



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

MINUTES

DATE: April 16, 2025

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

The April 16, 2025 Public Information Meeting was held on the above date and called to order at 7:30p.m. via electronic participation and in-person at 7404 Wellington Rd 34, Puslinch.

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

ATTENDANCE:

Councillor John Sepulis – Chair
Councillor Sara Bailey
Councillor Russel Hurst
Councillor Jessica Goyda

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Justine Brotherston, Interim Municipal Clerk
Sarah Huether, Interim Deputy Clerk
Mehul Safiwala, Junior Planner
Lynne Banks, Development & Legislative Coordinator
Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions
Julia Salvini, Township Transportation Consultant, Salvini Consulting

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE:

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting
Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD
Cathy McNabb, 40 Badenoch St.
Lucy DeJonge, 7501 Wellington Rd 36
James Dors, 7515 Wellington Rd 36
Mike Van Hee, 7519 Wellington Rd 36
Daniel & Elizabeth Sisolak, 7537 Wellington Rd 36
Carly Seeley, 24 Back St.

3. DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

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 and would like to be notified of future meetings and the decision of this meeting.

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 specified 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 specified 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 to the 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.
- The Township Planner will then provide a brief presentation.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

- 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.

5.1 Zoning By-law Application D14-WDD Main St Inc. – Part Lot 31, Concession 8, Township of Puslinch

Councillor John Sepulis: This Public Meeting involves an application by WDD Main St. Incorporated, Zoning By-law Application D14-WDD-WDD Main St Inc. – Part Lot 31, Concession 8. 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 rezone the lands from Urban Residential, Future Development 2 and Natural Environment zone to Urban Residential, Site Specific Special Provision zone and Natural Environment zone with an environmental protection overlay. I now would like to call the owner/applicant to please approach the table to make a presentation.

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: Thank you. Good evening, everyone. As I said, my name is Kaylee Robbins. I'm a planner for the applicant, so we are here tonight for the second public meeting for this Zoning By-law Amendment application. I see some familiar faces in the room here. So, the intent of this meeting is really not to go through everything that we've already presented. We've tried to scope the materials that we are discussing today, based on the feedback we received from the last public meeting which, just to kind of summarize, was mostly related to traffic and transportation concerns. That's what we're focusing on in our presentation. But we are available to ask questions regarding other matters of the application.

So, just as a quick overview of kind of some items we discussed at the last public meeting. The intent of this Zoning By-law Amendment application is to provide increased housing opportunities in the Morrison community. We are trying to propose something that's in keeping with the fabric of the community. That's where you see one to two story dwellings, approximately 2,500 to 3,000 square feet. As part of this application, we are also proposing protection of the natural heritage features and their functions for the long term through the zoning provisions. We're also proposing improvements to the existing street network. So



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

this would include upgrades to the existing Ochs Street to design that per Township standards and then we're also looking at relocating the current retaining wall at the Ochs Street and Badenoch intersection to improve those current sight lines, which we know are a concern, and then we are proposing a scale of development that can be supported from the private servicing perspective.

This might be a bit tough to see on the screen. So perhaps I'll just speak to it. So, the green area is the environmental protection lands. The yellow is the proposed lot fabric. The blue is the proposed stormwater management facility, and then the purple is a new municipal street. With the call outs that you can't quite see on the screen. Here is some additional information regarding the transportation network. Based on the initial development of this concept and then after the last public meeting we did go back to MTO to discuss an access to Highway 6 with them. It is unfortunately not an option. It is a controlled access highway, and they do have significant concerns with any new access to Highway 6 and that aside, it would also traverse the existing wetland which the Conservation Authority would not be supportive of in encroaching in that existing wetland.

We also reviewed the Main Street access. As that was a comment that came up at the last public meeting as well, and in conversation with our traffic engineer, and I'm sure he'll provide comments tonight as well. Those sight lines are also deficient because of the crest of Badenoch. And there's also issues with the proximity of that access to the Highway 6 and Badenoch intersection. Working with the Township, based on the comments received from the public meeting, there is a potential to convert Back St. to a 1-way street. We don't anticipate traffic for this development to travel on Back St. Obviously, it can happen. That's not what we're anticipating. We do anticipate traffic traveling onto Badenoch, turning onto Ochs directly into the development. But based on the concerns and the potential for using that street, I think the Township is exploring, converting that to the one way, and I don't know if there's been a decision on that. I can obviously let the Township speak to that a little later.

Our traffic engineer has assessed the sight lines at Badenoch based on surveyed speed of the street, and the sight lines do meet the requirement with the shifting of the retaining wall. So through this application we understand there are existing concerns with the road network, and with this application we are proposing improvements to provide a better road network for existing residents as well as future residents, with the improvements to Ochs St. and the relocation of the retaining wall. That is really the presentation tonight. I obviously am available to discuss other components of the application. But I wanted to focus on the traffic items as coming out from the last public meeting. Thank you.

Councillor John Sepulis: Let's turn it over to Jesse Auspitz, the Township Planning Consultant, to present his report.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: This application, as mentioned, is related to 23 hectares of land in northeast of Highway 6 in Morriston. The subject land would be accessed from Ochs Street, which is located southeast of the site. Located northeast of the Main St. entrance and also connects to Badenoch Street east. This slide that shows in terms of the application process. This slide outlines the development process regarding the proposal. The 1st submission was received by the Township in March 2023 and there were also 5 subsequent submissions since that time. Notice of complete application and public meeting were issued on January 31st, 2025. Minutes of Council indicate and direct staff to hold an additional public meeting for the application. There was already one public meeting that occurred March 5th, 2025, this is the second public meeting that has been required as per Council minutes.

Through the process we've have been working collaboratively with the applicant to address various comments as they have been received. We're not providing a recommendation report at this time. But at a future date there will be a recommendation report outlining the planning opinion.

As indicated, the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment would facilitate a subdivision consisting of 21 single detached dwellings, a stormwater management facility, and also natural environment lands and public street, as was shown. There is a concurrent application of draft plan of subdivision that's being considered by the County at this time, as well to actually facilitate the creation of these lots and blocks. There are various environmental features on the lands that have been identified, including non-provincially significant and unevaluated wetlands, significant woodlands, regulated and non-regulated watercourses and the regulated watercourses also include floodplain.

