the zoning amendment application, however, have not made any comment in support or objection. The Township is not aware whether Capital Paving would agree to surrender the active license on the subject lands.

3. Gravel pits that are in the rehabilitation phase would generally require fill to be brought in. Is a pit operator obligated to obtain a site alteration permit for fill brought in for rehabilitation or are they exempt from this as part of their license and rehabilitation plan?

No, the Township Site Alteration By-law does not apply on lands with an active ARA license. The pit operator would be required to follow all ARA requirements including the excess soil requirements recently implemented.

4. The pit is nearing the end of its life cycle, at which point it would be returned to agricultural use. The applicant is proposing the hydro-vac use be permitted permanently. If this use were to be approved, are there any mechanisms that could be used to implement and “expiry date” on the hydro-vac use?

The Planning Act does allow for temporary use by-laws to zone lands for a specific use for a maximum period of three years, with extensions to this time period possible with Council approval.

5. If this zoning does not get approved, what are the next steps to stop the use that is already taking place without approval?

Staff recommend that discussions regarding enforcement, if required, take place in-camera as they would be confidential in nature and subject to solicitor client privilege.

Delegation 7.2.1 - Is there staff concerns around ski school special event ?

The current procedure is to permit one special event per property per year. This is to allow property owners to have a special event on their property without having to re-zone to allow the use. Most commonly, the Township provides special event permits for weddings or other special family events. This is applied consistently and provides the neighbours the assurance that this is a one-time event and not a continued use. Staff have concerns with providing a property owner an exemption to hold more than one event per year as it becomes challenging to determine



when the property should be subject to a zoning amendment – which includes consultation from the neighbours. Staff suggest that a policy/by-law be developed to set out specific criteria for special events on private property and consider including a relief provision to address if/how this type of request can be processed in the future.

Re: Special Event permit delegation

Q – is there a cap on the number of equestrian events (horse shows) that are allowed per year on agricultural zoned properties? Where is this information available?

The Agricultural Zone in the Township’s Zoning By-law includes permissions relating to the training and or riding of boarded horses, as well as farm-related commercial and industrial uses that are directly related to farm operations in the area, support agriculture, benefit from being in close proximity to farm operations, and provide direct products and/or services to farm operations as a principal activity. The Agricultural Zone also permits Agri-tourism businesses which includes a number of permissions. The Township does not issue special event permits for equestrian uses, but can look into how this might be regulated by OMAFRA.

Re: ADM 2023-015 Heritage Act Designations

C – error p257 of agenda in Heritage report: 84 Queen St. should say Queen street not Ellis Rd in heritage attributes.

The error is noted and will be corrected as we continue to work on the draft statement with the Committee.