



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
JANUARY 17, 2024 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Page / 1

MINUTES

DATE: June 12, 2024

TIME: 7:00 P.M.

The June 12, 2024 Public Information Meeting was held on the above date and called to order at 7:00 p.m. via electronic participation and in-person at 7404 Wellington Rd 34, Puslinch.

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor James Seeley – Chair
Councillor Sara Bailey
Councillor Russel Hurst
Councillor Jessica Goyda
Councillor John Sepulis

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

CAO, Glenn Schwendinger – Absent
Interim CAO, Courtenay Hoytfox
Interim Municipal Clerk, Justine Brotherston
Interim Deputy Clerk, Sarah Huether
Junior Planner, Mehul Safiwala
NPG Planning Solutions - Jesse Auspitz

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE:

Innovative Planning Solutions, Nick Skerratt
Property Owner, Usman Aziz
Employee of Maple Haven Kennel, Parkash Venkataraman
Noise Consultant, SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd

3. DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None

4. PURPOSE OF THE PUBLIC MEETING

The Chair stated the purpose of this Public Meeting is to inform and provide the public with the opportunity to ask questions, or to express views with respect to the development proposal. The Councillors are here to observe and listen to your comments; however, they will not make any decisions this evening.

The Township requests that you notify by email planning@puslinch.ca or by phone at 519-763-1226 ext. 4 if you wish to be on record regarding this matter.

Please note the meeting is video and audio recorded and all electronic meetings are uploaded to the municipality's YouTube page. By attending this meeting in person or by registering to participate in the meeting by electronic means, you are consenting to have your likeness and comments recorded and posted on YouTube.



Please note, in accordance with the amendments to the Planning Act through Bill 185. The following parties may appeal this application to the Ontario Land Tribunal for a hearing:

- a) The applicant (a specific person, a public body, the registered owner of the property to which the by-law would apply)
- b) The Minister

Please note that if a specific person or public body does not make an oral submission at a public meeting or a written submission to the Township of Puslinch, before the decision is made, the specified person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Township of Puslinch in Ontario Land Tribunal.

In addition, if a specified person or public body does not make an oral submission at a public meeting or make written comments to the Township of Puslinch before a decision is made the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of the appeal before the Ontario Land Tribunal unless in the opinion of the Board there are reasonable grounds to do so. You may wish to talk to Township staff regarding further information about the appeal process.

The format of this Public Meeting is as follows:

- The applicant or agent will present the purpose and details of the application and any other relevant information.
- Following this, the public can obtain clarification, ask questions and express their views on the proposal.
- Members of the public are permitted 10 minutes each to ask questions and express their views. This time limit is imposed to provide each member of the public an opportunity to speak.
- Council will then have an opportunity to ask any clarification questions.
- The applicant and the Township Planning Consultants will attempt to answer questions or respond to concerns this evening. If this is not possible, the applicant or staff will follow up and obtain this information.
- Responses will be provided when this matter is brought forward and evaluated by Council at a later date.

5. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL FOR USMAN AZIZ D14-AZI CONCESSION GORE FRONT PT LOT 9 PT 3 PT 2 – KNOWN AS 6706 GORE RD, PUSLINCH

Mayor Seeley: The purpose and effect of the proposed zoning by-law amendment is to amend the Township of Puslinch new comprehensive Zoning by-law 23-2018 to permit the establishment of a dog kennel and dog breeding operation. The application proposes relief from the general provisions to allow the dog kennel and breeding operations to be located 97 metres away from an existing residential dwelling and to repurpose existing buildings on the subject land to accommodate the use of a dog kennel and dog breeding operation as outlined in the application.

I will now ask the owner or applicant to make the presentation.

Nick Skerratt: Good evening Mayor, Council members, staff and the public. My name is Nick Skerratt with Innovative Planning Solutions, here to speak on behalf of the owners in attendance for the lands municipally known as 6706 Gore Rd.

