



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

**MINUTES**

**DATE:** March 5, 2025

**TIME:** 7:00 P.M.

The March 5, 2025 Public Information Meeting was held on the above date and called to order at 7:00p.m. via electronic participation and in-person at 7404 Wellington Rd 34, Puslinch.

**1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER**

**2. ROLL CALL**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:**

Justine Brotherston, Interim Municipal Clerk  
Sarah Huether, Interim Deputy Clerk  
Mehul Safiwala, Junior Planner  
Andrea Reed, Township Engineer Consultant, GEI  
Angie Mason, Township Hydrogeologist Consultant, Wellington Hydrogeology LTD.  
Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions

**PUBLIC ATTENDANCE:**

Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting  
Ian Robinson, Applicant Ecologist

**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](mailto: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



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

- 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.
- 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 Hurst:** 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:** Good evening, Council and members of the public. I am an associate at Weston Consulting, and I am here representing the owner, WDD Main St Incorporated. The purpose of the meeting tonight is to receive feedback from Council as well as the public and take that back and evaluate the comments and move forward with a recommendation when the timing is appropriate.

The purpose of the meeting is to describe the Zoning By-law Amendment application and the associated proposed development. On the screen you will see the timeline of the application. Over the last few years, we have been working with Township staff, Conservation Authority and the Township peer reviewers to evaluate the technical merits of the application. We have worked through numerous comments. In January of this year, the Council deemed the



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

application complete, which means we provided the technical requirements for the application. Last month, we went to a Planning and Development Committee meeting in which we presented the application to the Committee. They were in general support of the application and provided comments for Council to consider in their evaluation of the application. Today, we are at a Statutory Public Information Meeting in which we are looking to seek feedback from the public on the Zoning Amendment application. We will take that back and evaluate those comments and determine which revisions, if any, need to be planned.

Just a quick overview of the subject property. It is located in the southeast quadrant of Morriston. It has an approximate area of 23 hectares with frontage on both Back St and Main St. It is currently vacant with naturalized lands. You have residential uses abutting the site to the North. Mixed uses at the intersection at Badenoch and Highway 6.

This is the proposed development. You will see with the yellow, those are the proposed lots. We are proposing 21 lots which will accommodate single detached dwellings. The lots range in size from 0.19 hectares to 0.36 hectares. Predominantly, they are about half an acre, so 0.2 hectares. We are proposing a new public street in accordance with Township standards. So that is a 20m right of way. We are also proposing a storm water management block to provide for stormwater quantity and quality control. Then you will see the greatest portion of the site is still environmental protection lands. We are protecting those environmental protection areas with appropriate buffers to the features which I will explain more later on in the presentation.

Based on some comments we received at the Planning Committee; we wanted to provide images of the design inspiration for the future dwellings. The actual design of the dwellings will be much later in the process but these are the renderings that are being contemplated at this point. They will be 1 to 2 storey dwellings. Size will be approximately 2500-3000 sq ft, that is just approximate. There was a comment or two about lighting. Any exterior lighting would be in accordance with the Zoning By-law and the owner would be looking to achieve dark sky confined lighting.

Also stemming from the Planning Meeting, there was a desire to see the potential landscaping. This is just a conceptual image of the Township standard for the right of way, 308m asphalt two-way drive by all and then sod either side and a sidewalk based on Township comments.

Under the County of Wellington Official Plan, the lands are designated Residential, Core Greenlands and Greenlands. The Core Greenlands designation represents the wetlands on the site, generally speaking. The Greenlands designation generally represents other features such as the woodlands. The yellow in the image represents the Residential designation which does permit a variety of housing types but does have policies to protect the low-density character of the community which we have taken into consideration with the proposed development being a low-density development.

This is the current Township Zoning By-law. There is a small portion of the site zoned Urban Residential with the large majority of it zoned Future Development, in contemplation of future development on this site. It also has an environmental protection overlay and a Natural Environment zone which is generally representative of the wetland area.

This is the proposed Zoning By-law. We are proposing to re-zone the Urban Residential portion of the property with a special provision to reduce that minimum lot area. The requirement is 0.4 hectares (about an acre), we are seeking to reduce that to just under half an acre (or 0.19 hectares). We are also looking to establish a special provision for the storm water management block to ensure that block is only used for storm water management. We are also looking to permit home based businesses in the future dwellings. So that would be for example a private



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

home daycare or in that realm. Home based businesses are permitted in any residential lot in the Township so we are looking to just maintain those provisions. We are rezoning a large portion of the property to Natural Environment with that environmental protection overlay to ensure the long term protection of those core features on the site.

Since we are seeking a reduction in the lot area, we wanted to take a look at Morriston and what the existing lot fabric is. The blue on the image is essentially all the lots that are half an acre or less. Our proposed development is quite consistent with what you see in the community. There are many lots that are around that size on private services and we are looking to maintain consistency with those existing lots.

