



June 18, 2025 Council Meeting

June 18, 2025

Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the June 18, 2025 Council agenda items.

6.1.1 May 28, 2025 Council Meeting Minutes

Resolution No. 2025-181:

Bill 17, Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act 2025

-re "That Council direct staff to forward Bill 17 and the Township's comments to the Planning Committee at the County for consideration."; have we heard back from County?

The Planning Committee received the Township's comments for information and the minutes will be going to County Council for approval on June 26th, 2025.

6.2 Hon. Jill Dunlop Minister of Emergency Preparedness and Response regarding Emergency Management Modernization Act, 2025

-does County Emergency Preparedness and Response have any comments regarding the proposed legislation that we can put forward to the Province?

The County of Wellington Emergency Management Staff provided Council with the comments that were provided with respect to the Modernization of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act through the September 25, 2024 Reporting out update. County of Wellington Emergency Management staff have advised that their comments/feedback remains consistent with that was provided in that report. County of Wellington's Emergency Management staff provided the following information to the County of Wellington Warden and Member Municipality Mayor's in December of 2024:

I am reaching out to give you an update on the recent announcements by the provincial government regarding the proposed updates to the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act. We are currently reviewing the proposed changes however, a quick summary is noted below.



Beyond a few items that have changed, the changes to the Act will not affect much of our existing programme. However, the forthcoming changes to the pertaining regulation 380/04 likely will.

Summary of the key changes impacting our current Emergency Management Programmes:

- *All references to the Solicitor General are replaced with reference to the Minister (of Emergency Preparedness and Response).*
- *Emergency Management Plans would be reviewed by the Minister of Emergency Preparedness and Response, not what is currently done with review by the Provincial Emergency Operations Centre (PEOC) and the Chief of Emergency Management Ontario (EMO).*
- *The Minister may request any Emergency Management Programme information and must be replied to in writing.*
- *If a Municipality or Entity does not comply with an EM order from the Ministry within the time specified, 'any funding provided to the entity by the Minister may be reduced or terminated at the discretion of the Minister'.*
- *All Emergency Response Plans (ERP's) must conform with the new Provincial EM Planning Framework (not yet shared).*
- *The Province may order Municipalities to create hazard-specific emergency response plans (Hazard specific like floods, dams, encampments)*
- *Declaration of an emergency:*
 - *adds a precondition to declare, the Head of Council must consult the Emergency Response Plan and being satisfied that the taking of an action authorized is necessary to address the situation or impending situation without the risk of serious delay.*
 - *Councils must receive a report from the Head of Council every 30 days during a Declared Emergency, 'outlining the reasons why it remains necessary for the emergency declaration to be in effect.'*
 - *There is now enhanced reporting to the Minister justifying decisions to declare an emergency.*
 - *This is a written report with prescribed requirements (dates/times, explanation of why it was needed, etc.).*
 - *Further confirmation that Declarations are not needed to request resources from the Province.*



- *Some Federal resources (i.e.: Armed Forces) do still require a Declaration before assistance is provided.*
- *There are some new requirements around responsibilities for infrastructure owners (Critical Infrastructure: Utilities, Dams etc.) having Emergency Response Plans, EM Programs etc.*

Given the changes to declaring an emergency and requirements to align our Emergency Response Plan(s) (ERP) with the Province's EM Planning Framework, we will need to make those changes in our existing Emergency Response Plan(s).