The surrounding lands are residential and commercial uses, and directly northwest of the subject lands are residential parcels of varying sizes. I'd like to turn it to the next slide, please. This is the location which I identified. So, we have heard several comments from the public to date and I'll provide a summary as well as some of the considerations regarding those comments. These are basically the bigger comments that have come from the public, and we are hearing them as we're going through the process.

The first comment is regarding the location of the access. As indicated, there was two options that were requested to be considered, Main St. as well as Highway 6, both of them have issues. Main St. is less than the 20 meter as required for a boulevard. Ochs St. does have that required boulevard with the paved portion may have to be reevaluated, but if Main St. were to be used, you would have to take some land, some private lands. Highway 6 is not an option because it's a controlled access.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

There were concerns regarding sightlines. A sightline analysis was completed in accordance with the requirements of the Township and the County. The assessment confirmed that sufficient sightlines are available conditional on the realignment of Ochs St. and shifting of a retaining wall. And that retaining wall is on Ochs just up the southwest corner. The location of mailboxes was raised as a concern as well. The location of mailboxes has not been determined, however, through the process, and recommendations for conditions of approval, we will be considering location or requesting locations that do not encourage access onto Back St.

The length of a public road was raised as a matter. Specifically with respect to a comment, was brought up with respect to safety. The Chief Building Official and the Fire Chief don't have concerns regarding the length of the road. The reason is because there's two water reservoirs being proposed, one in front of Lot 18 and one across from Lot 16.

There were comments regarding dark sky compliance. The Township Zoning By-law has provisions requiring lighting to be confined to the vicinity of the lot. So, that's lighting on the private lands. Regarding lighting on the public lands, the Township doesn't have specific standards on that. Then the last concern or comment that came up was regarding the internal grade of the roads. We know that Public Works is not concerned, has reviewed the application, and does not have concerns regarding the grades of the public roads. So that's what I have.

Councillor John Sepulis: Okay, great. Thank you very much. We'll turn it over to the public now to ask their questions. What I'd like you to do is come forward to the stand, state your name and address for the record, and then ask your questions or provide any comments. I understand that there's two members of the community, Kathy McNabb and Lucy deJong. You have a presentation ready, so we'll ask you to come first and do your presentation.

Cathy McNabb: Thanks very much everyone. I'm Cathy McNabb. This is my neighbor, Lucy. My husband, Hans Jurgensen put this together after we left the last meeting last time, where we were really talking about traffic and that sort of aspect of all of this and he went and did a little more just digging on his own, because he was just really concerned that the Back St. access. We call it Back St. I know it used to be called Ochs St. there, and that's actually one of the points that I wanted to make. This Council has always been really great about, you know, listening to residents and our concerns about danger and liability and that sort of thing, and that used to be called Ochs St., and, we had like ten streets in Morriston, and two of them had the same name. We live right at the corner where this retaining was, and we would constantly get people knocking on our door, looking for Number 12 Ochs St. or number whatever, and there was none. There's two of us there, and it was sort of comical at first, and then it became annoying. And then it became a problem when it was an ambulance one day, and that's when we called Council at the time and said, can we do something about this? And right away they got on it,



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

and they changed it to Back St. So that was a great example of the proactivity that we've always appreciated from Council and listening to our concerns.

So, that's why Hans put this together tonight. Now. Unfortunately, he couldn't be here. He hadn't been so he couldn't get out of, so he asked myself and Lucy and her husband Mike, to kind of listen to his concerns. He put it together last night. So really, this is all of our concerns. Our goal with it is really to just express why we don't think the Back St. access is a good idea, based on our observations of living there for over 20 years. I'll just go through it here. But so, we're talking about the 21 houses of unknown size. We did find out last time, and, as you said, 2,500 to 3,000 square feet. But as Mike asked last time, could they be bigger? And the answer was they could, so could there be ARU's in them? I understand it's a right in Puslinch. They could, and home businesses are going to be allowed from what we understand, so that just generates in a lot of traffic. None of this is about the size of the house, the look of the house, or any of that. There's no NIMBYism at all. It's nothing to do with that. We agree that development is good, but just don't access it there.

So, the sightlines create a blind intersection. You say that that's been addressed, well, it seems like we have some conflicting information. So, I'd love clarification. The narrow portion of Back St., the east/west part of the back is not suitable for two-way traffic, and one way is just going to clog it up even more. The grade of the proposed road. Now you've addressed that. So that's great, if that's all good. And then the access and entrance, when the 401 is blocked, which, as we know, happens regularly.

Hans took a bunch of pictures. So, here's the intersection as it is with the offending retaining wall, and as it is, it is very, very bad which we all agree moving that retaining wall will give us much better lateral sight lines, but it won't do anything about seeing through the hill. It's the hill. We can't see through it coming or going. So, there's the location. It's 50 kilometers an hour is the speed limit going through there further to the east just before you start coming into the town, it's at 80 kilometers, and you can see it's a big, wide, open road. People go 80km, and they don't really rarely slow down to 50km. They just keep going because the road environment is built and looks like it is an 80 kilometre road. So, that just illustrates that.

And again, this is not about that we don't like the look of the houses or anything. It's just the trend in Morriston, and Hans went out and took pictures. They're all the houses seem to be large. They're not small cottages. They're built for lots of people, multi- generational, additional family members, nannies. So it's not about size, that doesn't matter. It's the number of vehicles and cars. So the bigger the house, the more cars, the more residents, the more traffic. And that's the concern for us. He's got a few pictures of the samples of the trend, and I see they've all got 4 car garages, 3-4 cars, as Hans says. As Han says, they all have 3 car garages, except for the ones that have 4 car garages. So, when you add up the cars, if you say 3-5 cars per home times 21 homes that is another 63 to 105 cars. Now then, you add in the ARU's, which as we said they are a right, basement apartments, that is another 10-40 cars, and that is just the residents, and



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

then we have non-resident traffic. So, what we are asking is that if you cannot just look at the little traffic study.

Lucy says that the traffic study was done before there was a camera at the end of her driveway for overnight and sure there is not a lot of traffic on that corner there. But now you add all of this in. So, we are just asking if Council can consider looking ahead, not just at what might be there now, or when 21 homes are put in. Because when you add in all of that plus the non-resident traffic you have. They've got a daycare. Now you have got, they are dropping off, people coming and going, dropping off the kids twice a day. You've got a tax consultant or hairstylist. There are more people coming and going. Amazon deliveries, food deliveries, PSWs. That is a lot of traffic on that little road and the reason that we are concerned about that is it is a very dangerous intersection, Back St. and Badenoch St. It's got that hill, that blind hill, and you can move the retaining wall, but you can't move the hill.