This slide is a list of some of the technical reports that the project team has prepared and submitted to the Township and it has been reviewed by Township staff, Conservation Authority and the Township peer reviewers.

The first was an Environmental Impact Study which was done. We do have the ecologist on the call to answer questions. The green on the slide is the significant woodland, the blue is the wetland. Within the woodland and wetland area, predominantly the woodland area, there are species at risk that have been identified, special concern species and endangered species. The environmental impact study does evaluate and identify what species are on the site and does provide an assessment of the potential impact of the development on those features. We are providing a minimum of 10 m buffer to the woodland and species and at a minimum a 15m buffer to the wetland. So based on that and the location of the proposed development the study does conclude that the development does not have a negative impact on the ecological features or their functions and they will be protected for the long term especially with that rezoning portion of the application.

We have also completed a Hydrogeological Assessment as part of this application. Five bore holes were installed on the site with three monitoring wells and three test wells. These instruments tested the ground water quantity and quality. They did find that the groundwater quality did meet the health-related drinking water standards and the groundwater quantity is capable of meeting the residential peak demand for the future development. I understand there were comments from the Township peer reviewer hydrogeologist, and we have addressed those comments about groundwater quality and quantity.

We also had a civil engineer as part of the project team who prepared a Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report. Within their report they noted that these lots would be serviced by private wells and private septic systems. The private septic systems will either be advanced or standard treatment systems. The Functional Servicing Report also details stormwater management facilities which is planned to be a dry pond and will outlet to the Bronte Creek tributary.

We also prepared a Traffic Impact Study which assessed nearby intersections and the road network and the traffic generated from the proposed development. At the beginning of formulating the proposed development we had considered an access from Main St. Originally, we wanted to provide a continuous road network through the development from Back St to Main St to have two points of access. Unfortunately access from Main St is not a viable option due to disturbance to the wetland. Main St itself is not the appropriate width and the location of Main St did not meet the MTO minimum spacing requirements. So, with that, the access is from Back St. The traffic consultant identified a need to assess the sight lines come from Back St onto Badenoch St. The traffic engineer assessed turning left onto Badenoch St from Back St and if those sight lines were available to them. They assessed a passenger vehicle as well as a snow plough. There is sufficient sight line available that meets the requirement. The requirement is



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

125m and there is 136m available for sight line conditionally on a relocation of the existing retaining wall on Back St. This retaining wall is on County property so we would work with the County to have that relocated. As part of the application, the project engineer did provide further drawings with a minor adjustment to that location of that retaining wall moving that slightly to the south. We understand that the condition of Back St is not per Town standards so as part of the engineering package they did show improvements and upgrades to Back St to be in accordance with Township standards. It is my understanding that the road is the width that it is needed to be, it only needs to be reconstructed in accordance with Township standards. The traffic impact study also assessed the traffic generated by the development and found it to be negligible on the impact of the community. The study intersections will also be operating at satisfactory levels when looking at a five or ten year horizon. There is sufficient parking spaces provided for each dwelling. We are anticipating two at a minimum but are anticipating there may be more parking spaces for each dwelling provided.

In summary, the Zoning By-law Amendment application is to permit residential development of 21 new detached dwelling lots on a municipal street. We are proposing the conservation and protection of significant natural heritage features and functions. We have assessed groundwater quality and quantity. The traffic assessment reviewed both sight lines, traffic as well as access. It is our opinion that the proposed development is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, conforms to the County of Wellington Official Plan and does provide for housing opportunities in the community while protecting the environment and providing upgrades to the existing road network.

Thank you, and I am available for questions.

**Councillor Hurst:** I would like to invite Jesse Auspitz, the Township Planning Consultant, to present his report.

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** Good evening, my colleague has answered many of the questions with respect to the application for Zoning By-law Amendment. I will attempt to skim through some of the matters that have already been raised. As noted, the application pertains to the Zoning By-law Amendment for approximately 23 hectares of land located northeast of Highway 6 in Morriston. The subject lands are accessed via Main St which is located southeast of the site and Ochs St located northeast of the Main St entrance and connects to Badenoch St E.

This slide outlines the development process with respect to the proposal. The first submission with respect to the application was received by the Township in March 2023. Five subsequent submissions were received since the original application was submitted. A notice of completed application and public meeting was issued January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2025 and that was based on Council deeming the application complete on the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Council meeting.

The minutes of Council indicate that "Council direct staff schedule an additional public meeting for this application in order to give the public an additional opportunity to provide input on the application." This has not yet occurred.

The Applicant is working to address comments through the review process. A recommendation report will also be presented to Council at a future date.





THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

To rezone the Subject Lands from Urban Residential (UR), Future Development 2 (FD2) and Natural Environment (NE) Zones to Urban Residential Site-Specific Zones (UR(spXX) and UR(spYY)) and Natural Environment Zone (NE) with an environmental protection overlay.