6.3 Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry Letter regarding Reintroduction of the Geologic Carbon Storage Act

-can our hydrogeologist comment whether stratigraphy in Puslinch would support carbon storage and if so would there be an impact to our groundwater? **Staff will have a draft motion prepared to request a review accordingly.**

6.11 City of Caledon Council letter to Premier regarding Illegal Land Use

-will our AMPs program alleviate a lot of the concerns cited in the letter? **No, AMPS currently cannot be used for By-laws with authority under the Planning Act. Staff recommend supporting Caledon's letter and ensuring that the support resolution is sent to the Premier and the official opposition.**

6.12 May 1, 2025, County of Wellington Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

-given that we have been unsuccessful in finding a candidate for the Committee can we approach Councillor Bulmer ask whether he would be willing to fill this position on our behalf? **County Councillor Bulmer sits as the Chair on the Committee, and it is staff's understanding that he cannot also act as the Puslinch Municipal Representative. County of Wellington Staff have advised that a member of local Council could sit on the Committee in their capacity as a community member if there was interest.**

9.2.1 Report FIN-2025-020 – Development Charges Update – **Staff will include this criteria in the scope of work at Council's direction should the study be approved.**

-p.78 re "The proposed TMP would evaluate and formalize criteria for when a double lift of asphalt should be required, particularly for growth related road infrastructure."; suggest criteria should include



- how long current pavement has lasted with single lift vs projected life with double life.
- using different type of asphalt for bottom lift
- best practice to place the two layers for maximum life of road

9.2.2 Report FIN-2025-022 – 1st Quarter Financial Report

- p.271 please explain the negative entries for professional fees **These were expenses accrued as of December 31, 2024 (i.e., services performed in 2024). The entries are reversed in 2025 once the invoices are paid and the negative entries will be reversed so there is zero impact in 2025.**
- p.279 is it typical to have heat and waste disposal costs up in first quarter? **Heat costs tend to be higher in the first quarter due to colder weather. Both heat and waste disposal costs will be analyzed to determine whether budget adjustments are needed for 2026.**
- p.285 why the positive entry of \$125 for revenue? **This reflects revenue that was incorrectly recognized in 2024 and subsequently reversed in 2025 to correct the prior-year reporting.**

9.3.1 Report ADM-2025-023 – Planning and Development Committee Goals and Objectives Update

- Schedule A is not included **This was added through the addendum.**

9.3.3 10:05 A.M. Report ADM-2025-025 – Reporting out from Council Direction Update ≠ ERO 025-0476 & ERO 025-0235 ARA Site Plan Amendment License 5738

- Schedule A are Source Water comments; are these the comments that the recommendation refers to or are there other comments?

Yes, the Source Water comments attached as Schedule A are the comments being recommended for submission on behalf of the Township and Source Water Protection.

2024 Mini Lakes Annual Wastewater and Drinking Water Monitoring Reports and Peer Reviews

- p.361 and 362 show two schedules. What project does each schedule depict?

OCWA has provided the attached schedules with updated naming.

- will move that GEI Consultants Report of May 7, 2025 be sent to Mini Lakes specifically noting sections 10.0 Required Improvements and 11.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The GEI consultants report was provided to Mini Lakes on May 9, 2025.

9.4.1 10:25 A.M. Report PD-2025-010 – WDD Main St. Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Recommendation Report

- re Recommendation “That Council recommend to the County of Wellington that the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision application 23T-23002 be granted draft approval, subject to the Township’s Draft Conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval as [presented/amended] in



Schedule “B” of this report; and”; is there opportunity to amend and finalize the draft conditions after the public meeting?

No, the conditions attached to the report will be recommended to the County of Wellington Council and the conditions are final once the County Council approves the Subdivision. The conditions do require detailed studies and/or drawings such as the redesign of Back Street (Ochs Street), Landscape Plan, Streetscape Plan to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Township. The condition language cannot be modified after the County approves the application, but the content of the required studies and/or drawings will be worked out between the Applicant and the Township during the detailed design stage. Inputs from any subsequent Public Meeting will guide the content of the relevant studies and/or drawings.

