



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
OCTOBER 7, 2026, PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

MINUTES

DATE: October 7, 2026

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

The October 7, 2026, Public Information Meeting was held on the above date and called to order at 6:00 p.m. by electronic participation and in person at 7404 Wellington Road 34.

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor James Seeley – Chair
Councillor John Sepulis
Councillor Sara Bailey
Councillor Russel Hurst
Councillor Jessica Goyda

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Courtenay Hoytfox, Chief Administrative Officer
Justine Brotherston, Director of Corporate Services/Municipal Clerk
Laura Emery, Manager of Corporate Services/Deputy Clerk
Monika Farncombe, Planning & Corporate Services Coordinator
Lichheng Lim, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions
Brianna Miller, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions
Max Fedchyshak, Township Planning Consultant, NPG Planning Solutions

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE:

John Cox, Applicant Planning Consultant – D14-SNY
Rob Snyder, Applicant – D14-SNY
Rob Stovel, Applicant Planning Consultant – D14-KUK
Tony Latimer, Applicant Hydrogeologist – D14-KUK
Brandon and Jordan, Crozier Consulting Engineers – D14-KUK
Jennifer Gaudet, Applicant Planning Consultant – D14-HAS; Wayne Fisher.
Doug Pilkey, 16 Hume Road

3. DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Councillor Jessica Goyda declared a conflict of interest with respect to application D14-KUK, advising that the land in question is owned by her employer. She indicated that she would not participate in the discussion of that application.

4. PURPOSE OF THE PUBLIC MEETING

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: The purpose of this public meeting is to inform the public and provide an opportunity to ask questions or express views regarding the development proposals. Council is here to listen to comments and will not make any decisions this evening. The applications are D14-SNY (339 Downey Road), D14-KUK (Part Lots 7–9, Concession 10), and D14-HAS (7248 Gore Road, Emerald Lake).

The Township requests that you notify staff by email planning@puslinch.ca or by phone at 519-763-1226 ext. 4 if you wish to be on record and would like to be notified of future hearings and the decision regarding this meeting.

The County requests that you please notify staff by email at landdivisioninfo@wellington.ca if you wish to be on record regarding the Official Plan Amendment Application and would like to be notified of future hearings and decisions regarding this application.

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 Planning Act the following parties may appeal this application to the Ontario Land Tribunal for a hearing:

- the applicant,
- a specified person,
- a public body,
- the registered owner of the property to which the by-law would apply and 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 Tribunal, 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. PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING APPLICATIONS

5.1 Zoning By-law Amendment D14-SNY – 339 Downey Road

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: This public meeting involves an application by zoning bylaw application D14 SNY property location municipally known as 339 Downey Road, Township of Puslinch. The purpose and effect of the proposed zoning by-law is to amend the Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 2018-023 as amended to rezone the lands municipally known as 339 Downey Road, change the zoning from Agricultural (A) to Agricultural Site-Specific Zoning (A spxx). to prohibit new dwelling unit on one part of the site into an agricultural site-specific zone to permit two existing dwelling units on the other part of the site. Would the owner applicant make their presentation, please?

John Cox, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-SNY): My name's John Cox, the J.L. Cox Planning Consultants representing the applicant, and I also have Rob Snyder representing the family in attendance with me. I am just going to provide a few comments that go beyond what is specifically referred to in the NPG report, which was a comprehensive review of the application, and as noted therein, it is a surplus dwelling application. that has been approved back in December of 2024 by the Wellington County Land Division Committee, and, proposed to separate 1.4-hectare site, which is shown on the screen, from the agricultural land associated with it, which is a total of 46.8 hectares. Specific bylaw requests are for a 14-meter frontage for the existing driveway. The purpose of both the width of the driveway and the irregular configuration of the property was to minimize any loss of agricultural land, but to be able to accommodate the existing dwellings, driveway, and their associated septic systems.