The purpose of this presentation is to provide an overview of the proposed development and zoning by-law amendment and receive feedback from Council and the public in attendance tonight.



The intent of this application is to facilitate the rezoning of a portion of the agricultural lands to agricultural with exemptions in order to permit and facilitate the development of a dog breeding use which falls within the kennel definition as per the current Zoning By-law.

The subject lands shown in red outline contains a total lot area of 7.8 hectares with approximately 307 metres along Gore Rd and 408 metres along the existing rail line.

The property contains open field agricultural areas, which were used for agricultural purposes and previously used horse paddocks with an associated horse track. Within this area are vegetated areas and the property is bordered by trees. Within the existing structures currently used for dog breeding kennel operations is a large barn structure, two medium-size sheds used for dog breeding, housing areas along with, two smaller shed structures used for storage.

There is an associated fenced dog run area, parking and two access driveways from Gore Road. There is one dwelling, which the owner operator resides in and contains an office area related to the dog breeding operation. Fencing and vegetated buffer areas separate the dog breeding kennel operation from abutting properties.

This slide provides a high-level overview of surrounding land uses from the subject property as you can see from this image there's a lot of farm and mature vegetated areas surrounding the subject property shown in red outline.

Further to the East are agricultural with some residential uses. South contains the majority of agricultural uses and a farmhouse; and West contains agricultural and residential uses. All agricultural and vegetated areas are to remain on the subject lands to ensure protection of natural features and maintain the countryside field.

This slide provides a high-level overview of the County Official Plan with respect to the subject property. The County Official Plan designates these lands as secondary agricultural shown in brown and core green lands shown in green. The secondary agricultural designation allows for kennel uses subject to Municipal Zoning By-law regulations to establish criteria for such uses. This means that no Official Plan amendment was required to establish a dog breeding kennel operation rather a Zoning By-law amendment was necessary to ensure the permissions and site-specific provisions.

Building off the policy framework of the Official Plan, the Township's Zoning By-law is an implementation tool containing specific regulations such as uses, setbacks, structures, parking requirements, height and landscaped areas. This slide shows the existing zoning of the subject lands. The property is currently agricultural and natural environment with natural environment overlay protection area. The proposed Zoning By-law amendment intends to rezone a portion of these agricultural lands to agricultural exemptions in order to facilitate the existing development of a dog breeding kennel use.

This slide provides a site plan concept of the entire property and site-specific area as part of the rezoning proposal. This property is intended to be rezoned in the central to the property and contains all existing structures and outdoor dog run areas. The dashed box area outlines the proposed site-specific zoning for the dog breeding kennel uses which is approximately 108 hectares in size with dimensions of 108 metres deep by 100 metres wide. All areas outside of the proposed site-specific zone will remain agricultural. The environmental protection areas will remain to be protected from development impacts. This image shows setbacks from the dog breeding kennel structures and the outdoor dog run areas from the closest residential structure located at 6700 Gore Rd. The purpose of this measurement is required for distance separation

from the kennel uses and residential uses. This is to ensure it is an appropriate distance from the kennel operation. The separation distance is identified as a site-specific zoning exemption and as part of the zoning proposal. A list of site-specific exemptions will be provided further in this presentation.

This slide provides greater detail to the area intended to be rezoned. The image on the left is a site plan drawing that provides details of the building location, setbacks, outdoor dog runs, vegetation, fencing, access driveways, fire routes and location of utilities. The image on the right is a rendering with reduced details to provide a clear illustration of the buildings located on the property and the overall area to be rezoned encompassing these structures within a 108 hectare area.