The nature of the development has already been indicated by my colleague. A concurrent application is being considered by the County of Wellington for Draft Plan of Subdivision with respect to the Subject Lands.

This slide shows the location of the Subject Lands which has already been discussed. I just want to outline some of the features including non-provincially significant and unevaluated wetlands, significant woodlands, regulated and non-regulated watercourses including tributaries of Bronte Creek. The regulated watercourses also include associated floodplain.

Surrounding land uses consist primarily of residential and commercial uses. Directly northwest of the Subject Lands along Back Street and Badenoch Street are residential parcels of varying sizes. It was pointed out that many of those parcels are actually smaller than what is being proposed in this application. Located west of the Subject Lands along Queen Street is the Morriston Central Business District which includes various commercial uses including cafes and restaurants. The Subject Lands abut the Old Morriston Baseball Diamond to the north and open space and agricultural uses to the east.

This slide identifies the policy context with respect to the Subject Lands. I would like to note that the County has two objectives under Section 3.3 of the County of Wellington Official Plan, as follows:

- to encourage growth in primary and secondary urban centres;
- to support the achievement of complete communities in primary and secondary urban centres and hamlets.

The lands are zoned Urban Residential Zone (UR), Future Development 2 Zone (FD2) and Natural Environment Zone (NE) with an Environment Protection Overlay. The Urban Residential Zone applies to approximately 1.1 hectares of land south of the Old Morriston Baseball Diamond. The FD2 zone applies to lands not impacted by natural heritage features.

The UR zone provides for and regulates all forms of housing (including single detached, semi-detached, duplex, and townhouse dwellings)

The FD2 Zone which applies to a large portion of the undeveloped lands provides for and regulates the orderly development of the unbuilt residential areas of the Urban Centres of Aberfoyle and Morriston.

The NE zone provides for and regulates flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features, within the Township. The EP zone indicates that physical features are present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals.

These are maps showing the extent of the Wellington County Official Plan designations and the Township Zones and overlays.

This slide identifies what the requested Zoning By-law Amendment is specifically. The portion in yellow is proposed to include single detached dwellings, home businesses and private home daycare. It also proposes to reduce the minimum lot area from 0.4 hectares to .19 hectares. I would like to point out that additional residential units were applied for previously but based



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

on comments that we received through the Township consultants, that request has been removed.

The Urban Residential Site-Specific Zone also would permit the Storm Water Management facilities as well as reduce the minimum lot area from 0.4 hectares to 0.3 hectares. The NE zone would permit conservation uses.

There is a concurrent Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision for the Subject Lands. This application is presently being reviewed by the County. (Notice of Complete Application was provided December 13, 2024.)

With respect to circulation, I would like to note that technical comments regarding the Zoning By-law Amendment have primarily been resolved. There are ongoing matters that are being discussed with respect to home businesses and how to address that to make sure that there are no negative impacts to groundwater and that is an ongoing discussion.

We are continuing to review the application and will have a recommendation report for a future Council meeting. This will be once all planning matters have been satisfied or resolved.

**Councillor Hurst:** Thanks Jesse. Jesse's presentation will be available on the Township's website.

We will now move into the in-person public opportunity to share particular comments or ask questions. Are there any persons in the gallery that have any questions, require additional clarification or information that wish to present their views on the proposal? If yes, just raise your hand and we will have you come down to the chair here and share your comments and questions.

**Hans Juergensen:** Hello, my name is Hans Juergensen. I live at 40 Badenoch St. I am not going to mix words, I don't like the proposal. It's not just because you are going to screw up my entire house that I built 20 years ago, that's beside the point, we do need housing. I have nothing against the proposal to build new houses. My issue is with Back St. I'd like you to drive down Back St and turn left like you mentioned and see it work. It won't. I am not saying this lightly. You cannot turn left on Back St in the winter, you can barely do it in the summer. With new cars nowadays you can't step on the gas or the tires spin. If you stick your nose out even without the wall being there and a car comes over the hill towards the east, it is dangerous. We've had accidents there. There are going to be people hurt. There could be people killed there. People come over that crest and they are speeding. Turning left out of there has gotten so questionable that we have had to turn around and go down Back St and leave on Queen St because we cannot turn left. Everybody turns left on Queen St with the very short distance between there and the lights on Highway 6. This access point to this property is not good. You said it is a 124m minimum and it has 136, I didn't measure it. Maybe you're right maybe you're not, that's not the problem. The problem is it is not safe to do it. I have had my car in reverse and make sure there is no car there because it is all very tight. Even if you remove the wall, it does not take into account the crest of the hill. I would like to really know if the access to Highway 6 isn't the wiser move in the potential future if the by-pass is put in anyways. Your lands already have access to Highway 6. I know it is a long shot but if you want to incorporate the calming measures that you guys want to do with Highway 6 going through Morriston. Why isn't the traffic from this community that is going to be built, which I think is a fine idea, access a less dangerous intersection. If this is going to happen, and you have the hill and the dangerous intersection, is it the liability of Puslinch? It is a Township Road. That is my



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

concern. I just think that it is a dangerous place to have 21 houses coming in and out of there. Most of them are turning left. Once you turn left you are going to the 401, Hamilton or Guelph. 90 % of the time I am turning left.