In terms of why, there are two dwellings on the property. The smaller dwelling, which is closer to Downey Road on the right, is the original farmhouse for the property, which was built in the early 1900s. In 1966, a new dwelling was built as the primary dwelling, and that is the building to the rear of the sketch. At that time, the original dwelling was used for farm help. Zoning By-law 26-1966 at the time permitted such a second dwelling for non-paying staff or help employed on the property. So, it had legal non-conforming status as a second dwelling, but because of the severance application and the alteration of the property, that status is, would no longer be in effect if it is approved. We specifically made submissions. regarding the conformity to the Wellington County Official Plan, and the fact that the lands are designated prime agricultural and note that that designation permits residential dwellings in the plural and also recognizes existing use.

So, we concluded that the proposed amendment does conform to the Official Plan and will also fulfill the conditions of severance approval. The only other comment I will make is that we did attend the PDAC meeting for the Township back on September 8th, and as a result of that, there was a condition requested that there be no future severance of the two dwellings, or that no future severance of the two dwellings be permitted, and having reviewed that with my clients, we have no objection to the imposition of such a condition. Thank you.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Thank you, John. We will now ask the Puslinch Planning Consultant to present their information.

Brianna Miller, Township Planning Consultant: Yes, good evening. I am Brianna. I will be presenting for NPG tonight on this one little switch of rule. So yes, we are discussing the property known as 339 Downey Road. We are just going to move through the development process, location of both provincial and county policies. Talk about the zoning bylaw, the proposed development, the zoning bylaw amendment, and then we will talk about any comments that we have received, next steps, and then we will take questions and comments at the end. So, we have received the application for the Zoning By-law Amendment. Currently, we are hosting the public meeting to provide an overview of the applications, and there will be a future recommendation report that will be provided to Council at a later date. So, the subject lands are located at the northwest corner of Downey Road and Laird Road West intersection. It is an agricultural parcel, as can be seen there.

So, it is considered a prime agricultural area, and it does have a natural heritage feature on it as well. It is designated as prime agricultural and core Greenlands under the Wellington County Official Plan. And it is zoned agricultural, natural environment, and has an environmental protection overlay that corresponds to the wetland that is on the property, as well as the GRCA regulation limit. So, the Zoning By-law Amendment, as was mentioned, is needed to fulfill conditions of Consent Application B94-24. The severed parcel will have one-story single detached dwelling, a two-story single detached dwelling, and the retained parcel will have agricultural lands, it will have the wetland. There is a dry shed and barn currently there, but those are to be removed for the conditions of the severance as well. So, the proposal is to rezone the vacant, retained land to prohibit the future construction of a dwelling, as of such with farm surplus severances.

And next is to rezone these, proposed severed lot, to permit the following, which would be a frontage of fourteen meters, just to accommodate the narrow driveway, and to permit the two

single detached dwellings to continue to exist on the parcel. All right, great, thank you. Sorry. Went too fast. So, there are some comments. What was mentioned at the PDAC requested that there would not be a future severance of the two dwellings, permitted. We did ask for additional justification for permitting of the two dwellings that we just heard tonight. And the City of Guelph did reiterate they do need the road widening transferred to them as part of the consent conditions as well, but they are fine with the width that is being provided of 2.2-2.92 meters. And we did not have any public comments so far. So, the next steps, we are doing an ongoing review of the application. We will provide comments to the applicant, and they will have the opportunity to respond or make revisions, and then, yes, we will complete the recommendation report to Council at a later date.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: No questions. Great. Thank you. Is there anyone in the gallery that would like to speak to this? If there are, can you just state your name and address for the record? All right, is there anybody online? If there are any members of the public that are attending online that would like to speak to this application, you just have to use the raise your hand function on Zoom. It is located at the bottom right-hand corner of your screen. Does Council need any clarification questions? for having clarification questions.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Is there anything you would like to add?

John Cox, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-SNY): Just one comment, and that is I did receive an update on the land exchange with the city today from the Snyder family's solicitors, and they've indicated that a draft of the exchange of property, as shown on the reference plan, is being currently reviewed by the city, so that's in process. Thank you.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Great. We will move on to the next one. Thank you. The next one we are going to do is 4.2. So, I believe that's Rob and Rob Jr. Is that correct? Come on down. Do you have a copy of the updated bylaw. Can you sit down and start? We are good to go. Thank you.