This is some speed data that we collected. Now, I understand you have some as well. But this is Han's email from Wellington County and you can see the average speed was 66 kilometres an hour with the 85th percentile at 76. So that is a lot faster than the 50 that is posted. The minimum sightlines for 50 km/hr is 130 metres. Hans had Pasquale Constanza from the Wellington County Road Department come out and do a sightline measurement and at that intersection he saw that it was 121 metres. So, it is not sufficient. That is at 50 km/hr and they are not doing 50 km/hr. This study was from a couple of years ago, but they have not slowed down, I think, anecdotally. We can tell you that it is not slow as of yesterday. I think that this is sort of the basis of our concern right here. You can't see through the hill. You can move the retaining wall and see across, but you can't see through it either coming east to west or west to east, especially in the winter, especially when it is slippery. It is just an accident waiting to happen literally, especially when you in all that extra traffic coming and going in that one area. So, that is the crux of our concern.

You can see now nosing, you have to nose way out before you can even start, hope to look up, especially if you want to make a left. If you move that retaining wall that will help but the hill is right there, so I don't understand how that will help. Maybe you guys could clarify that for us. Here is the actual Back St. There is no way that can be a 2-way street. Now you've addressed the possibility of turning that into a 1-way street. But how are you going to enforce that? Are you going to have OPP sitting there and catching people? We have asked for it often on the hill and try to catch the speeders and we rarely have OPP presence there. I can't imagine them sitting around Back St. trying to catch people going the wrong way, there would be no place to park. It is all traffic. Whichever way you put it, all the traffic is down, you can't even go around the 12 homes that use this area now we make it work tucking into one another's driveways and it's fine. You can't add another 30-40 cars in there and hope for that to work and school buses. We have both seen school buses trying to get down there, especially in the winter, especially when there is snow piled there backing up into Lucy's driveway. It's just not set up for what I believe you propose to happen there. That is our concern.

You have addressed the grade. This was another concern that we had. So, we took a picture of the grade. There, now, you have addressed that and said your public works feel that they can get a snow plow up and down there, and again we'll leave it to your expertise for that. With all



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

that traffic, now we have got a whole lot more people trying to make a left hand turn there when the 401 is closed. That would be the same at Main or on Back. That is why our real goal is we were hoping that we could encourage you to do the best you can to work with the MTO and look at Highway 6. You have said that you have asked. I don't know how persuasive you can be. I know that I have contacted our MPP and haven't gotten anywhere but that was because of the election going on. We do know you would have some more clout with them than we would. Understand no one wants to hear about the by-pass anymore.

There are the traffic calming measures and if this could somehow be proactively future thinking and not just going the cheapest, easiest route but be more forward thinking for our community as a whole. We would really appreciate it if you could find out exactly what the MTO's issues are with it. Why can't we come up with a more creative solution. Possibly a roundabout, a stop light, it is doable. That would be our first ask. We are going to request MTO to confirm in writing that they are denying access off of Highway 6. We would like to ask them to confirm why Main St. is not a consideration. The proximity to Highway 6 was expressed to us and it does not have the sightline requirements but either does Back St., so why is one better than the other. At least Main St. doesn't have that hill. We are requesting Township study Back St. and Main St and assess which access possesses the least risk or liability to the Township. It comes back to the Township with the Ochs St. example when we had an ambulance show up at our door. They realized this is a problem and they fixed it. So, realizing that another 50-60 cars coming and going on Back St. is a potential problem, can you just go ahead with that and say well, that's it. We would like you to at least look at the two and maybe pick the worst of the bad. We do not support the one-way traffic on Back St. It is really a bad idea. It is way too narrow to do two-way and one-way is going to clog everything going down the north/south portion of Back St. The one-way east to west makes Main St. an unofficial entrance anyway. If it is one-way, can you confirm compliance with the OPP to come out and look. If Back St. is approved as the entrance than the east/west portion should be upgraded to two-way on Back St. and I don't know how you are going to do that. But I think that is the least that could happen so it is not funneling along Badenoch. If the Township does not approve the development proposal using Back St. as an access based on the increased liability the Township will incur, can a developer or OLT force the Township to take the increased risk when another access is possible with less risk to the Township? That is what we are discussing. Knowing the risk, knowing the sightline is not within the guidelines as Pasquale Costanza indicates to us the other day, can the Township knowingly say, oh well? I don't think that is what you guys do but that's the concern we had. Thank you very much for listening and answering many of those questions.

Councillor John Sepulis: Thank you very much for the presentation. I would like turn it over to Kayly to answer some of the questions.

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: Thank you. I will clarify a few items. You mentioned ARUs. We are not seeking those permissions so there would be no additional residential units permitted in these homes so these will be a one-unit dwelling. ARU's are permitted in other dwellings in the municipality but we are having those provisions removed. Hopefully that alleviates some concern with traffic within this development. It is just one main unit in the house.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

The size is proposed to be 2,500-3,000 square feet. It is regulated by the zoning provisions and we are not seeking any other changes to the zoning. We are not seeking a reduced lot coverage to have a bigger house. We are not seeking reduced setbacks to your lot lines. We are not seeking an increased height. The only provision we are seeking is a reduction in the lot area which does not impact the size of the dwelling. We are not looking to change what your property is zoned. The same would apply to these dwellings.

I understand there were some concerns with the sightlines and I will let our traffic consultant, Will, comment on that. I think you mentioned the sightlines and speed limit coming east on Badenoch because you do not have the same crest coming eastward into Morriston.

Enforcement of one-way traffic. I cannot comment on the enforcement of that. I think it does take some time for residents to realize it is one-way and comply with that.

I will pass it over to Will for his comments.

Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: Lots to digest. Thank you very much for your comments. In terms of trip generation. You mentioned about the number of units and how many cars per unit. We need to take it back in terms of the analysis that we do for a traffic impact study is based on A.M. and P.M. peak hour. Weekday A.M. and P.M., the commuter peak hour and that is the traffic that we go out and capture. Someone mentioned the camera set up. It was there to capture the A.M. and P.M. peak hour. So we recorded the traffic during the daytime starting at 7 in the morning, go till about 7-8 o'clock at night and from that data we captured the highest hour of volume in the morning and the highest volume in the evening. We use the ITE, The Institute of Transportation Engineering Handbook in terms of calculating the anticipated trips that are going to be generated by a single-family home. In this case that's what we do to put the additional traffic onto the intersection that we studied in the case of this traffic impact study for the peak hour A.M. and P.M. So, I understand that there could be more than 4, you know, vehicles in the house. It all comes down to how much of that traffic is actually leaving in a single hour and in the peak hour. If there were people coming in and out, I mean, yeah, there could be a lot more traffic throughout the entire day, but we always look at the capacity of an intersection for the peak hour when the highest volume of commuter traffic is on the road network.

In this case here with Back St. and Badenoch, the capacity analysis is telling us that there is a lot of capacity. There isn't a lot of existing queuing that would be anticipated. It is all going to be within acceptable parameters. Hopefully that kind of answers your question about trip generation. It could be, you know, more traffic throughout the entire day in and out, but in terms of the capacity of that intersection based on the geometry of the intersection there is the capacity there in terms of what it can accommodate. Way more traffic than what we put on it. We don't just look at the existing traffic and put the site trips onto it. We look into the future. We add a



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

quarter growth, 2% per year to the traffic that is there now, to anticipate additional growth. Then that is the analysis that we do in the future as well. There was nothing identified in terms of queuing or delays that would be unacceptable to the operation of that intersection.

With respect to sightlines, which I think is the next big comment here, the access onto Highway 6, we did reach out to MTO via email to request their comment on the possibility of having an access there. They emailed back that based on their review, we don't satisfy the spacing guidelines for any access on Highway 6. Their preference is always when there is acceptable access off of lower tier roads that municipal roads would be the preferred option for an access point and not directly onto an MTO road. And I think there, you know, because, it's not just as simple as putting in an access on the Highway. 6. There would be other requirements, i.e. left turn lanes in order to just get traffic in and out, not to stop traffic on Highway 6 if you were coming south and wanted to turn left into the development. There just isn't enough right of way and room there to accommodate additional lanes, and so MTO access guide spacing guidelines are not satisfied. There is acceptable access off of lower tier roads. So, they're saying no to Highway 6.

Then they looked at both Main St. and Back St. and their position was that Main St. also doesn't meet their spacing and their access spacing guidelines from the intersection. And so they're saying their preferences is for Back St. to be the access to the site.

I think you mentioned and we're talking about the one-way system and trying to keep it two-way. Or we're trying to keep traffic from this development to go on to Main St. because of its if it's narrow existing pavement. If we were to make Main St. the main access right and not Back St., that would force all of this traffic from this development to use Back St. to get to Main St. to exit onto Badenoch.

Cathy McNabb: Wouldn't the best direct line be down Main St. into the subdivision?

Will, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: No, it has to still come from this location where it intersects with Back St. today. But then they would all have to travel along Back St. to get to Main St.

Cathy McNabb: But there was on your drawing that it could go right into the subdivision from Main St. What's the problem with that. Is it going right into? Doesn't the property go all the way along?

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: We explored this option with the conservation authority. There's no policy that allows for the development in the wetland. We would be completely removing the wetland within this property to accommodate that road, and I believe the Main St. right-of-way is also not 20 meters, so there would be land acquisition required to meet Township standards there.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Cathy McNabb: And is that a deal breaker?

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: I can't comment on the Townships acquisition policies or abilities, unfortunately.

Cathy McNabb: So, in order for Main St. to be considered an access, not having to use Back St. to go to the right of way at the north/south Back St., and into the subdivision with that road you showed, you would have to acquire some lands and get wetland permits from the Township and from the conservation authority? I think, continue in the site analysis in a second.

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: Yes, the way we look at both Main St. and Ochs/Back St. are, you know, there's constraints with each. So, we had to really weigh the constraints with each, because we did consider both. Main St., it does not meet the MTOs spacing requirements. It requires destruction of a wetland. It requires acquisition because I believe the right of way width is not 20 meters.

Whereas Och St., the boulevard width is 20 meters. We can upgrade it to Township standards, and we can shift that retaining wall to ensure better sightlines. There's no destruction of wetland with that option. Then the Main St. also does not have sightlines. So, there's quite a few items that need to be considered here. So, when you're weighing both options, Ochs St. does have less constraints and less concerns, really, from a traffic perspective and environmental perspective.

Will, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: The issue when going through the wetland when there is an alternate is getting permission to go through the wetland when there is an alternate access to that road. That's why, when we were looking at it, it was ideal to not use Back St. at all. We didn't assign any traffic to Back St., and the goal was to make the Back St. and Badenoch intersection as best as it can be to make it the ideal and optimal and recommended sort of access to and from. It's the most direct access to and from the proposed site which would then preclude anybody from having to use Back St. and Main St. So that was the point I wanted to make.

So now, coming to the sight lines. We did, as our traffic impact study shows, go out there and did a sightline assessment measurement from the existing Back St. and Badenoch intersection. We also did one from the Main St. and Badenoch intersection, and you were, I think you mentioned 130, I think, from our table the County's is 135 is the requirement based on the posted speed limit of 50 km/hr.

So, it's based on the posted speed limit. So, the requirement that the County has doesn't look at the existing speed of cars, etc. So, it is based on the posted speed limit. It's 135. When we went up there and did our assessment of the Main St. access. I believe we were coming in at about 128-129. So almost it's the same crest in the road that affects the



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

sightline from Back St. that is affecting the sightline from Main St. It's just in the opposite direction. Right? So, I say, we're pretty close, you know, 135 or 129 almost satisfied.

The sightline assessment that we did from Back St. We did it two ways. So, we did it field measurement, which for us is always the preferred. From our field measurement, I think we're getting 135 or 136 right about there.

We also took a look at the drawings of Badenoch St. that we requested from the County, from the last time they went out and did their roadworks along there, where they actually did reduce the crest in the in Badenoch St. and improved the sightlines along Badenoch St.. Based on those drawings, now they're not as built drawings, which means they're not shot as a survey drawing after the construction they would be construction drawings. So, these are the drawings that would have been used when they went out there to reconstruct the road and the sightline measured on the drawing comes in at about 129 or 130. So, you know, it's just about matches with Main St., however in the field measurements came in about 135 from the existing Back St intersection.