For additional context, operational function of the business is solely a dog breeding operation and no dogs or animals will be boarded on this property. The maximum number of adult dogs housed on the site for dog breeding purposes is 25 and will remain on the site permanently in line with the kennel by-law regulations. There are 44 dog pen areas within the existing structures and 4 outdoor dog runs. Permanent adult dogs will be housed in individual dog pen areas to ensure spacious, safe accommodations above industry standards. The remaining dog areas are utilized for infant dogs and for the ability to relocate adult dogs to clean spacious dog pen areas while other pens are cleaned. This ensures adult dog accommodations are continuously maintained for optimal treatment of animals. The facility is not open to the public which reduces or eliminates any traffic concerns. The only option for members of the public to access the property is with respect to purchasing of an infant young dog through scheduled appointments. This will occur between the hours of 10:00 a.m, to 6:00 p.m. Similarly, dog breeding kennel operations will function between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., and the goal of the operation is to adhere to applicable legislation including the Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law and Kennel By-law. The operator will provide employment of 5 full time employees with part time staff members in addition to the owner operator residing on the property, within the existing dwelling. This operation actively participates in partnerships with local College institutions to assist with student co-op programs.

Related to sound, any potential noise disturbances are mitigated through recommendations within the sound report. The inclusion of an existing tight board fence and vegetation along the West boundary to assist with visual buffering from adjoining residential properties allows for softening of existing structures and outdoor dog run areas. A professional noise consultant was retained to provide sound level evaluations of the use to residential properties. Through the noise study, mitigation measures were identified in line with operational criteria of the dog breeding kennel use. The resulting professional noise study concluded that the dog breeding kennel use is within acceptable sound level of abutting residential properties. It is important to note that the sound study has been reviewed by Township staff and subject to the Township peer reviewer consultant on multiple submissions to conclude sound levels are within acceptable levels. The closest portion of the dog breeding kennel use to an abutting residential property located at 6700 Gore Rd is slightly over 97 metres while all other portions of the use are located over 100 metres or more from residential use. From our understanding, no noise complaints have been filed with the municipality related to this use prior to submission of the Zoning By-law amendment.

The area noted with cross-hatching is Zoning By-law Provision A-SP# illustrates the area to be rezoned in relation to the entire parcel. The remaining portion of the parcel will continue to be zoned agricultural and natural environment areas.

This slide lists the proposed site-specific zoning exemptions to establish the dog breeding kennel use as a portion of the subject property. This list includes permissions to allow for kennel use, which include:

- dog breeding
- restrictions on the total size of existing structures, outdoor dog run area
- restrictions in setbacks from residential uses at 6700 Gore Rd to the dog breeding kennel use, and;
- all other regulations of Section 4.13 of the Township zoning by-law related to kennel uses be applicable.

To note, the additional zoning regulations are to ensure that the dog breeding kennel operation remain within the existing layout, size and area. It has also helped identify separation distances from residential uses. The Zoning By-law requires a 125m setback to existing residential dwellings from a kennel use. The proposal reduces the setback to 97m. Through submission of a noise study and the establishment of a tight board fence with vegetative screening from the residential uses along with operational timelines aligning with by-law regulations, the reduction in setback can be justified. All other provisions of the Zoning By-law have been satisfied with respect to parking, landscaping, building sizes, heights as well as all other provisions of Section 4.13 for kennel uses.

In conclusion, the purpose of the re-zoning amendment is to re-zone the subject lands from agricultural to agricultural site-specific to reflect the legalization of an existing dog breeding kennel operation on the subject land. The proposal is consistent and aligns with Provincial planning interests and policies, supports preservation and protection of cultural through the creation of an area of the subject property specific to dog breeding kennel use, protection and maintenance of natural environment areas, provides opportunities by diversifying the economic base within the countryside landscape and adheres to sound levels to residential uses.

It is our objective, subject to the Zoning By-law amendment process, to adhere to municipal licensing requirements for kennel operation as well as detailed requirements as part of the site control process with the Township. We have reviewed all comments submitted for this Public Meeting and we are willing to work with applicable agencies and staff to address any comments as needed.

This concludes the presentation. Should you have any questions that arise, council, staff or the public, please address them to myself or we also do have the noise consultant here to answer any of those specific detailed questions.