5.2 Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment D14-KUK – Part Lots 7–9, Concession 10

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: This public meeting involves an application by Kukavika, which actually does not any longer, is my understanding, right? Just as a historical name. Official Plan and Zoning By-law Application D14 KUK, Property Location Municipally Known, as part Lot 729, Concession 10, Township of Puslinch. Purpose and effect of the proposed official plan amendment is to expand the Hanlon Parkway by redesignating the subject lands from primary agricultural and secondary agricultural to Hamlet area to facilitate a residential subdivision.

The purpose and effect of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is to amend the Township Puslinch Zoning By-law 2018-023, as amended, to rezone the lands municipally known as Park Lots 7, 8, and 9, Concession 10, from agricultural A zone to a Hamlet residential site-specific zone with a holding provision. This is a mouthful. HR (SPXX) (H-Y). There is a bunch of brackets in there, too. To permit a residential subdivision consisting of single detached dwellings, additional residential units, home business, and a park.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: I will now turn it over to Robin Rob Jr.

Rob Stovel, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-KUK): Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. Beautiful day today. Got some interesting weather coming in, and I appreciate, having the opportunity to talk to you today. I am here with my son, Rob Stovel, and my clients, from Sloom Construction, Dave and John and Sean Marsh from Timberworks. We also have members of our consulting team here; in case there's questions that may come up that I am unable to answer. We have Tony Latimer, he's, our hydrogeologist, and Jordan and Brandon from Crozier. Brandon manages the traffic engineering, and Jordan is our stormwater management functional services engineer. Again, like you said previously, if there are any questions that come up that we are unable to answer tonight. we will record them, and we will get back to, Council and staff as soon as we can. So, again, thank you, Mr. Mayor, and Council. Happy to be here, and staff, and welcome members of the public here tonight.

So, we have a brief presentation that describes the site location and the proposed development and the planning applications. And they are in front of the county and the township for consideration. My clients, Timber Works and Slood Construction are long-time builders in the community. They operate family businesses, and they employ many local trades, and they need these lots to continue their business. We will start the slideshow. So, the primary objectives are to, you know, to describe the proposal and, eventually seek, support from Council, for the proposed development. The site location is approximately, a little bit less than 50 acres, so 18.8 hectares in size, of which a good portion of it is a wooden plantation to the south. Located at part of Lot 789, Concession 10, it is bounded by Watson Road to the west, and Arkell Road, to the north, and, along the south, there is a railroad, the Guelph Junction Railroad.

A portion of the site is included in the Hamlet, and we think that this is a logical extension for the Hamlet. The provincial policy sets out requirements for permitting, settlement bond or expansion, and we feel that we have satisfied those requirements. So, one of the biggest things, as part of the work that the county, did as part of OPA131 was determine how much land is needed for development. The county set out fifty units of growth for article. My client's proposal is for less than that. And I just wanted to say, regarding the lots is that the lots are needed by my client. I know that Sean has no lots remaining, and I am quite sure that Slood Construction requires lots, too, to continue business. And they really are hopeful to get work going on the build as soon as they can. In terms of, site servicing. The engineering reports set out the requirements for servicing things like drilled bedrock wells, septic services with tertiary treatment, stormwater management system, and promotion of infiltration.

Yes, that figure shows the Hamlet boundary, which is in yellow, which has a small portion of the site included close to the railroad there, and then also a small portion of the site is mapped as a secondary (inaudible). So, the next slide, please. So, the bylaw that we proposed is fairly straightforward, and it follows what the Hamlet residential zoning. The only difference is that in this zone, our lot size is going to be around the minimum is 0.2 of a hectare, which is a half an acre, right around there. Some of the lots are proposed are to be bigger than that. So next slide, please. Well, I guess another part of the rezoning process that is important to know is that. We will be working with the Township planning consultant to settle specific, setbacks for the railroad, and notice that there is an MDS arc, MDS that, affect a part of the plantation. There is no proposed residential development in that area.

