



December 18, 2024 Council Meeting

December 18, 2024

Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the December 18, 2024 Council agenda items.

6.1.2 November 27, 2024, Council Minutes - Report FIN-2024-029 entitled 2025 Proposed Operating Budget

- on an individual's tax bill what would be the time and resources necessary to provide a breakdown of taxes for the Township, County and Education? **The current tax bill and community newsletter includes this information. Please find attached.**

6.7 AMO Policy Update – OPP Billing, Bills

-are we eligible even though we do not directly contract with the OPP?

Staff have received the following response from the County of Wellington's Treasurer:

No – the member municipalities won't see this support directly, as they don't see the billing directly. The relief is a temporary 1-year reduction of the O.P.P. billing. It will be applied against the billing.

Since this is a temporary reduction, it is unlikely that the County will use the relief to reduce the levy, as it will just result in a larger increase in 2026. County Council will discuss the County's budget in January.

9.2.1 Report FIN-2024-031 – 2025 Municipal Insurance

-what was Marsh's quote for 2025? **The Township did not seek a separate quote from Marsh, as Intact's proposal was more competitive than the industry's pricing increases and aligned with the recommended \$25K deductible. Obtaining quotes from multiple insurance companies requires considerable time and resources, including the completion of detailed questionnaires and application forms tailored to each insurer. Additionally, switching insurance providers involves a significant investment of time and resources, as well as external technical expert**



consultant support, to thoroughly review each proposal and ensure there are no gaps in coverage.

-what are the premiums with a 50k deductible from Intact? Staff have requested this information from the Township's insurance broker.

-any substantive changes from previous policy? The detailed schedules outlining the changes from the previous insurance policy were inadvertently not included in the Councillor Shared Drive. Staff have now provided this information to Council.

9.2.1 - Municipal Insurance

- Were any other insurance quotes provided? See above
- Are there any notable changes to coverage that differ from last year? See above
- Would like to confirm that any user groups who store items or equipment in township facilities are responsible for insuring their contents? As the Township does not provide content insurance, staff are developing agreements for the use of Township space for storage for community groups to assist groups with obtaining content insurance. This initiative is scheduled as part of the 2025 corporate work plan.

9.2.2 Report FIN-2024-033 – Proposed Donation Policy ≠

-how do we cover off volunteers who want to contribute labour to undertake a task such as rink maintenance, building a shed etc.?

This would be considered a gift of service. The Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) gifting and receipting policy for a gift of service is outlined below:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/charities-giving/charities/policies-guidance/policy-commentary-017-gifts-services.html>

As summarized above, the CRA does not recognize a gift of services as an eligible donation entitled to an official donation receipt. However, should the Township accept a gift of service, the organization may want to invoice the Township for its gift of service and donate the monetary amount back to the Township. This enables the organization to fulfill its wish of gifting a service and receiving an official donation receipt for the gifted labour.

The CRA guidelines also outline that if a business receives special recognition for its donation, or if it receives more than minimal recognition (for example special recognition or more than minimal recognition includes banners or advertising of products), this is considered a



sponsorship. The Township would then follow the Sponsorships section of the proposed donation policy for future sponsorship initiatives that the Township chooses to solicit.

See REPORT REC-2024-003 - Badenoch Storage Shed Replacement – Gift-In-Kind Donation for further information on a specific example associated with a gift of service.

-p. 135 re “The Township reserves the right to refuse to enter into agreements for any Sponsorships or Naming Rights that originally may have been openly solicited by the Township;”; Is this statement necessary if our procurement documents already state that we have the right to refuse?

This statement was included to provide clarity within the policy itself, ensuring there is no ambiguity regarding the Township's right to refuse Sponsorships or Naming Rights, even if they were initially solicited. While the procurement documents may already outline this right, restating it in the policy helps reinforce transparency and consistency.