Mayor Seeley: Thank you for your presentation. I will now ask Jesse. Are you doing a presentation?

Jesse Auspitz: The applicant has covered everything that I would be saying. I know there were some questions that have come forward with respect to noise for the property to the South. If that is alright I can respond at the conclusion.

Mayor Seeley: Is there anybody in the gallery here that has any questions or needs clarification. Do we have any attendees?

Courtenay Hoytfox: Anyone in the virtual gallery on zoom. If you any questions or comments or would like to make a statement if you could just use your raise your hand function. It is just located at the bottom of your screen.



Mayor Seeley: I am a little confused (directed at Jesse). Do you have something you want to present to us or just you want to be available for questions from Council?

Jesse Auspitz: I would like to be available for questions. If anyone has a question, I could respond at the appropriate time.

Mayor Seeley: is that not now?

Courtenay Hoytfox: It could be now. This relates to a question that came up when this was in front of Council when we were ready to deem it complete. It was in respect to the vacant lot that is in the area and just how noise is going to be assessed, should it be developed into a residential unit later on. So, our planner Jesse has looked into that for us.

Jesse Auspitz: The noise study that was prepared in support of the application stated should a residential dwelling on the land to the South, in the Township of North Dumfries, the noise study prepared provided a recommendation noting that noise across the street would exceed appropriate limits for residential use. Keeping in mind that the property does not have a dwelling right now. What they suggested was, should a residential dwelling or other noise sensitive land use be proposed or constructed within the highlighted area of the vacant lot to the South (as shown in figure five) it must be reviewed to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated into the kennels operations to comply with the noise guideline limits at the new receptor location.

The question was related in terms of whether that could in fact be implemented. We do not have an answer at this point in terms of whether that can actually be implemented through the site plan agreement. The reason is that the site plan agreement deals with physical elements of the site so updating a noise study at a future date when the residential dwelling is constructed; I do not believe that can be implemented through the site plan agreement. I do want to point out that the Township does have a Noise By-law. Dog barking is not covered in the Noise By-law. I also looked at the Licensing By-law as it related to kennel operation. Your Licensing By-law does not require a noise study for an existing kennel operation, unless there is an expansion. (inaudible) I understand we are looking into that a little bit further and that it will be detailed in the staff report.

Mayor Seeley: Ok, thank you Jesse. Alright, Councils opportunity to ask any questions or any clarification.

Councillor Sepulis: I would like to understand the nature of the complaints, if any, that we received.

Courtenay Hoytfox: Certainly. Just to give a timeline from staff records, there was a pre-consultation that was submitted in December of 2021 for this use which was sort of the first step in legalizing it through a planning act application. There was a noise complaint that was submitted in October 2022 as the applicant was sort of working through the process. This did result in a notice letting them know that this had taken place and recognizing that we needed to work through the planning application process here. That was the complaint in relation to noise.

There was another complaint that was not noise related and it did prompt, as I understand, there was a visit from PAWS which is the Ministry's Organization but there was no concerns that were raised with that and likewise the Township has had their humane society that we work with, Cambridge Humane Society, go out and inspect the property as well by I understand



a veterinarian which is part of our process and again there were no concerns raised. There has been a conditional kennel permit that's been issued based on those types of inspections.

Councillor Sepulis: So with respect to the complaint that was received in 2022, was that before or after the fence was put up.

Courtenay Hoytfox: It was before.

Councillor Sepulis: Ok. Thank you.

Councillor Bailey: Just a follow up to Jesse. Just so I am clear on it. If the vacant lot was to be built upon, is there a trigger or is there a mechanism that gets triggered to then say okay now we need to look at a new noise study?

Jesse Auspitz: That is a question that has come forward. The noise consultant put forward a recommendation that the noise study be updated should a residential dwelling be constructed. The problem is, as you have pointed out, I do not know how that can actually be implemented and how the Township can require it. I do not believe that we can require that through the conditions of approval. However, I understand that the Township is looking into the matter a little bit further. There are other opportunities, if we wanted to include physical mitigation at the forefront. There is the opportunity to apply a holding provision at a future date as well.