So just a little bit about the description of the type of the development. The idea behind it is smaller in scale, rural in feel, and connected to its surroundings. We think that by retaining a good portion of the plantation, which is how we will help to achieve that, and with the large lot design, which will also be similar to what is expected to be seen in Arkell. So, the goal is to extend Arkell in a way that it feels like it belongs. Next slide, please. So, the houses that are being proposed, these are just some renderings that, Sean's crew prepared. And they are going to be a little bit smaller in width than some of the other bigger estate lots in the Township, but the idea behind it is similar to what has been built in the local area. Garages to the rear and, the width of the lot, or the actual development would be somewhere in the range of 65 to 85 feet to fit within the 100- or 110-foot-wide parcel.

Next slide, please. So again, I am sure that you know about the. The two, builders here, they are local. Their families live and work in the community, and they have a long-term accountability tied to the reputation for good building, and it is important to note that the investment stays within the local economy. And we are going to emphasize; they want to emphasize quality of work for the military stays here. So next, please. So, just, you have mentioned this before, you know, the Kukavika thing, and where are we now? So, it has been this project was started 20 years ago, the proposal, and it has taken till now to really get some momentum. And what had happened was, in 2017, Slood purchased the property, and then in 2022, Sean Marsh and his company partnered with Slood Construction on this. And since 2022, we have been working hard with the engineering and technical reports to produce a product that meets the tests of the planning act and satisfies the local peer review committee that, Township has retained. So again, a key thing about that is the county's official plan amendment to the fifty units of potential growth for article. So, we fit right within that next slide, please. So, there were a number of reports that were completed in 2006, and since 2022, we have updated those

reports and added on new ones. One of the big reports that was completed was right at the start, and we worked with the township hydrogeologist to do the pump test and ensure that there's potable water on the site. And, the township hydrogeologist has, peer-reviewed the reporting and, is satisfied with it. Other reports that were done were, noise and vibration feasibility study, the scope DIS. A big part about the DIS is, and what we try to do with the development is, not encroach, within the plantation. Next slide, please. So, this is an example of, how, a development, or how the building, footprint could work on the site. It could change many ways, but.

We have a well in the front, which is what the circle is about, and then the rectangle at the front of the parcel is a building envelope that would be width. It certainly could be bigger than that. And in this example, the septic system is located at the rear of the property. It certainly could be closer to the house, but we just wanted to make sure that everyone understood that everything fit on the property. On the proposed list. The groundwater study was a key thing, and again, what I mentioned before is that Harden Environmental has reviewed it, and they are satisfied with the pump test that there's sufficient water there for the service of the development. Next slide, please. So, I would say probably, concluding the presentation here, I wanted to go through some of the comments that were raised, throughout the PDAC and some of the other comments that we have seen from the public. But what we think about this is that it is a logical, expansion. It has planning merit. It is directly contiguous to an existing settlement area.

It is logical and defensible, and we have had it peer reviewed. All our studies are, they are deemed satisfactory, and like I have mentioned before, is that my clients need it, and they are ready to develop this site, subject to council giving approval. Thank you very much. So, this is just an example of the conceptual plan that we have developed for the site. It shows, two proposed entrances, one to the south on Watson Road and one to the north on Arkell Road. And I think the important thing about the development is that we try to do is keep outside of the plantation. We do recognize that the plantation is going to require management, and we also recognize that as we move through the process. We are going to have to do additional planting buffers, things like that, to make sure that we screen our proposed development from existing properties. But that is the general kind of layout for it, with three cul-de-sacs and two entrances.

And we have shown, MDS arc from a building further to the south. And it will not affect, any development envelopes on the site. So, I just wanted to take a second or two and, review some of the comments that were raised by the, Planning and Development Committee, and address them, and also, to address some of the comments that we heard, or that we've seen through the public circulation. So, one of the comments that was raised by the committee was, what is going to happen with the plantation? And my clients are open to discuss that, and we think that this could be best addressed at the draft plan approval stage, when the details of everything get hammered out. But yes, that is a good question. We are looking forward to having a discussion with Council about that. So, we showed some conceptual site plan and building elevations. We think they look good, and they definitely fit on the property.