**Councillor Hurst:** Thank you for your comments. Are there any points of clarity that you would like to make?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Yes, that is fair. I have went and turned left a few times from that intersection. It is something that we have looked at very closely as part of this application and has been a major constraint to the development. We do not want to hold up a development of 21 houses because of this one item so we have worked closely with the Township traffic consultant. Their concerns seem to have been addressed with our traffic report that does assess it and does propose a new retaining wall and we are looking at making those upgrades so that it is not only safer for the proposed residents but also for the existing residents. It does not fix the crest of the hill unfortunately, but the shifting of the retaining wall and bringing Back St to Town standards hopefully does provide an increased level of safety for future and existing community members. I will take these comments back and see if there is something more we need to evaluate. The crest was part of the evaluation by our traffic consultant and the Township traffic consultant, but I will take these comments back.

**Hans Juergensen:** Thank you. Is the access directly to Highway 6 off the table and if so, why?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** We don't have lands as part of this application on Highway 6.

**Hans Juergensen:** Doesn't your little notch go right to Highway 6?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Those ones are not part of the application. It is all wetland so we did not explore that option.

**Councillor Hurst:** Any of the Township Consultants, are there any points of clarity that you can provide?

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** No, I do not have anything to add.

**Councillor Hurst:** Any other members of the public?

**Mike deJonge:** My name is Mike deJonge, my wife Lucy is here with me. My address is 7501 Wellington Rd 36 so our property is going to be also directly impacted. I have a few questions. Has this application considered where the mailboxes are going to be?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Per the Draft Plan of Subdivision application we have requested comments from Canada Post. I don't believe we have received comments from Canada Post thus far. I assume it would be a community mailbox within the development.

**Mike deJonge:** Okay, because typically Canada Post does not want to go much further than existing mailboxes and there are existing mailboxes on Main St. If this development contributes to more mailboxes on Main St there will be people coming with their cars onto Back St and Back St on the backside will be impossible for two cars. Another question, I see that from the drawings that Main St was not considered. You state in the traffic report that Back St is not capable of handling the traffic without reconfiguring and some construction. Main St is actually





THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

wider than Back St. So, Main St could handle the traffic and I would propose that the applicant consider Main St as an entrance.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** That was the original plan we were trying to move forward with. The MTO would not permit an access that close to the intersection based on spacing requirements and the wetland. The road would have to go entirely through the wetland to Main St. I also believe the asphalt itself on Main St may be larger than Back St but it depends on the boulevard width. The boulevard width of Back St is 20m the boulevard width of Main St is 12m.

**Mike deJonge:** You said the MTO will not allow access to two points. This is MTO's policy, this is not the law. MTO can change their mind. It all depends on Council and the Township to determine what is the best entrance. What I am saying, Main St is the best entrance. I also agree with Hans Juergensen because we exit on Back St and the sight line is dangerous. There will be accidents, and if the Township allows access to this development without considering Main St the Township may be liable for a wrongful death. You also stated in your proposal that the houses were going to be from 2000-3100 square ft. Is there going to be a maximum allowance of square feet or is that just the estimate of what these houses are going to be?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** That is currently the estimate. We are not seeking any changes to the zoning maximum lot coverage.

**Mike deJonge:** So, if a member of the public wanted to put a down payment on the property and on a house of 4000 square feet, are you saying that the builder would be likely to do that?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** It would be based on the meeting the zoning provisions.

**Mike deJonge:** So, if Council were to allow that and a building permit was given to a house of 4000 square feet. A 4000 square foot house can house two or three families. That would be like six cars per driveway. If the Township allows these things, there would be many more cars trying to exit through Back St than we typically think. If I look at all the cars that are in the driveways of the houses that are across from Regional Rd 36, I see 4-6 cars per driveway. If you have 21 houses that could mean 100 cars coming in every day to go to and from work. That also does not tell you how many cars come in and out during the day. That many cars at that intersection are going to be dangerous and I strongly suggest that the applicant look at Main St. I know Highway 6 is not a viable thing because it is too busy at the moment. Who knows when the bypass will go in.

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** Can I just address one item of clarification that came out of the traffic study. I noted that the Traffic Impact Study that was submitted and accepted provides that there are 20 new two-way traffic trips that would occur during the weekday A.M. peak hour, 5 inbound and 15 outbound trips. There are also 25 new two-way trips that would occur during the weekday P.M. peak hour which would consist of 16 inbound and 9 outbound trips. I am not giving an opinion I just want to give that information that came forward.

**Mike deJonge:** I saw those people doing the count and the traffic report. They were standing right at the end of Back St and it doesn't take into allowance for a person sitting in their car to look 8 feet ahead and try to peer around the corner. Does the traffic report take into account the speeds?