In our opinion, the sightlines are slightly better from the Back St and Badenoch intersection than they are from the Main St. intersection. Now these are taken from the existing alignment of Back St. So, one thing to keep in mind is what we're proposing in terms of the reconstruction of Back St. to town standards is also shifting of that road slightly to the to the east, further away from the crest. So, it does improve the sight lines by about 10 meters or so from where the new location of any vehicle that's sitting there waiting to turn will be further away from the crest of the road. So, because of those two things, we're saying that the sightlines from Back St. and Badenoch are better than they are for Main St.

I heard your comment about the speeds along the road. So, we had a speed study done on Badenoch St. Now our speed study was done west of Back St., pretty much towards the top of the crest of the curve, because that's the traffic that we're interested in seeing the speed. It is what was leaving the town coming east, right towards Back St., because that's the vehicles that are traveling over the crest that we that you know the motorists need to see in order to be able to make that left turn. Looking to the west there's plenty of sightlines. We can see vehicles, so even if the speed of a vehicle approaching from the from the east is 80 kilometers or 100. There are sufficient sightlines there to be able to see that vehicle. So, our concern is with coming over the crest and being able to see that traffic.

So, I believe you had mentioned the speed study that was done was between Currie and Back St. which is east of Back St. So, it doesn't surprise me that it's coming in at higher speed because that is when it turns into 80 km/hr, and a lot of the traffic in both directions is either coming in and slowing down by the time they get in, but they probably don't slow down until they get into the town, or they're speeding up. So, I understand, you know, coming from that where there is very



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

little side friction and no driveways, that the speed you know would be higher. Our speed study, as I said, was done to the west of Back St., and we were getting about 59-60 kilometers as the 85th percentile speed limit. We did the speed study over 24 hr. period and that's what we use then, for the design speed of our sightline assessment.

Cathy McNabb: Is all of that data and reports available for the public to see?

Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: We do mention in the speed study what the results were, and it's in in our TIS and in the appendix and the sightline figures are all in the appendix as well.

Cathy McNabb: And that is all available to us?

Councillor John Sepulis: Yes it is.

Cathy McNabb: Okay, I will dig that up.

Councillor John Sepulis: Great, anything else to add by Jesse.

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: I don't have anything else to add.

Councillor John Sepulis: With respect to the ARUs. It's a provincial matter, and the comment was made that then they don't have to allow it.

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: ARUs, they are a provincial matter. However, they're a provincial matter on urban areas that are serviced. These lands do not meet that criteria because they're on wells and septic systems. The Township Zoning By-law permits ARUs, however, the exception that would apply would be that ARUs would not be permitted on these lands, and part of the reason why we were considering that was because of the density of the lands being less than an acre.

Councillor John Sepulis: So, let's turn back to the audience. Are there any other members of the audience that would like to come up, ask a question. Please come forward, state your name and address. You will have 10 minutes to speak.

Mike VanHee: Hi Mike VanHee, 7519 Wellington Rd. 36. I just wanted to clarify. Sorry it's been an interruption. But it doesn't just turn to 50 right there. There is a sign there just before Back St. But it's actually quite further down almost at the 401, basically, right?

The other thing I wanted to just mention was, you know, the sightlines that you guys are talking about. Those are minimum requirements. So, when we're talking about minimum



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

requirements, you guys are playing around with a few meters here, there, like it's, you know, like an average or whatever. But it's their minimum requirements. I think that's a bad idea in general to kind of be skirting along the minimum requirement because it's basically scraping the bottom of the barrel when it comes to building code for anything, you know, like I wouldn't want my house built at minimum requirements just because it barely passes code. I wanted to know that it's built with a little bit of thought and what not right?

The other thing is your average speed is still above the posted speed limit. Right? So, we're dealing with minimum requirement sightlines. But then, when it comes to speed, it's not, you know. We know that people aren't driving 50 kilometers an hour, right? And so, it's been a major problem for all of us on that road. Especially when there's a school bus and stuff like that. You know what I mean. But anyway, I would just kind of leave that thought there, you know what I mean. We don't want to be kind of doing things to the minimum.

The other thing I wanted to mention was we have 21 lots. You want to reduce the minimum lot size for houses that are built. Most of the homes that are there that you guys are making reference to are like to the community. You know, they were built when these pictures were taken 100 years ago. Most of those houses are 1,000-1,200 square feet. They're old century homes and things were a little bit different back then, right? So, the majority of the homes that are being built now are built to a higher standard. A lot more people, a lot more consumption. I think 21 houses is a lot. It's a lot of traffic, it's a lot of water, it's a lot of water coming out of the ground and water going back into the ground in the septic beds. It's going to put a lot of strain on the water table and everything, in my opinion. I know we didn't really bring it up last time. Notice the size of the plots. But I think that's a major thing that is kind of being a little bit overlooked with traffic. It's all coming together with, you know, the amount of houses that are going to be there. The house size, I think, is great. There is a lot of major big homes there, right? But keeping with the community I think one acre is small enough for a home of that size.

The other thing I wanted to mention was Highway 6, which you said, was controlled access. I was wondering when the bypass does come, there won't be a highway anymore, will it? So, will it still be controlled accessed? Will it still be a point of conversation? Or is this just, you know? That's all I wanted to know. But it's a lot more you guys have to dig in and kind of reach out to MTO about that. They've already procured all the land for this bypass. So apparently, it's coming. But you know what I mean. It's going to really change the way everything happens in Morriston.

Councillor John Sepulis: Okay, thank you. So, I was wondering if you can address Morriston bypass?

Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: Yeah, I mean, I don't know if the MTO, once the bypass gets constructed, is going to downgrade this from access control. They do maintain access for control to a lot of their highways, even though it's not, you know, a higher order like highway



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

states would be. Just for this exact purpose, they want to be able to maintain control over permitting access onto their roads. But I can't speak for that, but I think we don't know when that bypass is going to be in, and they're trying to make a decision now for this to be constructed now. Then they're using that for their decision making.

Your comment about the minimum requirements, right? It's a fair comment. And I think, the one thing that we got to take back here is that we are not proposing this access because we have a bunch of frontage along Badenoch, and we can decide where the access is going to go. I would agree we would locate it as far as possible, but in this case it's an existing intersection, and we are choosing the best option that we have available to us in terms of the access. We're also going above and making it better than it is today, both with the retaining wall and with shifting it further away from the crest by moving it over to the east to improve it. We're not just scraping the bottom of the barrel, as you said, to the best of our ability, in terms of how much room we have to be able to move it. So, I just want to make that comment.