There was a question regarding, school pickup. So, the school pickup areas will be set out as a condition at the draft plan approval stage and will likely either be at Watson Road or Arkell Road. You have to remember that the internal road system, is not assumed immediately, by the municipality. It takes time for it to work through the process, and our understanding of it is that the school board requires, children, students, to be picked up at the location of a public road. So again, the school board has been, contacted. Through this process, and our engineers have, reached out, and had contact with them, but that is the, general, our general understanding of it. There was a question regarding, sufficiency of water and water bylaw. So again, our hydrogeologist worked with the township's hydrogeologists, and there's sufficient water. Harden is satisfied with the proposal, and there are no outstanding issues. And the comment about the water bylaw, that was just an example. It was not like; this has to be done. These are some of the things that could be done if there ever was a concern.

There was a question that we saw regarding the potential for impacts on the intersection at Arkell Road and at Watson Road. And I do not believe there is going to be any impact. But the

beauty of tonight is that I have my traffic engineer, who is going to address that right now. So, could you stand up and address the council, please? I would request you come down by the table.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: You know you are better up here.

Brandon, Applicant Traffic Consultant (Crozier): Okay, so this is in response to a question we got in one of the letters, right, Rob? So, the intersection of Arkell and Watson today operates at what we call LOS level of service A's and B's, A being less than 10 seconds of average delay, and B being less than 20 seconds of average delay, between 10 and 20 seconds of average delay, and then when we trip, we essentially estimate the traffic that will be associated with the development during these two peak hours, the AM and the PM peak hour, to see how much traffic will layer onto the network post-development, and when we put that traffic onto the network, we see that the level of service would be expected to stay at level of service A and B in the PCAR, respectively, so we don't see a noticeable change. you know, I think you have some of the best levels of service in the area, so that's always nice to start from that, and we have negligible impacts on that intersection, so as a result of this zone, we're not proposing to do anything, but there is, you know, the internal road network that will be provided as well.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Should take some impact off the intersection. Good. All right.

Rob Stovel, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-KUK): Through you, Mr. Mayor, there was another question that was raised. It was regarding, lighting, and lighting impacts from the proposed subdivision on the adjacent area. And our answer on that is that the lighting, if required, I think it will be, has to conform to the township's municipal standards. And our engineers will work with the township engineers to develop a lighting that conforms to the, what do they call it? Dark sky, dark sky requirement. Good job. There was a question regarding screening and privacy. So again, as a condition of draft plan approval, a revegetation planting program's going to be required, and through that program, architect develops a planting program to ensure that there is, native plants planted along the periphery to provide appropriate screening and buffering. Regarding privacy, the developers can work with the township to determine what and where, or if any, fencings required.

Got it. Anything else? Did we miss anything in the letters? Well, if we missed something, I am sure we are going to hear about it, and we can certainly address it here or come back. I think that. That concludes our presentation, and, we are available to answer any questions, comments that, Council or staff or the public might have.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: So, thank you very much. I will turn it over to the townships consultants.

Lichheng Lim, Township Planning Consultant: Good evening, everyone, and members of Council. My name is Lichheng, and I am a planner with NPG Planning Solutions, acting as the Township's Planning Consultant for this file. Tonight, we are here for the statutory public meeting for the Zoning By-law Amendment Application, known as D14-KUK, and Official Plan Amendment Application OP-2006-06 for the property known as part of Lot 7-9, Concession 10. My presentation tonight will outline development process and provide an overview of the location, provincial and county policies, and the zoning bylaw. I will also provide a summary of the proposal, the requested official plan amendment, and the zoning bylaw amendment, as well as the comments received from the township, county, and agencies to date. And lastly, I will touch on next steps and will be available to answer any questions if needed. In terms of the development process, the Zoning By-law Amendment application has been submitted to the Township and is currently under review. The Official Plan Amendment application has also been submitted to the County and was circulated to the Township for review and comments as well.