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Yes, it considered not only the posted speed but the average speed of vehicles travelling, and it used the overall average.

**Mike deJonge:** The average speed of what?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** 60 km/hr.

**Mike deJonge:** 60 km? I live on that street. 60km is not the average.

**Councillor Hurst:** I appreciate the comments. I think that is good feedback. Is there someone else at the back there that would like to speak?

**Emily McKenna:** I am Emily McKenna and I live on Main St. I give a different vantage point. I know the intersection has been the topic of everyone's concern. I walk that intersection multiple times a week with my stroller and my two dogs. I will say, my concern isn't as much the traffic of turning left but having a school bus trying to get onto Ochs St with no sidewalks and now these additional cars. I would assume the families coming in will be some young families with children. So, for my point it's adding the construction vehicles, with the school bus, now not being able to walk because there are no sidewalks with the increased traffic. I just wanted to raise that point.

**Councillor Hurst:** I appreciate it, and I am not sure if there are any comments on the questions at all.

**Councillor Bailey:** Are you suggesting that sidewalks would be more helpful?

**Emily McKenna:** I think sidewalks and my main concern when thinking about it is the width of the road.

**Councillor Bailey:** On Back St?

**Emily McKenna:** On Back and Ochs. Right now, if I am walking with my stroller and dogs if there is an oncoming car, I have to go into a driveway and park especially if it is a school bus or a snow plough and a lot of times there is no possibility of having both ways. So, with the increased traffic, it won't work.

**Councillor Hurst:** Any other individuals in the gallery like to share their comments?

**Cathy McNabb:** My name is Cathy McNabb, I live at 40 Badenoch St in Morriston. I have more questions than comments concerning this traffic management study. I am curious as to what exactly that means, how long have you actually studied that area and what were you studying when you say the MTO spacing requirement I am not quite sure what that means. I am curious if you are thinking that Back St was going to become two-way traffic because as the last lady pointed out that is not possible. What changes are being considered for Back St based on the study that has been done.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** I will try to answer the questions as best as I can. I can get you further information directly from the traffic engineer. They come out to assess the traffic that is currently happening and then they also assess the five and ten year horizon which includes the proposed development and a 2% average increase per year. With regards to the MTO spacing requirements, if the access would come from Main St the traffic would come onto Badenoch and then turn right or left onto Main St. The intersection of Main St and Badenoch is too close to Highway 6 and Badenoch intersection so it's brining too much

traffic close to an already higher volume traffic intersection. When I was speaking to the improvements to the road network that would be included with this proposal. It is Ochs St, so traffic would come from Badenoch St to Ochs St into the proposed development. The proposed upgrades are to Ochs St. The boulevard width is 20m so the road can become 8m asphalt with sodding or sidewalk, whichever the Township desires. That road would travel into the proposed development and the intent is that traffic would travel on the upgraded Ochs St into the development and that would become a two-way street and be upgraded based on Township standards.

**Cathy McNabb:** So the assumption is that people will never go down Main and along Back St to sneak into the subdivision, so they all will go down Ochs St.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Yes that is the assumption, especially considering that segment of Back St is obviously quite small that if we provide those upgrades to Ochs St it provides a bit more spacing that is much desired.

**Cathy McNabb:** It sounds like a great theory but I don't think that is actually how it will work. Seeing how the community works now. It will have that number of cars coming out they are going to go around out the other side. They are going to be lining up on 36 to go turn left anyway. It doesn't sound like it has been practically studied. I wondered how long the MTO person was there looking at the traffic. Was it just one afternoon? Was it during rush hour? I am not sure they have an accurate picture on how that little area actually works because adding 21 more homes worth of cars with home businesses and school buses. I'd really like to know if they did a really thorough study or just a Sunday afternoon.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** MTO assesses the impact of Highway 6 with that being their jurisdiction but the Township consultant and Township staff evaluate the traffic in the general area. I will say the traffic engineer on the project team was very thorough in his analysis and he worked very closely with the Township consultant and they are in agreement of the outcome of that study and the recommendations regarding the upgrades.

**Cathy McNabb:** So, the concern is that it is too close to the high traffic on Highway 6 and the MTO is allowed to say that it is unacceptable and you have to have that spacing?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Yes. So each jurisdiction has their own policies and requirements that have to be followed. Within every policy there are changes that can be made. For instance, Township requirements would require us to rebuild the retaining wall and relocate that to allow that intersection to be safer. It is really about balancing all these different jurisdictions that we have.

**Cathy McNabb:** I would like to reiterate that if there is the ability to make those changes and adjustments, if you can come off Highway 6. You say you don't have land but based on the pictures it looks like it does about there and it is a bit of a wetland issue. Is that not something that could be put back on the table with all those calming measures that are coming in? Maybe it won't be done as quickly as the developer would like but for the long term maintenance of the community I think both Main St and Back St are bad choices. I think maybe coming off Highway 6 and using that solution, involving the MTO, and not creating all these problems for the Township would make it a better community all around.