9.2.2 Donation Policy comments and questions:

- looking for staff recommendations on how to plaque the donated trees? On the ground, on a mount? Any donated trees should have an above ground mount for visibility and to ensure sitting water does not damage the plaque.

- original donor needs a back up contact if after 10 years a renewal or replacement is needed Yes, the form will include a backup contact at the time of the donation for potential renewal. If these contacts are both unsuccessful the Township will have the right to keep or remove the bench depending on its condition as outlined in the current proposed policy.

- locations of benches and trees should be decided in advance. How many can we accept per year with our current service level? All parks? Max # benches per park?

A total of 3 bench/tree donations per year, whether it be trees, benches or a combination of both. Because the purchase and installation of the benches and trees will be completed in house by Township staff, Township staff feel that based on current resources and other annual maintenance activities already established through service levels, 3 in total is achievable. Demand exceeding the 3 bench and/or tree limit will obtain priority to be installed in the subsequent year. This ensures all trees and benches are purchased and installed in a timely manner. Township staff recommend benches or trees in all of the Township's Parks or property if requested.



- in the past a concrete slab under each bench was recommended for lower maintenance. Is this the suggestion for the donated benches? **Compacted stone dust material is also an option to place benches on. Weed maintenance is required but there is no fear of concrete heaving or cracking. Concrete is an option too, but will increase the donation amount by \$500 dollars to a total donation of \$3,000 if a concrete pad is requested by the donor. If no request is given, stone dust will be the foundation for the bench.**

- suggest limiting the benches to honour deceased individuals - is there a guideline for who the donation is named after? What are the parameters?

The current proposed donation policy does not indicate that the person being honored through a commemorative plaque is only for a deceased individual. Many other municipal programs allow donations to commemorate:

- **Living individuals (honoring a milestone, such as anniversaries, retirements, or community contributions).**
- **Deceased individuals as a tribute or memorial.**

The current proposed donation policy offers donors flexibility as long as it is a person being commemorated and not a business.

- **“In Memory Of” plaques (for the deceased)**
- **“In Honor Of” plaques (for the living)**

- what if donation of service is given and the donor doesn't want an official tax receipt? Eg. Helping in the millennial garden with tree maintenance or garden projects or pathway rehabilitation? What is the process for this donation recognition under this proposed policy? Where could recognition of the service given (time/labour) be located?

The Township would not issue an Official Donation Receipt for a gift of service unless the organization invoices the Township for its gift of service and donates the monetary amount back to the Township. This would need to be initiated by the Donor.

The CRA guidelines also outline that if a business receives special recognition for its donation, or if it receives more than minimal recognition (for example special recognition or more than minimal recognition includes banners or advertising of products), this is considered a



sponsorship. The Township would then follow the Sponsorships section of the proposed donation policy for future sponsorship initiatives that the Township chooses to solicit.

The Director of Public Works, Parks and Facilities would determine the specific location for the recognition of the service.

The CRA guidelines outline that if a business receives special recognition for its donation, or if it receives more than minimal recognition (for example special recognition or more than minimal recognition includes banners or advertising of products), this is considered a sponsorship. The Township would then follow the Sponsorships section of the proposed donation policy for future sponsorship initiatives that the Township chooses to solicit.

The proposed policy outlines that Donations related to a specific Township facility or ground valued at over \$30,000 will be acknowledged with an identification plaque displayed in a designated area within the Township facility or ground.

Should Council want the Township to prioritize any specific sponsorship or naming rights initiatives in 2025, it is recommended that only 1 to 2 be prioritized and openly solicited as part of the 2025 Corporate Workplan based on current demands and resources.

- how are donations where the donor doesn't want to be recognized handled?

The proposed policy outlines that the Township will issue an Official Donation Receipt and letter of appreciation for Eligible Donations accepted under this policy having a value of \$20.00 or more. Official Donation Receipts and letters of appreciation will only be issued by the Township for Donations of \$20.00 or more. If further special recognition is desired, this would be considered a sponsorship.