Currently, we are at the public meeting stage to provide an overview of both the Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment applications. Following the public meeting, the next steps for the applications would be to make a future recommendation report to Council. and for the county to decide on the official plan amendment application. The subject lands are partially located in the hamlet of Arkell, with frontage on Arkell Road to the north and Watson Road south to the west, with the Guelph Junction Railway to the south. The subject lands are

rural lands in the provincial planning statement and are designated primary agricultural, secondary agricultural and hamlet area in the county Wallington's official plan and are zoned agricultural in the Puslinch zoning bylaw. The applicant is proposing a residential subdivision consisting of forty-four single detached dwellings, a block.

A block for a park, a stormwater management block, a drainage soil block, public roads, and a block identified as additional lands. The image on the screen there is the conceptual plan provided by the applicant, which shows the subdivision layout, lotting, and the roads. The applicant is seeking an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment to permit the residential subdivision. The requested Official Plan Amendment would redesignate the portion of the lands that are currently prime agricultural and secondary agricultural to Hamlet area. The requested zoning by-law amendment would rezone the subject lands that are currently agricultural to a Hamlet residential site-specific zone, with a holding provision, and a portion of the subject lands to an agricultural site-specific zone. The Hamlet Residential Site-Specific Zone with a holding provision proposes to permit single detached dwellings, a stormwater management facility, and a public park.

With site-specific provisions for a minimum lot area of 0.2 hectares, a minimum setback of fifteen meters from the railway, and a minimum setback of fifty-five meters from Lot 1 to the railway. The holding provision would require the applicant to enter into a subdivision or a condominium agreement with the township. The agricultural site-specific zone applies to the rear portion of the property abutting the Gulf Junction Railway, with a site-specific provision that would prohibit building envelopes in this area. I want to note as well that this zoning bylaw amendment that is shown on the screen here reflects the latest draft from the applicant. In terms of comments that have been received to date, PDAC have provided their following recommendations to Council. The committee requests clarification on ownership of the woodlot that will be determined and suggests that a conceptual site plan and elevations be provided at the public information meeting for a typical lot.

The committee recommends that a school pickup area be shown on the conceptual plans as deemed necessary by the local school boards. And lastly, the committee recommends that clarification of sufficient water for the development without adversely affecting existing wells and avoiding the need for a water use bylaw be provided. The committee has stated that they do not support a bylaw for water use. In terms of planning comments, NPG has provided technical comments to the applicant pertaining to the provisions and uses proposed as part of the draft zoning bylaw, the timing of other Planning Act applications in relation to the ZVA application. Clarification on future plans for the plantation, questions on the proposed concept plan, the minimum distance separation assessment, and the noise study. The county will provide their technical comments during a future circulation. In terms of engineering, the Township's consulting engineer has provided technical comments to the applicant pertaining to the pond outlet and have noted that technical comments can be addressed at the detailed design stage.

In terms of ecology, the township's consultant has provided comments to the applicant pertaining to the significant features, the impact assessment, and policy conformity. Traffic comments have also been provided to the applicant regarding the sightline assessment for the proposed access to Arkell Road and coordination with the Guelph-Junction Railway. The noise consultant has also commented that the acoustic requirements should be re-evaluated once grading information, site plans for the dwellings, and detailed house plans are available. And lastly, the Township Fire and Rescue Services have provided technical comments to the applicant pertaining to the road width for emergency vehicles. The township's other consultants and, Conservation Authority, GRCA, and the Guelph Junction Railway have stated that they have no outstanding concerns currently. At this time, no comments have been received from the township's building, public works, parks and facilities, and bylaw enforcement.

We have received two public comments on the application to date. The comments are regarding concerns about excessive lighting, traffic, impacts on the water table, and impacts on the neighborhood, with some questions as well regarding road improvements and the precedent set for future planning applications. In terms of next steps, we continue to review

the application and provide comments to the applicant. The applicant will have an opportunity to respond to the comments and make revisions, and following this, we will prepare a future recommendation report to Council. That concludes my presentation.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Okay, great, thank you. Is there anybody in the gallery that would wish to speak to this, file? Please, state your name.