Councillor John Sepulis: Okay, thank you. Jesse, could you comment about our hydrogeologists?

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: Yeah. So, the hydrogeologist has reviewed the application. They did not have concerns with respect to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. There were technical conditions that were intended to be addressed through the future plan of subdivision, one of the items that they wanted was using potentially the lower aquifer.

Councillor John Sepulis: Thank you. Okay. Any other members of the audience who would like to come forward and speak or ask questions? Yes, please come forward. State your name and address please.

James Dors: Yes, James Dors, 7515 Wellington Rd. 36 or Badenoch St., beside Lucy. I don't recall the last meeting that we talked about Back St. being a one-way and the traffic study with the increased traffic that will be if you make that a one-way. Coming out onto that intersection is now going to be coming in Main and up, back and out again. That's going to increase, and mailboxes are all there. So, the whole community on the east side of Highway 6 or most of it comes to there for the mailboxes. That's going to increase the traffic coming up to that intersection as well. Really just wonder if we can right the answer.

Will Maria, Traffic Consultant, GHD: The short answer is, no, I mean, we didn't update our traffic impact study. That was just something that was discussed at the last meeting, and then, I think, went back to the town and was just a point of discussion to say, is that possible? Would it help? And I think the comment that I made earlier all that traffic, if we made that a one-way street that would be redirected to Back St. and Badenoch. I, personally don't have an issue with capacity at that intersection. As I said, it's very low right now, in terms of volumes, or even the



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

projected future. I am confident that we can relocate that traffic, and from a capacity standpoint that intersection would not fail.

James Dors: We talked about the speed, and I think we have to be forward thinking if we're going to do something about reducing the speed there, because you know that it's more than 50 going both directions always. Like they're going past my driveway at 60 miles an hour at times for sure, coming out of the village. If you're going to reduce that speed, it's going to have a direct effect on the other Ochs St. and Currie. because when you slow the traffic down there, people are going to go through Currie and Ochs St., and you're going to increase the flow of traffic there. So, whatever happens on Badenoch and 36 to reduce speed is going to have a direct effect on Currie and if a traffic light goes there, I guarantee Currie through Ochs especially when the 401 backs up that's going to become the main thoroughfare to Highway 6. So, then you'd be looking at another light on Highway 6 again. That's where it's Currie that comes up there. So, I think we have to look at the bigger picture than just that intersection, because whatever we do there is going to affect the other ones. It's guaranteed to happen, it is human nature.

Councillor John Sepulis: Thank you very much. That's a very good point for us to take into consideration. Are there any other members of the audience would like to ask questions? No? Okay, then, let's go online. See if there's any attendees watching the meeting that would like to provide comments or ask questions. Carly, please state your name and address for the record.

Carly Seeley: Hi, It's Carly Seeley, 24 Back St. in Morriston. Just a couple comments, and then some follow up questions. I just want to state that I certainly don't support Back St., turning into a one-way.

Between 3-4 buses come down our street morning and after school, and turning that into a one-way with any other cars in addition to it, with the 21 houses being put in, is just going to cause a huge backlog. That is the first comment.

Ten the access off of Main St. Just a few points to touch on that. I think that the developers just looking for an easier, less expensive option for access. There's ways that you can cross over the wetlands. Yeah, it might cost them more money, but it's certainly an option. But, as far as the safety goes, keeping the access coming onto Back St. from Badenoch. I can't even count the amount of times, coming out onto that street, and I'm driving the speed limit, I'm cautious, I'm aware of what people are driving, coming, going eastbound from 6. They've come, maybe a kilometer, and they're already exceeding the 50 kilometer speed limit at that. To judge whether you're nosing out past the retaining wall, whether it's moved back or not



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

the speed people are driving at the crest of that hill is just a huge safety issue. So, I think that if a study, a separate study, is done for both entrances on Main and Back St. by the Township, that they'll find some different answers than what we've currently been told this evening. Then the speed study that the planners were speaking to, 24 hours isn't enough to give us a proper answer on speeds coming along that section of the road.

As a previous comment was stated, people are driving 100 km/hr coming westbound because they've started at 80, and they've barely slowed down when the 50 sign starts at the other Ochs St. But coming in from east, going eastbound from the light, even though it's a 50 km/hr zone, they're exceeding it tenfold and then with that crest you know you nose out there, and every other time I pull out, someone has to go on to oncoming traffic, and it's a huge safety concern not to mention if there's any snow or any other conditions that are going to impede any stopping abilities. So just wanted to make those comments. I think I've covered everything.

Councillor John Sepulis: Do you have any specific questions?

Carly Seeley: Maybe just a question on if it's a possibility of the Township creating an access study for both Main St. and Back St. to show the feasibility with it being a little bit more safe and efficient from a Main St. entrance versus the Back St. entrance. They're coming in slower from the lights. There's no crest on the hill to enter on Main St. They don't have to expropriate anybody's property to appease their entrance way. So, I'm just wondering if the Township might be able to do something with that.

As well as Main St. being a partial access. How is it partial? It's either not an access or it is an access. How is it able to be a partial access?

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: I'd like to respond to using Main St. as an access. I think that I think Main St. has been thoroughly considered. There are significant constraints with Main St. Specifically, the width of the right-of-way is well below standard, as well as crossing a wetland is a major environmental and natural heritage concern that would be very difficult to challenge.

The crest does impact both Main St. and Ochs St. I don't see any value, from my perspective, to ask for another study for Main St., given those constraints already. I will let the traffic consultant experts respond as well.

Carly Seeley: We're just asking you to consider the sightlines compared to Back St.

Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: I think I would just reiterate from our measurements that the Back St. and Badenoch intersection had better sightlines, albeit slightly



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

including the relocation and shifting of that road further east away from the crest than the existing Main St. does.

I'll just leave it at that.

Carly Seeley: And the Township can confirm that there's better sightlines at Back St. versus Main St.

Councillor Russell Hurst: We have our transportation consultant here. I wonder if you could comment on that as well.