**Councillor Hurst:** Thank you.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

**Jamie Dors:** I am Jamie Dors, at 7595 Wellington Rd 36, directly next to Mike deJonge. When we are talking about the traffic, can I hear those numbers again on the traffic coming in and out in the A.M and P.M?

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** Sure. 20 new two-way trips during the weekday A.M. peak hour and that consists of 5 inbound and 15 outbound trips. 25 new two-way trips during the weekday P.M peak hour and that consists of 16 inbound trips and 9 outbound trips.

**Jamie Dors:** That doesn't make sense to me. There are 21 houses there and businesses. That sounds like they are assuming only one person in the house leaves the house a day, roughly.

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** Can I just make a point of clarity. So, this is 20 new two-way trips during the weekday A.M peak hour. Not everyone leaves their house during the peak hour.

**Jamie Dors:** I understand. Not cutting the day in half you are doing just peak hour. That is still is not conservative, it is underestimated. I think they should look at those numbers again. I don't think the number is high enough. There will be more traffic especially if we have businesses and we have larger houses with larger families leaving from the same home.

Everyone is going to go up Ochs St between Mike and Han's and if there is multiple cars sitting in front of them they are going to make a left and go back down Back St and come out Main St. The traffic is going to increase on Back St between Ochs and Main and Main is still going to increase. You should be looking at two exits also for emergency response. There is one way in that is blocked, is that good for emergency response? Has that been considered if there is a fire or need an ambulance for an emergency?

**Andrea Reed, GEI, Engineer:** It was. We ran it by the fire department and they were okay with it given the number of houses. We did not talk to ambulance I believe.

**Jamie Dors:** You mentioned about an environmental protection overlay. What does that mean?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** The Township Zoning By-law provides for a Natural Environment zone which is the key feature and the environmental protection overlay is in addition to that and it may not cover the same land but it provides for that extra layer should something change on site there are features on this property that would need to be assessed. It is just that extra protection and evaluation should the lands be rezoned.

**Jamie Dors:** Thank you. Those are my points.

**Mike Van Hee:** My name's Mike, 7519 Wellington Rd 36. I just want to add to the point about Ochs St. If you have ever crested 36 going eastbound, you cannot see anything over that crest until the very last minute. It has become more evident when they had the snow piled up there during snow clearing. You have to wait basically until everyone is clear and then you can move up the crest to see if anyone is coming. If there is anyone walking their dogs and someone has to wait to make a right turn to go onto that street, there is no way to see. There are people that crest that and stomp on the gas and there has always been speeding and that is my concern.

If you guys move the retaining wall, there is still not going to be room for a right hand turn lane. If anyone is stopped on that road because something is not allowing them to make a right, there are going to be a lot of accidents because you cannot see anything there. People are not going to use that street to go in and out as it is too dangerous.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

The road that goes into there heads south and then east. That grading there is like a motocross track. I am assuming it is not going to stay that way. What level is that road going to stay at and what does it look like for the houses that back onto that road? Will there be a big retaining wall?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** There is no retaining wall proposed. I think you are speaking about where the road goes east. There is a small block between that lot line and the proposed road to allow no impact to that grading. I don't know what the grading will be.

**Andrea Reed, GEI, Engineer:** Showing the grading plan map. It is not showing all the way up to Badenoch St but we got 6% and then we go some 3 to 1 here but there is no retaining wall.

**Councillor Hurst:** Is this map available on our website?

**Andrea Reed, GEI, Engineer:** It is part of the civil engineering set.

**Councillor Hurst:** I think it would be of value to have it on the website.

**Mike Van Hee:** 6% is still a pretty steep grade.

**Andrea Reed, GEI, Engineer:** It is a bit steep for a road.

**Mike Van Hee:** Especially in the winter time. Is this the grade on the road?

**Andrea Reed, GEI, Engineer:** Yes this is the grade on the road.

**Mike Van Hee:** My next question would be the grade off the road to the north side.

**Andrea Reed, GEI, Engineer:** So you have an 8.5 and a 3.3.

**Mike Van Hee:** Is that sloping towards the road or sloping towards the north or the south? It looks like it is sloping towards the street. 6% is for the street grade would be something to consider changing. My driveway is 6% and it is nightmare.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** We will take that back.

**Mike Van Hee:** My next question would be how many streetlights would be a part of street and what style would they be when looking at the night sky?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Components like that would be confirmed through the detailed design process which is typically you get zoning and then draft plan approval and within draft plan approval you get a full list of conditions that have to be met. With something like this, the construction of the retaining wall would be a condition, the upgrading of Ochs St would be a condition, and a detailed design would be a condition as well which shows the landscaping of the public road and the lighting. All the lighting would be based on Township standards. Any public street the Township has a standard that they have and maintain. I don't know the exact spacing under the Township standard but we would follow what is required.