If a donation of over \$30,000 is made and the donor does not want their identification plaque then they can choose to not accept it. A donor could also donate a commemorative item without a person of commemoration if they choose to do so.

-“ d.) The **Township** will consider, but is not obligated to accept the following types of **Sponsorships** and **Naming Rights**:

i. Organizations that wish to **Sponsor** municipal programs such as skating or other drop-in programs;”



- this type of sponsorship helps create community; it encourages physical participation, reduces costs to residents and helps promote a local business. I would hope staff would consider aggressively soliciting these types of sponsorships (similar to how Centre Wellington does).
- Suggest we determine naming rights locations across the township for donors to sponsor. Eg. A specific ball diamond, the rink, a soccer field, a pavilion, play structure, snack stand (similar to what Centre Wellington is doing) – they recently announced that their community centre now has an annual investment with a 10 year commitment.
- What will the outreach look like to encourage donation requests? Can we connect with the County Economic Development department to help?

Should Council want the Township to prioritize any specific sponsorship or naming rights initiatives in 2025, it is recommended that only 1 to 2 be prioritized and openly solicited as part of the 2025 Corporate Workplan based on current demands and resources.

9.2.5 Report FIN-2024-036 – Staff Expense Policy Update

-p.177 any particular reason to delete list of staff receiving cell phones?

The list of staff receiving cell phones was removed because it may change annually based on operational needs. Including this detail in the policy would require frequent updates to reflect changes in users, whether adding new staff or removing individuals. To streamline this process and in accordance with current budget practices, new users are added through the base budget increase form during the operating budget process.

9.3.1 Report ADM-2024-063 Proposed Amendments to Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

-p.188 re “Members of Local Boards.” Suggest change to something like “Members of all Advisory Committees”; Same comment is applicable to the ToFR for other committees.

This wording should not be changed as “Member of Local Boards” is what Advisory Committee members are defined as in the *Municipal Act*. In addition, the *Conflict of Interest Act* draws on this same language and as such, members of the Township’s Advisory Committee are subject to the *Conflict of Interest Act*.

-p.188 re “A Member who is making a request to be excused from Council must provide a reason for the absence and then may be excused by resolution of Council by a majority vote”; this sentence does not make sense. Same comment is applicable to the ToFR for other committees.



Staff have amended the wording as follows for additional clarity, “A Member who is making a written request to Council to be excused, must include in their request the reason for the absence. The request will be considered by Council and the absence may be approved by Council by a majority vote.”

9.3.3 Report ADM-2024-065 2024 Heritage Designation Objections

If Council opts to withdraw their intent to designate when can Council consider designating the properties again?

Council may begin the process to designate the properties at any time. Should Council withdraw their intention to designate the properties will lose their interim protection from demolition including removal of individual heritage features. Should Council wish to restate their intention to designate in the future heritage features that exist now, may not exist in the future and this may result in changes to the Designation By-law or the property no longer being worth of designation.

9.3.3 - Heritage Designation Objection

Could staff please provide some background information regarding how heritage designation does or could impact managed forests, growing produce or landscaping?

The Township’s Heritage Permit By-law states that maintenance and landscaping which does not require heavy machinery, and which does not significantly change the appearance of the property is exempt from requiring a heritage permit. Therefore, it is staff’s interpretation that gardening and growing produce would not typically require any Heritage Permit approvals, except in the case that heavy machinery was to be used near a listed heritage feature such as a mini excavator digging along the foundation of a structure where the foundation is listed as an attribute. In that scenario a Heritage Permit Waiver or Permit may be required to ensure the work is completed in such a way as to not impact or damage the attribute.

While landscaping and gardening are exempt from a Heritage Permit, property owners are always encouraged to contact the Township when undertaking projects where fill is being imported to the property or where changes in grade at being made as other Township permits may be required.