-p.611 and p.648 re ARUs are not recommended. I am concerned that basement apartments will be constructed eventually that septic system should accommodate. Is the rationale fact based ie technically a larger septic cannot be accommodated? ;with respect to the argument of lot sizes we have similar lot sizes elsewhere in the township with likely basement apartments The Applicant’s hydrogeologist completed nitrate attenuation calculations based on the proposed lot sizes and septic systems sized for single family dwellings. Given the proposed lot sizes, advanced tertiary treatment is already required for most lots to reduce nitrate concentrations in shallow groundwater to less than 10 mg/L (the Maximum Acceptable Concentration based on the Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standards). If ARUs were added, the nitrate attenuation calculations would need to be updated to account for the additional sewage flows and nitrate input. With the existing calculations already approaching the 10 mg/L nitrate limit with the best available treatment for residential use, there is little room for increase.

The Township’s Hydrogeologist had suggested that this be handled on an individual basis as part of future building permit applications as it is possible that more advanced treatment technology may exist in future. The Applicant subsequently indicated that they are no longer asking for ARUs as part of the rezoning.

Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft

-p615 does clause 4 include the NE zone?

Clause 4 is a site-specific special provision for the Open Space lands which do not apply to the natural features that are zoned NE. As there is no site-specific provision for the NE Zone, a special provision section was not added to the by-law. The uses and regulations of the parent NE zone will apply.



Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft Conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval

PDAC had provided comments of which the following do not appear to be covered in draft conditions

1. Land Use & Zoning Compliance

- Township development standards are to be used during detail design plans

Condition 48a requires “all infrastructure works will be constructed to prevalent Township’s standards”.

2. Infrastructure & Services

- Fibre internet should be required for all homes in the subdivision

Condition 48i requires the Applicant to make satisfactory arrangements with the appropriate telephone/telecommunications provider for the installation and delivery of permanent telephone/telecommunication services to the subdivision. The provision of internet will be worked out between the Applicant and the telecommunication provider.

3. Environmental Considerations

- Ensure existing fill meets quality for a residential development

This question has been provided to the Township’s Engineer for response.

5. Transportation & Walkability

- Clarify sidewalk requirements and who will be responsible to maintain

Condition 16, 48d and 48e require the Applicant to provide sidewalks. Once the Township assumes the public street, the Township will maintain the sidewalks in this subdivision.

- Consider on-street parking and it should be planned for now

Condition 48e requires the submission of a plan illustrating on-street parking among other streetscape elements such as sidewalks.

6. Public Spaces & Amenities

- Access to be provided to the wooded area to the south for recreation, hiking etc.

Access to the wooded area is contemplated through the stormwater management facility. The Zoning By-law for the storm pond allows passive recreation use to accommodate this access in the future. Staff had previously recommended that the NE Lands remain unmaintained and “use at your own risk” or restricted access, until such time that staff are able to make a recommendation to Council on the best use for the lands through the Recreation Master Plan update.

- Easy access from the development to the ball diamond area

Conditions have been added requiring fencing to be installed along the boundaries of Old Morriston Park. During the review of the fencing, staff will ensure there is appropriate access between the subdivision and the ball diamond area.

10. Other

- Impact of construction on current residents and the road systems



The Township's Road Activity By-law regulates various road activities mostly related to hauling and debris deposited on roadways. The Township's typical notification process for road construction is mailing or hand delivering leaflets to affected properties regarding the construction and staff post the construction on the Township's website and social media pages.

- Township should consider renaming street(s) to a name with historical significance

The Township has a Municipal Street Name Policy which provides naming categories for a new street name. These categories include Honouring those who have given their life in public service; Honouring individuals for community service or for local, national or international historical reasons; and Names that promote pride in the Township, acknowledge local heritage and history, unique features and geography. Staff will work with the Applicant to ensure the new name meets one of these criteria.

p.622 re "a. That supply wells to be installed in either in the lower bedrock aquifer (Gasport Formation) or in the upper bedrock aquifer (Guelph Formation) where low permeability overburden deposits (hydraulic conductivity less than 10⁻⁵ cm/sec) are identified with a thickness of at least 10 m;" my recollection of our hydrologist's recommendation is that wells be to the Gasport Formation for water quality. Should we require that any well should be in the Gasport Formation?

