



January 22, 2025 Council Meeting

January 22, 2025

Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the January 22, 2025 Council agenda items.

Heritage Designation

During the Delegation at the December council meeting – the property owner indicated they would work with staff to arrange for a site visit to determine the current state of the home and also provide some clarification on how the designation affects certain areas of their property (specifically landscaping and forest management). Are staff able to provide an update on whether that site visit took place and any feedback on the discussions that took place? **Staff will be prepared to answer this question at the meeting.**

During the delegation, the property owner spoke about existing windows and doors that are not energy efficient. If designation were to proceed, can staff provide an understanding of the steps that would be required by the property owner to install new energy efficient doors and windows?

If the doors and windows are included as heritage attributes within the delegation by-law, in order to make changes a heritage permit would be required. I've included the process from the online guide below to outline the process details:



Heritage Alteration Permit Process

Heritage Alteration Permit application completed through Township website and submitted to Municipal Clerk. Clerk will deem the application complete when all of the required information is provided by the applicant.

Permit Application will be reviewed by the Heritage Advisory Committee to provide comments to Township Council.

Council to consider Heritage Alteration Permit Application.

Council Approves Permit.

Council Refuses Permit.

Without Conditions.

With Conditions.

Owner proceeds, or applies for more permits.

Owner may file appeal with Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

OLT makes final decision.

Township Kennel By-law

- Current by-law says that no person shall keep more than 3 dogs per dwelling unit. Does that mean dog sitting in-home would be permitted for up to 3 dogs per dwelling without a license? **Yes, the by-law defines "keep" as harbouring or possessing for any period of time, whether temporary or not. The by-law requires these dogs to be licensed.**



- Is staff aware of how doggie daycares are dealt with in other municipalities? Would it be a license similar to a kennel license or would it be a home occupation license? With the exception of boarding dogs inside a dwelling instead of an out-building, would all of the other minimum standards generally be the same? **Staff would want to investigate best practices around doggie daycares and report back to Council.**
- If council wished to include a provision in the kennel by-law to allow for in-home pet sitting, is there a significant amount of staff resources required to do so and theoretically where might this be able to be incorporated into the corporate work plan? **Staff recommend that should Council add this to the workplan, that it be scheduled for the first quarter of 2026. By-law staff are implementing AMPS in the first half of 2025 and working on Short Term Rentals and onboarding the second by-law officer in the second half of 2025.**

Site Alteration By-law

- The slide deck provided by Wellington Federation of Agriculture indicates that compost is governed by other regulations. Are staff able to provide any information on this? **Staff have requested a response from its consultant and will follow up during the meeting if a answer is provided in time.**
- The township has not yet received an application for a Normal Farm Practice Waiver – is that correct? **Correct**
- If the township were to receive an application for a Normal Farm Practice Waiver, realistically speaking, how long would it take to process that application and provide a decision to the applicant? **Assuming all information has been provided by the applicant, the Township's consultant can provide feedback typically within 48 business hours. Please note, that the Township has no control over external agency permit requirements or turnaround times (i.e. conservation authorities).**

9.1.1 Report FIR-2025-001 – Fire Protection Grant – Execution of Agreement

-with receipt of the grant can the proposed budget be reduced accordingly? **The grant will reduce the utilization of the asset management reserve, it does not impact the 2025 tax levy impact.**

9.4.2 Report PD-2025-002 Zoning By-law Amendment Application (D14/WDD Request for Council to deem the application complete/incomplete)



Who will ultimately maintain the roads and storm water management systems? **The Township will assume the road network and SWM infrastructure upon final assumption.**

I have reviewed the submissions and have the following comments'

It is important to note that deeming an application complete is not intended to focus on the merits of the application. The Township's subconsultants did not have a concern regarding deeming the application complete, as required information has been provided. The Application is undergoing on-going review, and a position on the matter will follow at a later date after the public consultation and the detailed review. Attached is an email from the Township's engineer regarding the concerns raised which was omitted from the staff report in error.

Staff recommend the following resolution for clarity:

Whereas the application D14/WDD has been reviewed by the Township of Puslinch in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act; and

Whereas the Township's subconsultants have reviewed the application and have raised no concerns regarding deeming the application complete, confirming that all required studies has been provided; and

Whereas the Township acknowledges that deeming the application complete does not imply any judgment or position on the merits of the application; and

Whereas the application is still undergoing ongoing review, including public consultation and further detailed analysis, with a formal position on the matter to be presented following the completion of these processes; and

Whereas the Township expects that all concerns raised by its professional consultants during the review process will be adequately addressed to the satisfaction of the Township;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that Council of the Township of Puslinch deems the application D14/WDD to be complete in accordance with the Planning Act; and

That Council acknowledges that the deeming of the application as complete is procedural and does not constitute a decision on the merits of the application, which will be determined



following the full review process, including public consultation and the final analysis of all relevant information; and

That Council expects the applicant to adequately address concerns raised by the Township's professional consultants in accordance with the Planning Act and Township's policies and standards.