With respect the managed forests, the Township has not included any natural heritage features within its Heritage Designation By-laws and therefore managed forests would not require a Heritage Permit from the Township.



9.3.3 Our zoning bylaw speaks to certain provisions such as ‘not being visible from a public road’. Can this similar concept apply to the heritage components in their bylaws too?

Based on a review of the legislation and other municipalities designation by-laws, heritage attributes listed in the by-law can be quite specific. For example if Council only wanted to protect heritage attributes that are visible from the road then staff could amend the language of the by-law to reflect that. For example, if the attribute to be protected as the exterior field stone façade and the only part of the façade that was visible from the road is the front elevation of the property, then the attribute could captured in the by-law as follows:

- Front elevation exterior field stone façade

Staff do not recommend this approach as the Heritage Advisory Committee has identified properties to be of Cultural Value and/or Interest and worth of designation which are not visible from a public road and these buildings remain an important part of the Township’s culture and history.

9.3.6 11:30 A.M. Report ADM-2024-068 – Environmental Registry of Ontario Postings Related to Permits to Take Water

-do we have a copy of what the City of Guelph and Guelph Eramosa provided to the Ministry regarding the LaFarge request for the PTTW? Supporting them via our comments will show a united front before the MOECP.

Source Water Staff do have copies of the GET comments, however, as they have not been circulated to their Council yet they are unable to share them at this time. For Guelph, GRCA and Region of Waterloo, staff generally understand what their comments are but don’t have copies yet as they are still working on them ahead of the MECP deadline of December 20th.

Source Water Staff understand that Puslinch comments generally align with GET, Guelph, GRCA and Region of Waterloo comments although each agency is choosing to focus on certain aspects of the approval such as private wells, municipal wells, wetland impacts etc.

-re Concast permit to take water; Messrs. Davis and Denhoed do not state that the PTTW should only be for 5 years instead of the requested 10. Will they support in writing a request for a 5 year permit?

Given the results of the monitoring and the length of data available, the comments did not specify a 5 year permit. If Council wishes the comments to request a 5 year permit then staff would request that in writing from MECP.

9.3.6



Lafarge Permit to Take Water ERO

In the original comments in 2019 by Wellington Sourcewater, the following are noted:

7. "At this time, however, the WHPA-Q has not yet been incorporated into the Grand River Source Protection Plan or Assessment Report and therefore the WHPA-Q is not currently in legal effect"
8. "Due to the significant risk level assigned to the WHPA-Q, a project is currently ongoing by Grand River Conservation Authority, City of Guelph, County of Wellington, Ontario

Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), the Township of Guelph/Eramosa, Township of Puslinch and other municipalities (project team) to

complete the steps necessary to update the Grand River Source Protection Plan and Assessment Report with water quantity policies. Eventually policies will be added to

the Grand River Source Protection Plan to manage consumptive water taking and recharge reduction activities within the WHPA-Q"

Has there been any progress or development on the above 2 items that would necessitate revisions or further comment to either of these points?

The policy development for the GGETWHPA-Q is still ongoing at this time. A number of factors have contributed to this including the pandemic and the complexities of the WHPA-Q encompassing four upper tier municipalities and two watersheds. Source protection staff continue to participate in the working group led by the GRCA. Early engagement has been ongoing over the past few years with the MECP and those comments have been incorporated into draft policies. An update is anticipated in early 2025 to the Lake Erie Source Protection Committee and tentatively updates will be able to be shared to the affected municipal councils after that.