The proponent's hydrogeologist proposed a hybrid approach with assessment on a lot-by-lot basis based on soil observations during drilling. The rationale for this approach was based on the MECP Design Guidelines for Sewage Works, Section 22.5.14 "Low Permeability Environments." If the driller can demonstrate the presence of low permeability (<10⁻⁵ cm/s) overburden deposits of at least 10 m in thickness, the underlying bedrock aquifer is considered sufficiently isolated from surface land uses. Where 10 m of low permeability deposits are not present, the well casing should be extended and sealed into the Gasport Formation. It is noted that two of the three test wells on the site indicated 10 m of clay material overlying the bedrock, with one test well having only 3 m of clay (meaning that this well should be drilled deeper into the Gasport Formation based on this approach).

Given the reference to the MECP Design Guidelines for Sewage Works, I agreed that this approach may be protective of water quality on an individual lot basis, however, the driller(s) would need to understand and adhere to this approach for well installations. If the Township is unable to implement this approach, drilling deeper into the Gasport Formation by default is recommended.



p. 624 re “19. THAT the Owner shall submit to the Township for review and approval, a drawing demonstrating that the proposed parking areas and driveways of the residential lots can be provided outside of all catchment areas that do not have quality control.”; what does this clause mean?

This condition is to address Township Engineer’s comment “As there is no quality control for Catchment 202, the Township and future homeowners should be made aware that it will not be acceptable for driveways, parking areas etc. to be extended into the rear parts of the proposed lots in the future”. This is to prevent chemicals and oil from entering the creek through stormwater runoff.

p. 625 Road clauses 26 to 30; I am concerned that these clauses do not appear to cover the section of roadway between Road A and Back St; the design in this area design includes a retaining wall and regrading which would be of interest to the two adjacent homeowners. They should be consulted as is the owner of the property on WR36.

It is not the typical process to engage property owners directly regarding reconstructions. However, Council may ask the applicant to provide information regarding this design at the Public Information Meeting.

p.628 clause 48b suggest that name of street have some historical significance in Morriston

10.2 Wellington County Climate Change and Sustainability Division Highlights Annual Report
-how would our businesses and residents gain access to County funds for energy efficiency projects?

The County does not offer funds for residents at this time. Income-qualified residents may qualify for some energy efficiency programs through Save on Energy ([Energy Efficiency For Your Home | Save on Energy](#)) and Enbridge ([Home Winterproofing Program \(HWP\) | Ontario | Enbridge Gas](#)). Interested residents can contact the County’s Energy Coach for more information and assistance with applications ([Home Energy Efficiency Transition | Climate Change | Planning](#)). Businesses can apply for funding for energy efficiency measures under the CIP ([Community Improvement Funding | Economic Development](#)).

-does County have any grant funding for purchasing EV powered vehicles and small battery powered equipment?

No. I understand the new Federal Government may be re-introducing EV rebates.

-does County have any grant funding for making our buildings more energy efficient?

No. There are several programs through FCM and Save on Energy to support municipalities to undertake energy efficiency measures in their buildings. There are also occasionally fundings opportunities through NRCan and Infrastructure Canada.



10.4 11:00 A.M. Presentation by Sarah Wilhelm, Manager of Policy Planning regarding Wellington County Official Plan Review – Phase 3B Rural Residential Growth ≠

-what would be realistic time when the OPA containing the revised severance date be in effect?

For the revised severance date to be in effect, the OPA will need to be adopted by County Council and approved by MMAH. Provided there are no major delays in the processing of the OPA, County staff aims to have the OPA brought to County Council for adoption in April/May. Once the OPA has been adopted by County Council it will be sent to MMAH for review and approval. Unfortunately, we are unable to provide an estimate of the Provincial review timeframe.

10.5 Watsons & Associates & AMO Comments regarding Bill 17 Protect Ontario by Building Staff are reviewing this and will prepare information in a report back to Council.