**Councillor Hurst:** Do we have anyone online that has any questions? Oh sorry we have one more in the gallery please approach.





THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

**Lucy deJonge:** Lucy deJonge, 7501 Wellington Rd 36. Something that occurred to me is the increase in traffic that we always have when there is an accident on the 401. How is that going to affect this subdivision as well? Every time there is an accident on the 401 we have increased traffic on Wellington Rd 36. It happens a lot. I feel like Highway 6 would be a better entrance point because of that.

A little selfish concern is that a lot of people are using and coming and backing into our driveway already. That is concerning to me. Another thing, I noticed when they were doing the traffic survey they put a post on our property and that it only lasted overnight. I do not know if that was the length of their survey. I phoned them because it was on our property. They told me they were just doing a survey and within hours it was down. I don't think that was a good length for a traffic survey.

**Councillor Hurst:** Let's try to go online if we can.

**Justine Brotherston, Interim Municipal Clerk:** If there are any attendees that would like to speak if you can just use your raise hand feature at the bottom of your screen.

**Councillor Hurst:** We will give those online a few moments. Is there anyone in the gallery that has any questions?

**Mike deJonge:** I have one question on the traffic report. You said so many cars at peak hour. Does the traffic report suggest how many cars total in one day?

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** I don't recall that it did.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** No, the standards for this study are only required to assess A.M. peak hour and P.M. peak hour. Those two values combined would not include the most in a day as you can also have people come in and out throughout the day. That is the highest volume of traffic anticipated.

**Mike deJonge:** I would like to suggest that another traffic study be done and an estimate number of cars during one day based upon the square footage of the houses.

**Councillor Hurst:** Thank you sir. As this is a public meeting, that suggestion is certainly taken in.

**Unknown speaker from gallery:** As you can tell we are all beating the same horse here. The issue here is traffic. As you mentioned, your forecast is for five to ten years. Five to ten years is going to be over in a flash. By the time the houses get built it will be ten years from now and traffic is going to increase way more than you think it is. What will happen then is you will realize you created a bottleneck and now you have to build another road. I would recommend you would look forward twenty to twenty five years and see what the traffic flow is going to be like then. The inevitable conclusion will be that this access point is a bottle neck. I think this really needs to be looked at and I am not just saying this because I live there. It is a single point and it is too small and has a bad sight line. When accidents start happening they are going to point fingers at somebody.

**Mike Van Hee:** Can we somehow get over the hurdle of this wetland problem? If we can get a bridge over the wetlands where you can have an access to Highway 6 it would also help the province push for the by-pass. It would be a significant reduction to the traffic in Morriston. It would be a lot safer.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

**Councillor Hurst:** Thank you. Any last questions before we wrap it up?

We will now move to members of Council asking any clarifying questions.

**Councillor Sepulis:** I have two questions. First question, was there any consideration for single lights at Badenoch and Ochs?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Yes I will take that back. They do assess the intersections and assess if any improvements can be made. That recommendation was not included so based on that I would assume they assessed that potential, and it was not needed at that intersection but I can take that back to check.

**Councillor Sepulis:** My second question is I was reading all the reports of the ARUs going to go ahead. I don't see why they were eliminated because you can put an ARU on top of a garage, you can put it in a basement.

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** An ARU is an additional residential unit. The concern with respect to ARUs from a planning perspective is the density of the site. We wanted to make sure that there were no negative impacts to groundwater. As you are increasing the density of the site the septic systems have to be constructed to a higher standard and we did not have sufficient information that ARUs can be accommodated on the site.

**Councillor Bailey:** We have a lot of traffic concerns and questions. Is there any opportunity to ask the traffic consultant direct questions or request a redo of a traffic study?

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** The way that these typically get done in the Township, the recommendation report goes immediately after the public meeting. In this case, that may not be the most appropriate approach. When you are dealing with a more complicated application, we are dealing with the Zoning By-law Amendment but there is also a concurrent Draft Plan of Subdivision application. Typically, what happens is you bounce it back to the applicant to provide a response and that could be reviewed by the traffic consultant.

**Councillor Bailey:** It looks to me on one of these images that there is a Gordon St. I am wondering if that is a road allowance off Highway 6, yes it would have to go through wetland, but I am wondering if that was ever considered? And if not, why? Can you take that back? I like the idea of doing another traffic study with some of these concerns.

**Mike DeJonge:** When you say Gordon St do you mean Queen St?

**Councillor Bailey:** Nope, it is perpendicular to Highway 6. It looks like it would go from Highway 6 right into the wetland and it is called Gordon St on this image I am looking at. South of Church.

**Cathy Haskell:** My name is Cathy Haskell, I live at 67 Queen St which is Highway 6. It is an unopened road allowance. It is wetland on one side of me and I am on the other and it goes right across the tributary of Bronte Creek.