Councillor Bailey: onto the vacant lot?

Jesse Auspitz: No, on the subject lands and that holding provision would ensure appropriate mitigation measures are put in place.

Councillor Bailey: Just so I am clear on the timeline as well. There was a pre-consultation in 2021 to legalize the kennel but how long has the kennel been in existence?

Property Owner: The kennel, during the process, I was not doing the breeding. When I bought the property in 2021, I had the dogs, some dogs, not the whole 25. As you mentioned it was a noise complaint in 2022.

Mayor Seeley: How long has the Township been dealing with this file? It is historic and it is further back than 2021.

Courtenay Hoytfox: No. It was, as I understand, brought forward through pre-consultation in 2021 and then subsequent to that we did receive those two complaints that were noted. One being noise and one being more about welfare, and both of those things were looked at and again the one on the side of welfare we've had like I've noted there's three separate groups in and we have signed off on this kennel permit. They've met the requirements of our kennel permit.

Mayor Seeley: But, what initiated that first pre-consultation? Was there a by-law complaint about a kennel? I feel that the original owners possibly had an operation going on and there might have been some complaints driven which then brought the original owners in to get zoning to legalize their use then these individuals purchased. Do you have an indication of how long the previous owners had dogs?

Property owner: A lot of the set up was already there and I was not aware of the noise complaint. I was under the impression that somebody felt that there is dogs there. I was walking my dogs outside everyday on the leashes. So, I was under the impression that



somebody complained that I had more dogs than legally should be but there was no complaint as far as I understand. I do not think we have any noise complaint it was more about the welfare which you said we have complied on three or four different times. We went to pre-consultation in 2021 and it got delayed because we were working with a different firm at that time so because of the delay and then there were some welfare people who came in and at that time because of the delay then we were issued to come and apply for the permit. It was those two notices, to my knowledge, they are not noise related. It was just about you started an application, you're not finishing it on time and we are giving you this time to come and finish it off.

Mayor Seeley: What the Councillor is trying to find out is how long dogs have been on the property because if, this is my interpretation of your question, because if regardless of when you are legalizing the use if dogs were there for 10 years and there was one complaint versus dogs came in 2021 and then you got the complaint that's where the Councillor is trying to get.

Property owner: Yes. The previous owner had the dogs there before. When I bought the property he had the dogs set up there. I bought this property in 2021 so probably they had.

Mayor Seeley: So it is difficult to determine exactly when but these individuals started a legal process in 2021 when they purchased.

Councillor Bailey: I just had one more question. I did not see any report from Source Water Protection in there. Is there a need for that with excrement storage on the property?

Jesse Auspitz: We did get comments from Source Water. There were no concerns.

Councillor Hurst: Maybe a couple follow-ups to the questions. Maybe it is hard to decipher from the briefing note. The distance from the kennel to the vacant lot, do we have a distance on that?

Nick Skerratt: I believe there is a residential property, not on the vacant lot, but beside it to the East. If we go back to the presentation, I think it is slide 6. That distance, from the closest point of the kennel operation, to that residential home which is a similar distance to the vacant lot is about 133 metres. So, you can see that there is a number of very small numbers here at the bottom where it says Gore Road. Those are distance specs from our consultant that shows the distance from any point of that structure. I know it is little blurry. You can see the bottom one is 146. The top one is about 133 and then 137, 145.

Councillor Hurst: So presumably, that would be a somewhat similar slightly less distance to the vacant lot?

Nick Skerratt: Relatively, yes. But we can easily produce that number should it be wanted.

Councillor Hurst: I think to just follow up on previous comments, that would be something I think just for full clarity in the process that would be a good thing to make note of and any potential building distance separation from the actual roads. Just thinking like the maximum distance one would potentially have a property and that is probably where my number goes if that is 125 then great, if it's less than that then that becomes a concern.