9.3.7 Report ADM-2024-069 – By-law Enforcement Service Levels and Resources



-p. 347 re “The AMPS process allows disputes to be resolved through a screening review. If the screening decision is contested, a hearing can be requested”; who will be conducting the screening review and who will be conducting the hearing? **The screening will be conducted by Township staff (not the same staff member that issued the ticket), and the hearings will be conducted by an external representative (not staff or Council).**

-p. 349 are the 2025 budget implications a decrease of \$32k assuming the Committee Coordinator position is not filled and the associated budget applied to the costs identified in this report? **The total anticipated cost (less recoveries) for the second by-law officer and associated fees for AMPS is \$24,300. This represents a decrease of \$23,500 from the original amount of \$47,800 earmarked for a Committee Coordinator position.**

-p. 349 on a full year basis would \$60k be recoverable? **Staff anticipate \$60k in recoveries through AMPS annually. However, this is an estimate with a number of uncertainties that are difficult to predict, such as the number of by-law violations for any given year.**

9.3.7 - By-Law Enforcement Levels

- With the introduction of the AMPS system, where are hearings held and who conducts the hearings? **Hearings are proposed to be conducted virtually and by an external representative (not staff or Council).**
- Would council members be expected to be involved in the screening/hearing process or in the decision making of those screenings and hearings? **No, Council is not involved in the process. As part of the requirements for AMPS, a conflict of interest manual is to be established and approved by Council outlining the separation between Council and the AMPS. Training will be provided to Council should the AMPS be implemented.**
- Would this model allow for evening and weekend by-law enforcement? **Yes, staff are aiming to develop a schedule where coverage can take place outside of business hours on a regular basis.**
- Any idea of roughly how many part 3 summons are issued each year on average in Puslinch? **In the last 3 years the Township has issued approximately 4-5 part 3 summons each year.**
- Has this arrangement been discussed with our current by-law officer and is he agreeable to this approach **Yes, the Townships officer is actively engaged with senior leadership on the potential to implement the AMPS and the potential increase to service levels. He is supportive of both proposed changes to the by-law service sector.**

9.3.7 - By-Law Enforcement Levels

Could the addition of a second by-law FTE create an opportunity for more technical assistance



and support for minor site alteration permit applications and normal farm practice waivers for site alterations? Given that the engagement on the site alteration noted in several comments that the permit process is complex and difficult to navigate, are there opportunities that with a second by-law there could be workshops or open office hours for those needing help?

Staff have provided a number of resources for the public such as guides, checklists, initial screening forms, and the ability to schedule a delegated official meeting with staff and Township consultants. Staff do not recommend that direct assistance from Township staff or consultants be given to applicants/agents to complete applications. This is a similar approach that is taken for planning act applications and building permit applications. Applicants are recommended to retain the appropriate professionals to assist with the technical aspects of their applications as the Township cannot act as their agent. For site alteration applications, the appropriate technical professionals also need to be retained as these are complex projects that require a Qualified Person. This is a requirement not only in the Township By-law, but also a requirement in the provincial regulations.

9.3.7 Can staff speak to a second bylaw officer helping with prevention of offenses? How can we prevent offences if bylaw officers only respond to complaints? Will there be opportunity for enforcement based on active monitoring of permits issued? Staff can review the current By-law Complaint Policy and suggest revisions based on an increased service level should Council approve the second officer.

Do any of our member municipalities use this AMPS system and if so, what are their comments on staff capacity, timing, cost recovery? Yes, many municipalities have implemented AMPS recently. The process includes a heavy workload in the front end to get the system established with all the necessary documentation. Timing can range anywhere from 6 months to a year to implement the system. Staff are aiming for a June 2025 implementation date. Given the Township's workload in the by-law service sector, two officers are needed for the program. Cost recovery is three-fold: increased ticket recoveries; reduced legal expenses; and more time available for staff to focus on tasks not associated with legal proceedings.

10.3 County of Wellington Official Plan Review OPA 126 Urban Boundary Expansions

- re p. 482 Text (Erin and Puslinch)

The revised section with the inclusion will now state

"9.9.3 Relationship to the Official Plan

The Greenbelt Plan builds on the Provincial Policy Statement and is to be implemented through municipal official plans. Therefore, the policies of this Plan and local official plans continue to apply provided that they conform with the Greenbelt Plan. **A reference in the Greenbelt Plan**



to the PPS is a reference to the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 as it read immediately before it was revoked and a reference in this Plan to the Growth Plan is a reference to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019 as it read immediately before it was revoked.