1. Water Quality

1.1 Comments have been made regarding the water quality and quantity as follows:
Dec. 13, 2024 NPG letter "subject to the Township's Engineering and Hydrogeological Consultant confirming that sufficient information has been provided to make a determination as to whether the site conditions are suitable"

1.2 Dec. 13, 2024 GEI letter "We defer to the Township Hydrogeologist and Wellington Source Water Protection for comments on the infiltration water quality and the effect on drinking water wells."

1.3 Dec. 13, 2024 Wellington Hydrology letter "Comment 3: The MECP have identified the potential presence of cyanobacteria in groundwater within the shallow bedrock aquifer in Puslinch just south of Morriston. Please run the sample for microcystins to confirm that the concentration is below the O.Reg.169/03 standard at the site" and "The water quality results also exceeded the ODWS aesthetic objectives and operational guidelines for hardness, total dissolved solids (TDS), total iron, total manganese and colour. Nitrates were present at levels up to 1.88 mg/L, but were below the ODWS MAC of 10 mg/L. Elevated chloride was present at levels up to 193 mg/L (below the ODWS aesthetic objective of 250 mg/L), with sodium levels of up to 90.2 mg/L (below the ODWS aesthetic objective of 250 mg/L but exceeding the Medical Officer of Health Reporting Limit of 20 mg/L). The extended O. Reg. 169/03 Schedule 2 results for TW3 (BH4) did not exceed the regulation limits"

The proponent does not believe testing for microcystins is necessary Ref. Dec. 2, 2024 letter from Englobe.

1.4 Dec. 13, 2024 Wellington Hydrology letter "Comment 4: we are unsure of the feasibility of the upper bedrock aquifer to support the density proposed for this development as well as future development in the surrounding area. It is our recommendation to the Township/County that water supply for this development and other high-density developments on private servicing in Morriston be sourced from the lower bedrock aquifer to ensure isolation from surface contaminants and provide safe and sustainable water supply now and in future.



Wells installed in the lower bedrock must be cased and sealed into the lower unit; multiaquifer wells (i.e., wells that are constructed with a screen or open hole extending through both the upper and lower bedrock aquifers) are not permitted.

The proponent is still proposing to use the upper bedrock aquifer.

1.5 Dec. 13, 2024 Wellington Hydrology letter Comment 5: A separate assessment should be completed for sewage impacts to groundwater and surface water quality resulting from potential ADUs and/or home-based businesses.

The proponent has only assessed quantity not quality.

Given that the WGL has recommended testing for microsystems, using the lower bedrock for potable water and assessing water quality from potential ADUs do staff still recommend that the application is complete?

2. Stormwater Management

2.1 Dec. 13, 2024 GEI letter has identified deficiencies as follows:

-item 4 Infiltration Water Quality

-item 10 Quantity Control of Stormwater

Given these deficiencies do staff still recommend that the application is deemed complete?

3. Crozier Report Nov. 2024 Sanitary servicing of Lot 1

-regarding the statement on p. 174 of the report "Due to space limitations, Lot 1 of the development is proposed to be serviced through a shallow buried trench as shown on FIG 2.";

Do staff and consultants agree with this approach?

4. Crozier letter of Nov. 15 re "The footprints of the proposed private sewage systems will need to be reviewed to confirm appropriate sizing as part of the building permit stage if ADUs or HBBs are proposed on specific lots. ADUs and HBBs can potentially increase the assumed fixture counts for the lots, necessitating a revised sewage system design."; *given a new homeowner does not typically consider a ADU or HBB until well after they have owned the property should either the septic system be designed now to accommodate in the future or alternatively at least include in the purchase agreement that the septic system is not designed to accommodate the ADU in the future.*

5. GHD letter of Nov. 13 on p.301 re "The flexibility inherent in the lot design ensures that any additional demand for parking or minor modifications can be accommodated without impacting adjacent properties or requiring variances"; *and*

GEI Comment (September 2024) "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.”; *these two statements seem to be at variance with each other shouldn't this be addressed prior to the application be deemed complete.*

6. Nov. 2024 Crozier Report p. 3 of report states “As reported by Terraprobe, the soils encountered consisted of earth fill materials, comprised of sand, with some gravel and trace amounts of rootlets to a depth of 0.8 mbgs.” ; *shouldn't the fill material be tested for contaminants if there isn't any analysis data? I seem to recall fill was added sometime in between 2015 to 2017.*