Nick Skerratt: Your Worship, just for clarification purposes. Hypothetically, if we took that lot that is in the other municipality and showed a hypothetical residential building meeting their setbacks and what the distance would be to the kennel operation is that correct?

Councillor Hurst: That's exactly correct.

Nick Skerratt: Perfect. We can do that.

Councillor Hurst: Thank you for that. Next question I had and maybe this is hard to answer but I'll attempt to ask the question. For the building owners, any future development plans within that property or is the existing infrastructure there suiting the needs of the business currently and into the future? I am just curious if you can share that.

Property Owner: We would love to invite you guys to come and visit the kennel. It is beautiful.

Councillor Hurst: I think that it is helpful to understand kind of what your future plans are. What I am hearing is the existing infrastructures there...

Property Owner: It should be more than enough for the dogs. I have three extra kennels which I used to just let them go here and there and to just watch them.

Councillor Hurst: Ok. Thanks. That is helpful. My third question, and maybe this is more for staff, if you can share and I get that the noise complaint potentially was pre your ownership on the property. Since the fence and the potential vegetation have been put in has there been any communication with the homeowner to the West of the property, this 97 feet, that this satisfies their concerns?

Mayor Seeley: Ms. Hoytfox can add some clarification to the noise complaint we received and the timing surrounding it.

Courtenay Hoytfox: So it was in October of 2022 that we did receive a noise complaint. There was likely a visit from our By-law Enforcement Officer around that time. That was the timeframe of it and I understand that was before the fence went in. With respect to the feedback during the public consultation from that particular neighbour, is it the one on the street here to the West that you are referring to Councillor Hurst?

Councillor Hurst: Yes the 10665.

Nick Skerratt: That is municipally 6700 Gore Rd.

Jesse Auspitz: The comments that we received do not all have municipal addresses. The only comment that I have that has a location speaks about two houses East and that was sent on June 1, 2024. There was another one there that had a noise complaint but I do not see a municipal address in that comment.

Councillor Hurst: I guess really what I was after is did the fact that a fence was erected and vegetation put in fully satisfy those concerns.

Jesse Auspitz: That is correct. However, I do want to point out there was a noise study done and as the applicant had indicated you would rely on that advice which is that noise would meet appropriate standards for the land that is to the East and to the West.

Councillor Hurst: That's good. I am good thanks.

Councillor Goyda: I just have one question. I know there is a noise study that is based on usually hypothetical things but should there be more noise than is anticipated where there is several complaints about noise is there a protocol in place?

Nick Skerratt: Yes, Your Worship. To Council's question, yes we have mitigation measures that we can employ should those noise evaluations go higher than what is anticipated through this study and we'd be more than happy to ensure that we meet those noise study standards. We want to ensure that this operation meets those regulations and contributes to the community. I also want to just circle back to any potential mitigation measures in respect to vacant property that we are more than happy to work through those detailed designs or mitigation measures through site plan control as a very detailed process with Municipal Staff and the consultant. We are happy to offer up any solutions that we can rectify. Given that it is a hypothetical situation on an existing farm operated land with existing mature vegetation and the likelihood of whenever that house may happen is very much up in the air.

Mayor Seeley: My understanding of this vacant lot is that we are not certain yet if we have the authority to impose some controls to mitigate the noise for the vacant lot and we are going to get more information on what is available to us and what is not.

Jesse Auspitz: That is correct and I just want to clarify. The concern is do we have to employ all the physical mitigation measures through the site plan process or can we employ those mitigation measures sometime in the future should a new dwelling ever be constructed. We can definitely employ physical mitigation measures through the site plan process but the question comes down to, can you have a condition that the applicant would have to update the noise study to employ mitigation measures should a new dwelling ever be constructed?

Mayor Seeley: The distance from the lot to South as a noise receptor are they using the property line immediately adjacent to the road allowance, are they using the centre of the property, where are they measuring to say that the noise may be at unacceptable levels to that lot.

SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd: I assisted with preparation of the environmental noise study. We modeled contours from each of the dog runs representing the barking at two different receptor heights. 4.5 metres representing a second storey window if it were a two storey dwelling or 1.5 metres which represents an outdoor point of reception or a single storey window. So that figure that you see in the report is an amalgamation of all those contours that you kind of see previously superimposed over the Northeast portion of that lot (Figure 6)

Mayor Seeley: Where on the lot? When you say 4.5 metres was it at road, or the back of the lot, middle of the lot?

SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd: We didn't assess. What we are showing is what the sound level would be at various locations within the lot where it exceeds the limit of 45 DBA.

Mayor Seeley: Ok where I was trying to go with this is I am struggling with putting restrictions on a possible business for a hypothetical situation. What I was trying to figure out is as a municipality if North Dumfries ever receives a building application for that property that our comments could be that we do not want a building within x amount of metres from the front of the property line to try to keep that separation from that business. What I am also hearing from Jesse is that once this is established there might not be as much authority to make them mitigate the noise to a house coming after the established business.

Jesse Auspitz: That is correct. May I add too one other point that you mentioned. I looked up the zoning for the property in North Dumfries. They are allowed a dwelling as a right so they wouldn't go through a public planning process if they were to construct a dwelling.



Mayor Seeley: So that's the issue.

Nick Skerratt: Your Worship, we understand that this is a potential concern in the future and we are more than happy to accommodate through mitigation measures should that ever happen. Even though there is no Municipal triggers but there are other avenues that we can explore that put restrictive covenants on that subject property such as a Section 118 which is registered on title that should that actually become a noise issue, mitigation measures will be addressed at that time. Those are similar to site plan control which is an agreement registered on title and can have conditions of approval. Should the municipality and their consultant not feel that it is an adequate way of regulating something hypothetical in the future, there are other legal means that we can register on title.

Mayor Seeley: Well I look forward to what staff report back. I am sure they'll take those comments into consideration.

Parkash Venkataraman: I just wanted to run through some timelines. The previous owner had this operation from 2011 and it is one of the reasons why the new owner decided to buy that property and as soon as the new ownership came into place and then the first complaint came in. There was no complaint from 2011 to 2021. As soon as new ownership changed the first complaint came in and then the mitigation was addressed with fencing and vegetation and all that kind of stuff. Because it was not legalized and so the new owner felt the importance of running the kennel with legalization and proper things in place. This has been going on for the last three years and it is really affecting the business and we request that Council and the Mayor have some consideration. He is going to create a lot of economic development. As our planner mentioned about five full time jobs and also helping with the local college and universities here. I just want to mention about the timeline and the request you to consider. Thank you.

Mayor Seeley: I am pretty certain they had some sort of operation there historically because I actually thought I knew the owners and you guys walked in and I am like those are not the owners I knew something had changed. Anyways, back to the script. Is there anything further from Council?

Councillor Sepulis: Just a question when would this rezoning application go forward to Council.

Courtenay Hoytfox: So Mr. Chair, I don't have the timeline in front of me but we would work through we think it is July 10th it would be a 90 day process period. We are sort of reaching the end of that so we are going to try to maintain those timelines.

Councilor Sepulis: Great, thank you.

Mayor Seeley: Last chance, is there any further information the applicant wishes to provide? I declare this public meeting closed. Council will take no action on the proposal tonight. Staff will be reporting at a later date with a recommendation for Council's consideration. If you wish to receive further notification of this proposal please email or call planning@puslinch.ca or by phone 519-763-1226 extension 4 or contact Township staff during regular business hours. Only those persons who leave their names will be provided further notification. If you wish to speak to the proposal that is brought before Council in the future you must register as a delegation with the municipal clerk prior to the meeting.

Thank you everyone.

Adjournment:



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
JANUARY 17, 2024 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Page / 12

The meeting adjourned at 7:43PM