The Greenbelt Plan relies on Schedules B2 and B7 of this Plan for the boundary between Prime Agricultural Areas and other rural designations, and for detailed settlement area boundaries. The Natural Heritage System is not a designation in and of itself with a list of permitted uses. Rather, it functions as an overlay on top of the designations on Schedules B2 and B7, subject to constraints of the Natural System policies.

The policies of this Section are in addition to, and to be read in conjunction with, all other relevant policies of this Plan. In the event of conflict, the more restrictive policy shall prevail, except that this Plan may not be more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan in regard to agricultural and mineral aggregate resource policies.”

The inclusion of the proposed wording of OPA 126 will make it very confusing to comprehend this revised paragraph. Suggest that entire paragraph be written for clarity.

Staff will prepare a resolution for this recommendation to be provided to the County of Wellington’s Manager of Planning.

10.5 Ministry of Finance Letter to TAMPO regarding new aggregate extraction property class and

10.6 Ministry of Finance Letter to Township of Puslinch regarding new aggregate extraction property class ≠

-re p.489 and 491 “The government understands the challenges small and rural municipalities face. In this regard, in the 2024 Fall Economic Statement announced the Ontario Municipal Partnership Fund will be increased by \$100 million (20% increase) annually. This will be phased in over two years with an immediate \$50 million increase in 2025.”;

Will the OMPF increase offset the our share of the \$3 million municipal tax in 2025 and subsequent years?

Staff have contacted Mr. Freeman and will report back to Council once a response has been received.

9.3.5 - Site Alteration By-Law Update

Given the requested presentation by Wellington Federation of Agriculture requested in January, should we consider deferring this report for the January council meeting? **Staff recommend that the presentation be provided at the December 18 meeting given the delegation that was added with the addendum. Staff also recommend that the presentation be**



included on the January 22 agenda for consideration during the Wellington Federation of Agriculture's delegation.

Are there any opportunities to reduce or simplify the permit application requirements for minor site alterations? The Designated Official currently has discretion to waive aspects of the control plan for minor, intermediate, and large applications. This allows for a scoped list of requirements based on the proposal. The Township's permit types and volumes are generally in line with other municipal By-laws. However, Council may consider increasing the volume for minor applications from 350m³ to 500m³. This may allow for more small scale permits that meet all other requirements to be eligible for a minor application.

Would like to ask for staff input on adding some flexibility into the exemptions section and increasing the cumulative volume from the existing 20 cubic meters to 50 or 100 provided all the other provisions remain and perhaps adds some additional provisions such as:

- only for the purpose of lawn dressing, landscaping, driveway re- surfacing or adding to flower beds or vegetable garden
- the ground elevation of the lands is not increased by more than 0.2m
- material is not stockpiled for more than thirty days
- there is no change in the direction or rate of Drainage to neighbouring properties

Any time soil is imported there is risk associated with poor excess soil management practices, such as risk of contamination. The permit process helps mitigate this risk not just for the Township and the environment, but for the property owner who ultimately assumes the financial burden should the property need to be remediated. Compliance with excess soil management regulations in the Township is very challenging due to a number of factors such as geographic location, large agricultural properties, limited resources, and proximity to the GTA. With the upcoming changes to O.Reg 406/19, the Township will face an increase in illegal soil importation. Given the forgoing, staff do not recommend changes to the exemption provisions at this time.

9.4.1, 9.4.2 & 9.4.3 - Various Zoning By-Law Amendments

Since the time of the statutory public meeting, have there been any formal comments submitted by members of the public?

There was a comment submitted after the addendum deadline today from the PLCA (see attached). No other public comments have been submitted for any of the applications.