Doug Pilkey, 16 Hume Road: I am, Doug Pilkey. I have lived in that area for 50 years now. I have known the Kukavika family for that entire time, Ivan, Maria. Currently, Luke lives there, and Peter. So, I respect that family a lot. I have two concerns. Mostly traffic. and water. Okay, traffic at certain times, and I do not know whether you have addressed this. Church on Sunday gets out at 10. There are cars lining both sides of the road. At peak hours, people are going into Guelph and coming out of Guelph. Traffic is not good at that time. There have been several accidents in that corner. Okay, and from what I see here, having two exits does not really address the traffic issue. And I think Councillor Goyda can probably attest to the fact that people are now going down that Side street. To get around that corner. Including school buses. So those are my two main concerns. I would wonder what the County has as a Plan B, in case all this information, the studies, etc., do not pan out. How are you going to address the traffic issues specifically? And hydro or hydrology.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: I will maybe ask the traffic consultant to come down, and if you can try to address the capacity of the intersection. Can I have that, layout? Put back up on the screen. So proposed layout. Yes, the proposed layout. It is helpful. That gives you something to talk to. Yes, that is helpful. That is it. Yes.

Brandon, Applicant Traffic Consultant (Crozier): Yes, so to your question, or to your comment, rather, about traffic on the weekends, say, or weekend, key times between 7 and 9 in the morning on a weekday?

Doug Pilkey, 16 Hume Road: Yes. Okay. Have you factored in the fact that there's incredible bike traffic?

Brandon, Applicant Traffic Consultant (Crozier): That was part of the counts, yes, on the roadway. So, what we do is what we assess, and this is a residential development, so it is typical to assess a weekday only, we did not look at the weekend, weekday only, AM and PM peak time. We find the peak hour within those peak periods, so we will count traffic from, say, 6 to 9, I believe we did here, and then in the PM, we'll count from, like, 4 to 7 usually, sometimes earlier, 3.30 to 6.30. And then we take the worst hour from that, and that is what we assess. So, at the intersection of Arkell and Watson, we saw A's and B's. During the AM and PM, respectively, peak hours, so those operate well. I can't really speak to the weekend, because we didn't assess that, and we didn't look at and that wasn't part of our terms of reference, so we always set our terms of reference out with staff before we conduct our study to make sure everybody's on board with how we're going to conduct our study. And that was not something identified at that time. I imagine especially with church, especially leaving church, it is typical that it gets busy, right? It all happens at the same time. I do imagine this intersection gets busy, I can't speak to accidents, but maybe I can ask staff if there have been records of any accidents at the intersection that we could look at and see if there's anything, that would concern us. It is not always stopped, so I keep speed low, which is nice. Unless people run it, but we cannot really (inaudible) you know, as long as sight lines are good, and people are following all-way stops, the speed should be low at the intersection, at least.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Yes. Could you explain the significance of A or B. So, you are saying A, I would assume, is getting closer to capacity of the intersection, B being less, unless I am wrong. No, the other way around. Other way around, yes. Okay, so explain to the member of the public, how often it met the A criteria, generally the B criteria, and you are out of traffic, what that will impact those two.

Brandon, Applicant Traffic Consultant (Crozier): Yeah, I can speak to that. So, level of service A, we consider less than 10 seconds of average delay. So, the average person is going to experience less than 10 seconds, at, say, an all-way stop, right? That makes sense if it gets busy, it can get up higher, and then in the PM, so that is in the AM where, we saw level of service A,

that's post-development as well. And then, in the PM, we saw level of service B, which is between 10 and 20 seconds. They are starting to get a little bit more delay, but still, like, Bs are very good in my line of work. I have done a lot of studies. And, you know, essentially, we start looking, even at level of service D, which gets up to 35 to 50 seconds, we probably won't make a recommendation depending on what the existing traffic is and what is able to be done about it. Once we get into level of service E, which is beyond 50 seconds of average delay, we will start to make recommendations and try to fix things.

And then there's also level of service staff, which gets further. We do not have any of that here, so level of service A and B. It may get worse on the weekends, I'm not sure, and like you said, like, when church gets out, you may have a lot of people trying to use maybe one leg at the same time, and that can really slow things down. There is not much that could be done at, say, an intersection like this. I would always stop to make that better. You are not going to be close to a traffic signal or anything like that. I did see some comments about speed, within the letter. Maybe the township could look at traffic calming measures within the area. The posted speed is fifty. Within the downtown.