**Councillor Bailey:** My second question, Kayly I think you mentioned dark sky compliance. This Township does not have dark sky by-law yet. What standard do you set it to or at what point can we request that the standard be more robust?



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Dark sky compliant is basically reducing light pollution on adjacent properties and keeping light pollution to your property. There is a certification process for certain fixtures so that is something we would look into. It is not typically a zoning bylaw item that we would include in that sense but it is something that could be a condition if you are wanting to review exterior lights of the houses. It would probably be through a condition during the building permit review.

**Councillor Goyda:** I have two questions. I am looking in the agenda on the map you had on the screen there. In behind all of the lots is the Natural Environment portion. Presumably all of the individual lots will be sold to their individual owner, what happens to the ownership of the rest of the land?

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** That is part of ongoing discussions that have not been landed on yet. We are still addressing that internally. There may be a separate report going to Council to deal with that matter. That block 23, the only access would presently be through the storm management pond block so we have to see if it would be appropriate to provide access to block 23 for maintenance. But in terms of what is going to happen to it, who is going to own it, that has not been determined yet.

**Councillor Goyda:** I am not sure what options are being considered. Could that become a park or a trail or something that would service not only this new part of the community but existing parts of the community as well?

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** That is something we would have to look into a bit more whether it could be used as a park and to what intensity. The reason is because it does have wetland and hazard features and is it appropriate to necessarily be drawing people to that site?

**Councillor Goyda:** Or could it be that one of the lots becomes a really great big lot with only a small building on it.

**Jesse Auspitz, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions:** That's another potential.

**Councillor Goyda:** Just one key thing I would like to know is if we are land-locking that entire land or if somehow we can have access for future use. My second question is in regards to traffic. I am wondering if prior to it coming back to Council if the traffic consultant can look at investigating if there are any measures that can be put into place to discourage or prevent traffic from the new development from travelling along the narrow portion of Back St. I don't know if there is anything out there but maybe there is something innovative that can deter traffic from travelling along the Back St portion that is not suitable for two-way traffic.

**Councillor Hurst:** I think I did have a couple questions. The first one, when I saw the layout I was concerned around emergency service access. If this was a building it would be a tough sell. I feel like a review of an updated traffic study has certainly been heard loud and clear here. The 10-15m buffer, maybe this has not been established yet. What would that buffer include? Is this a managed grass strip? Is this a planting of trees in association with the larger protected land? I am just curious what that looks like.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** Generally, the buffer would remain in its natural state with no additional plantings. You would just keep it as is and continue to be natural. We are working with the Conservation Authority to see if they want any enhancements in some locations to improve the natural state but generally it is to remain as it is today. It just



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

provides that separation between development of dwellings and sheds, whichever it may be, and the feature itself.

**Councillor Hurst:** My last question is regarding water management. One of the questions came up from the public around the sloping. It is quite hilly. Today is a prime example of this, we have had a lot of snow and several inches of rain. That is a very sloped area. I am just envisioning a wet mess, flooded basements. Has any consideration been given to how one would manage water in this potentially new subdivision.

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** We do have a storm management pond proposed. The stormwater management pond does provide the quantity and quality control and it does propose to discharge outlet into the Bronte Creek and that naturalized area there. We are taking drainage from the built-up area towards the natural area.

**Andrea Reed , GEI, Engineer:** They have advanced the design fairly well. We pushed them to go a bit further and show that it is feasible. There will be some more details that are ironed out during detailed design. The Township and Conservation Authority have reviewed it and what they have in place meets the guidelines of best management practices.

**Councillor Hurst:** Fair enough. I am envisioning the cadence of water this time of year would just be a mess. I encourage us to look at what does this look like twenty years from now.

**Councillor Sepulis:** I think we should have second public meeting. I think this traffic issue should be front and centre for all the residents to understand and the traffic consultant should be there.

**Councillor Hurst:** Well said. Are there any last comments you would like to share?

**Kayly Robbins, Applicant Agent, Weston Consulting:** I think this meeting has been very helpful to understand the community's concern and feedback. If you live in this community, you see it from a different perspective. This has been very helpful. I am hearing that traffic is the main concern so our traffic consultant is aware of some of the comments we received here today. If we can have them attend a second public meeting or have them provide an updated study for review we will be addressing these comments.

**Councillor Hurst:** Thank you. I appreciate it. Before we wrap up, to those individuals in the gallery and online tonight, thank you for taking time out of your schedule for an hour and half tonight. I thought all of the comments you provided were thoughtful and professional. I fully grasp that this impacts your livelihood. This is the community you live in, so I sincerely appreciate you taking the time tonight and sharing those. On behalf of Council and the Township it is duly noted.

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](mailto:planning@puslinch.ca) or by phone at 519-763-1226 ext. 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 when it is brought before Council in the future, you must register as a delegation with the Municipal Clerk prior to the meeting.

Thank you everyone.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH  
MARCH 5, 2025 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION  
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

**Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned at 8:35p.m.