Julia Salvini, Township Transportation Consultant, Salvini Consulting: Sure. Thank you. We have been looking at iterations of this plan and options for this plan, not all of the information that we've reviewed is in a report. My recollection is that when we were having this discussion about Main versus Back St., we did actually sit down and look at the this. I think we met and looked at the sightlines online. The applicant's transportation consultant looked at those sightlines. They shared them with us. They're not in the report. I say that just to say we have actually done the comparison. It just doesn't show up necessarily in a report, because we've been having all these discussions over time.

I'm satisfied. I've reviewed the analysis that's been done for Back St., and I'm in agreement that the sightlines there are appropriate. They meet the standards, and the one thing I would say about the standards is there are factors of safety built into those standards. They're not bare minimum standards. They're the standards that we go to when we say, at what point do we say, this is going to be okay. These are the standards that we go to. We're meeting those standards and they're reputable Transportation Association of Canada standards. They've been around and we work with them every day.

I'm not concerned. I hear what everybody's saying, and I'm not trying to be dismissive of what we're hearing about the sightline concerns. But, we use these standards and we go out in the field and take these technical measurements at times when we're unsure by just looking, we can't tell by looking in the field.

You can't just stand there and say, Is it enough? Because it feels uncomfortable. We're hearing from you. When you make that turn from Back St. onto Badenoch, it feels uncomfortable. It feels unsafe sometimes, but that's where we go to this guidance. These guiding documents that give us the kinds of guidance that we need to help make decisions. And they tell us, based on very scientific calculations, how much space we need and how much time we need for various vehicles to turn. And these are the guidelines that are guiding our decisions, and we are able to make those meet those guidelines with the two changes that we've both highlighted.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

So, one has to do with the retaining wall, and that has more to do with where the car sits relative to the road, and less about the length of the distance it has to do with what's in your way, and how close do you have to go into traffic. But the second thing is, the road is being shifted over a little bit. So, it is going to improve the sight distance in that location and make it a little bit more comfortable than what you have today.

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: Do you mind if I add a comment? I think it's important to highlight at the very beginning of this process, without any consideration of cost, we truly did evaluate both accesses equally. There wasn't any sort of we prefer Back St. or we prefer Main St. Originally, we had hoped to provide one through road, so an access on Main and an access on Back, so you didn't have a roundabout in this development. This was absent of any cost considerations. From that and all the input from the technical experts, Back St. is the less limiting access point. So, I just want to make that clear that from the very beginning we did try to evaluate both equally. There wasn't a consideration of will this cost more. We really wanted to provide the most appropriate access to this proposed development.

Councillor John Sepulis This is not being documented, is there a way of taking the notes and providing a document to show the analysis you did with respect to Main St.

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: There is some in in the traffic study, but we could look back at the various submissions we made. I believe there's part of the common response matrix. We submitted updated letters so we can make sure. I believe all of that would be accessible. But we can. We can provide that information.

Councillor John Sepulis: Any other questions. Carly.

Carly Seeley: Just to confirm the reports between access comparing Main and Back St. Is that what you just said you'd be able to give access to? We'll be able to see both. The comparison between the entrances to both based on sightlines.

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: Unfortunately, it's not like one report or comparison document that says, this is Main St. versus Ochs St. And within the traffic study, we have submitted that it reviews all the transportation aspects. So, we can provide that to you and any addendums that were submitted after that.

Carly Seeley: If there isn't exactly something comparing the two, can a study be done that compares both accesses?

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: I don't think at this point it's appropriate to be asking for another study to compare both the accesses. If the



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

information is available. I think it's appropriate use that information. However, we know that Main St. is significantly constrained and has significant technical issues with providing an access to the site. I don't think it's appropriate at this point to ask for that for another sightline analysis.

Councillor John Sepulis: Thank you, Jesse. So that's all this information e coming forward to Council and Council can make a decision at that time. Whether or not we, we would want a face to face up comparison between the options, 2 options, but certainly provide the data that you have, or have that sufficient information to address the concerns of the President.

Any other questions Carly?

Carly Seeley: No, that would be it. Thank you.

Councillor John Sepulis: Okay. Are there any other members of the audience who would like to ask questions? This is the for the virtual audience. Daniel, would you please state your name and address, and what your questions were.

Daniel & Elizabeth Sisolak: Hi, there, it's Daniel Sisolak, and as well, Elizabeth Sisolak. Just a shout out to Cathy and Hans for the great work there. We own a property, 7537 Wellington Rd. 36. We back onto the subject property, and we understand where the houses are subject to be built. But, where can we find information, or what information can you tell us about the rest of the property particularly, the wetland area, the forested area, again, that our property abuts up to.

Is there any future development that's going to be going on there?

A secondary question to that is: are there any alternative access points other than the two that are under consideration now that might be feasible, based on further research, investigation and study based on the overall proposal?

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: Thank you. With regards to the EP lands they're identified in the official plan of the County of Wellington, as I believe their terminology is environmental protection. We are also rezoning those lands to environmental protection as well. They are now but we're actually enlarging that area through the zoning application. This will provide for these lands' future protection. If they were to be developed, they would have to go through this formal rezoning process. I don't see that happening. There's no intent to develop these lands. We are zoning them for their long-term protection. So there's no development anticipated for these EP lands. With regards to access, there is no other access



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

options other than the ones we've discussed here tonight that the property doesn't have access on any other municipal right of ways other than those discussed tonight.

Daniel & Elizabeth Sisolak: Okay. So no plans for that to become park space, that is something we had heard when we were actually looking at severing the lot that we currently own there?

Councillor John Sepulis: We had a, there was a, report before Council today. Staff asked whether or not the Township should assume those lands. We basically deferred the decision until we have some more information. So, the jury is still out on that. Certainly, that's an option to consider that Township may take some ownership of those lands or may not. A decision has not been made.

Daniel & Elizabeth Sisolak: Okay, thank you. We do also have concerns that we always did when we lived beside the lot there for many years with children, like this speeding along there is ridiculous. So, 60 you know by the time you're getting into like Back St. there. But where we lived, motorcycles, it was ridiculous. It's one of the reasons we moved, actually.

I can also say back in the day, and we're going back, probably 20 plus years ago,, I put a proposal together with a group within the community, and we were able to get the traffic speed reduced to 50 km/hr because of all the complaints we got for the speed on that road from all points, and I know you've done studies. And I know you've done different areas within the geography of the area. But I can tell you, with 100% certainty, the road speeds on that highway are over the top.

It is a danger zone, and something needs to be done to mitigate it, because it is a serious problem and living there for 25 plus years we saw it grow over time based on the growth of the community. Thank you for your time.