Faster and Smarter Act, 2025 ≠

-given that Bill 17 has Royal Assent does Watson and Associates and or AMO have any information on which parts of their presentations were incorporated into the Bill?

9.2.1 – Development Charges Update

1. A significant amount of time and cost went into preparing the Townships Road Management Plan. I'd like to ensure we are not duplicating efforts when introducing a transportation master plan. Wondering if staff could provide a high level picture of how the roads management plan differs from the transportation master plan? Are they serving different purposes and is there any overlap in the scope?

The proposed Transportation Master Plan (TMP) builds upon the Township's 2023 Roads Management Plan, which outlines the road replacement schedule for existing infrastructure and includes key policies such as traffic calming, speed limits and community safety zones, and truck routes. The TMP aims to consolidate this information into a single, cohesive document while establishing a framework to guide future road improvements related to growth and the development of new infrastructure.

In addition, the TMP will clarify which infrastructure costs are eligible for Development Charges (DCs) and which are the responsibility of developers. A comprehensive list of topics the TMP will address is provided on page 3 of the report.

To inform the scope of the TMP, a review of existing studies was conducted to identify gaps. The intention is for the TMP to address these gaps while avoiding redundancy with current policies and plans.

9.3.1 – Planning and Development Goals and Objectives Update This was added through the addendum.

The recommendation refers to implementing recommendations outlined in report PDAC 2025-001 – however the report referenced is not included.



9.3.2 – Heritage Objection

1. The statement of cultural heritage value speaks about the barn under design value, however, in the description of heritage attributes, only features of the house are listed. Does that mean that any modifications to the barn would not be subject to heritage protection?

That is correct.

2. Does heritage designation prevent an owner from pursuing a planning application such as a severance? Are there any special considerations as it relates to heritage designation when a planning application is being considered?

Heritage Designation does not prevent an owner from pursuing planning act applications such as a severance, however additional studies such as a heritage impact assessment report may be required to demonstrate if there are any impacts to the protected attributes.

3. What is meant by the following sentence in the description of heritage attributes “It is intended that non-original features may be returned to document earlier designs or to their document original without requiring Council to amend the designating by-law”

Restoring a feature

The purpose of this statement is to advise property owners that should they choose to re-construct original elements that those elements will not be added to the designation by-law. A heritage permit would be required, however the restored elements would not be protected in the future from alteration as they are not original.

9.3.3. – Reporting Out from Council

1. The update from mini lakes indicates that approval was granted in March for the Portable Treatment Facility. Does that mean that the PTF is now up and running?

Staff have provided this questions to Mini Lakes in advance of the meeting. OCWA will be in attendance at the meeting to answer any questions.

2. The OCWA responses make reference to the latest schedule attached but there is no schedule attached.

Staff understand this to reference the “AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE APPROVAL” Issue Date: March 7, 2025, this begins on page 342 of the Agenda Addendum.

9.4.1 – WDD Main Street Zoning By-Law Amendment

1. Page 18 of the NPG Planning Report says
“The Applicant’s requested amendment to reduce the required setback from a Natural Environment Zone (NE) from 30 metres to 15 metres is not supported. Conservation Halton confirms that their policy does not permit any development within 30 metres of regulated wetland features. The extent of the proposed NE Zone aligns with the verified boundaries of the wetland feature. Reducing this setback requirement would contradict Conservation Halton’s policy”



If this is the case, is lot 1 still a viable building lot with enough space for a home and a septic system? Is this a concern for any of the other lots?

The Applicant has provided a drawing showing the preliminary location of dwellings and septic systems for all lots that are outside of the 30-metre buffer from the NE Zone. Conservation Halton has reviewed and has no issues with the preliminary locations.

2. Would it be possible during the meeting to give a brief overview of what steps take place following a zoning by law amendment of this nature if council is in support of passing the by law?

Yes. NPG will provide a brief overview of next steps for Council's benefit.