Councillor John Sepulis: Thank you for your questions. Are there any more questions from the audience?

Justine Brotherston, Interim Municipal Clerk: Not currently. If anyone would like to speak, if you could please use the raise hand function. You'll find out at the bottom of your screen.

Councillor John Sepulis: Okay, let me take one last over of the audience here. Anybody else have any other questions or comments before we turn it over to Council?

Okay, so it's a Council's opportunity to ask any clarification questions regarding this application and start with you, Councillor Goyda.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Councillor Jessica Goyda: No, I don't have any questions. We did have this same report on our Council agenda earlier today, and Council had an opportunity to ask questions to the consultant at that time. I would also encourage you all here to take a look at the video once it's posted from the discussion that took place earlier today. But I don't have any additional questions.

Councillor Sara Bailey: Thank you. Yeah. I guess it's just a question for a traffic consultant. You had mentioned the term acceptable queuing at Back and Badenoch. I'm just looking for clarification on what is acceptable queuing at an intersection.

Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: I think we look at what excessive queuing is going to impact. So, if the queuing from Badenoch extended back towards Back St., or the intersection or block a significant access point onto the road. We would say that is excessive. But in this case there is one or two vehicles at the most queuing into in terms of our future analysis. So, when I say, there was no excessive queuing or no queuing concerns at that intersection. That would be from Back St. onto Badenoch or alternatively, a left turn from Badenoch onto Back St. If they just weren't able to make it because of the volume being so high that would queue up then, traffic on Badenoch as well. If traffic couldn't get around a vehicle that was stopped trying to turn left. which we didn't find either, in our analysis.

Councillor Sara Bailey: Okay. So, I'm picturing new development traffic leaving in morning. Coming on Back wanting to turn left to get out to the 401, so would it be acceptable queuing to have, say, 10 cars waiting to turn left onto Badenoch?

Our analysis doesn't show that there would be 10 cars waiting.

Councillor Sara Bailey: What was the number?

Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: In terms of volume or in terms of queuing?

Councillor Sara Bailey: Well, the queue is going to depend on the volume of traffic trying to leave.

Will Maria, Applicant Traffic Consultant, GHD: Not necessarily. It depends on the volume and gaps of traffic on Badenoch. So, we can have a lot of traffic, but little traffic on Badenoch, and everybody can get out with the gaps that exist, or we can have a lot of traffic on Badenoch, and only two cars trying to get out, and they would be both queued because they just wouldn't be able to get out.

Councillor Sara Bailey: And then, I guess, just for the public and for clarification.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Let's say, the time comes for a decision for Council to make on whether to accept this application or not. And we're not comfortable with the access point. What happens? What's the process that would happen then after a denial of an application?

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: The applicant would have the opportunity to appeal the decision. Then it would go to the Ontario Land Tribunal. At this time, there would have to be reasons that are given. At this time we have had the application circulated to technical consultants, and we also had the application circulated to various review agencies. So basically, a lot of the technical comments and the planning merits based on provincial policy are what would be considered in the decision of the tribunal.

Councillor Sara Bailey: In favour of the applicant?

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: A decision might not necessarily be in favour of the applicant. But what would happen is that the application would be looked at to see if it complies with matters of provincial interest. If it's consistent with the provincial planning statement in the County and the local official plan. In making the decision the Tribunal would be looking at the technical comments that have been provided. So that's what would be the focus. There have been technical studies completed, and there have been technical comments that have been provided on the applications.

Councillor Sara Bailey: Okay. So presumably it would go through approval. Based on the studies that have been done, and all the technical reviews.

Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions: I can't predict how it would go, but those would be the considerations, the technical comments and consistency and conformity with provincial and County and local policies.

Councillor Sara Bailey: Okay, thanks for that answer.

Councillor Russel Hurst: Actually, thank you to members of the public. I know this is time out of your busy lives to come here and delegate. So just to thank you because I think I find value just hearing your personal experiences with this whole process.

A couple of questions from my standpoint. So, Kayly, I know you noted the size of the potential properties being 2,500 to 3,000 square feet. I'm assuming the maximum would be 3,000 square feet, with houses, presumably. Was there any maximum number of garages in the proposal? I didn't see that, but maybe I missed that. Is that a criteria that the developers looking to maintain?



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: Through this process there's no assigned minimum or maximum garages, so the homes would be constructed based on the applicable zoning provisions. And we aren't proposing to change those. So whatever kind of limiting factors you have in your Zoning By-law for all properties, I think in Morriston they're all very similarly zoned. Those would apply to these sites as well.

Councillor Russel Hurst: Okay, that's helpful. I was just curious what those were. I think the rest of my questions are probably more for the County Road aspect, and I'm not sure where these go. But crest management within Morriston. Is that even a viable option like I realize saying that it's like a massive undertaking to modify the elevation of a road in town like that. But I'm curious. And I look at that as well as you know as potential calming measures that can be implemented on the County Road as a mitigation aspect to reduce the risk level, if you will.

Councillor John Sepulis: I think you covered that all during our meeting. Yeah, by the Council. So, staff took that away. Fair enough?

Councillor Russel Hurst: Yeah. And I guess my last question is more about Lot 1 on the map. I'm just curious where the access is for that one. Where would that access be?

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: It would have a driveway directly from Main St.

Councillor Russel Hurst: Okay, exclusively. I think that's all the questions I have.

Councillor John Sepulis: Does the applicant have any further information they'd like to provide.

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting: I don't, just thank you for the discussion, and I hope we were able to answer some additional questions tonight and looking forward to the next steps in the process.

Councillor Jessica Goyda: One of the questions we heard tonight, or comments was about the naming of Back St. versus Ochs St., and even at our Council meeting earlier today this was an item of clarity, but none of us are really clear as to whether it is Back St. or Ochs St. Given that there is another Ochs just down the road. I'm wondering if maybe we can all agree here today on it being Back St. and calling it Back St. from here, moving forward to avoid confusion, moving forward in this planning process, I'm not sure if that's something that we can agree to. But I guess that is just my comment. Moving forward I will now refer to it exclusively as Back St. for everyone.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Councilor John Sepulis: Okay, meeting concluded. 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 on this proposal, please email or call planning@puslinch.ca or by phone at (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 as it is brought before Council in the future, must register as a delegation with the municipal clerk.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
APRIL 16, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34