Doug Pilkey, 16 Hume Road: I have a question. Okay, you factored in traffic now. I assume that you factored in growth. What about in the interim when there is all the construction equipment. like that. going up and down, turning, going to that intersection, and things like that. So, the construction of the equipment itself here? Yes. For the development? Like, building, like, so you are building the same number of homes That exists there now.

Brandon, Applicant Traffic Consultant (Crozier): That is a valid question. So, what we typically do, if we do not look at construction management plans, we call them at this stage, we are at the OPA and zoning stage, we will get into that. More so a draft plan, more so a detailed design to make sure the staging and everything is going to work. The nice part about here is you have a lot of land. Where the construction is going to take place, you are not going to have a lot of activity, other than maybe some trucks. I do not know how much cut and fill are on the site or anything like that. But it is the trucks coming in and out, the trades and everything like that. Yes. They are not walking.

Doug Pilkey, 16 Hume Road: No, they are driving, they have big equipment, they have vans, everything like that. That is going to be traffic on there. So, what would be typical construction process for that site. I would assume you are not building every single house at the same time. So, try to explain what somebody would experience as this construction project goes. I used to work in the concrete. One day, the concrete trucks come, you know, then a week, it cures, then the load of lumber comes, it drops it on the ground, it leaves, that kind of thing. And I am not a tradesman or a builder, but I do not think all these are going to be built at the same time.

Brandon, Applicant Traffic Consultant (Crozier): So, you are going to have sections built, and they are going to sell a lot slowly, and as sales come through, they will build more lots. Considering that we have looked at how much traffic is going to come out of here. after everything is built, I do not expect the construction traffic to be more than, say, that traffic. And there were already negligible impacts with this build-out. If that makes sense. For sure, there will be impacts. You are going to see construction, and the energy time will be the build-out. I do not foresee it being a swarm of construction, in the sense it will be It will be more the duration. So, does it take a year to build up the subdivision? Does it take two? But yes, you are going to see, as you are stating, that construction vehicle coming through the intersections. But that's also traffic in there.

Doug Pilkey, 16 Hume Road: Okay, yes, so I am somewhat assured that you have taken that into account. But I would then say, well if all your planning goes south. Okay, and there is a lot of traffic. What should it mean for the traffic? That is a crowded intersection right now. There are three businesses there. Okay, and a bike shop.

Brandon, Applicant Traffic Consultant (Crozier): We have seen, it is a good bike shop. Yes. Good bike shop. Like, you have a lot of capacity at this intersection. I do not have concerns with this intersection, or either of these intersections. These will be minor stop controls, we call them, so just stop controls.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: On the internal roads, I can help. Councillor Goyda proposed a notice of motion a month ago, and that went to the county. So, this is the intersection of two county roads and two township roads. I believe the county has jurisdiction over most of the intersection, if not all. And we received correspondence from Mr. Kudo, which was not in time for our council meeting today, but staff are going to have it on the agenda. I have asked, Laura to have it at the ready here. The Coles Notes version is the County does not see the necessity to do any improvements there, and what was the collision data in that Zeno 1?

Laura Emery, Deputy Clerk: Through the chair, they did collision history at that location from 2019 to the end of May 2026, and it indicated that there were seven collisions there, so that would be approximately one collision per year. Last year was one per year. So that is just the data you asked, because you mentioned the collisions.

Discussion (individual speaker changes) disappointed that the county took the position that it has capacity and there is no need for improvement. I feel that the Council's going to, whatever iteration is back after the 26th, to advocate for some improvements in there for walkability and things of that nature. However, the engineer at the county is stating the same as this individual, that there's capacity within the intersection to accommodate more, and it does not qualify. They went as far as to say that the road design and the way it's constructed warrants a seventy kilometer an hour zone, and you have a fifty, so I am paraphrasing, but I was upset. Anyhow I just wanted you to hear that they had looked at the collision data, and unfortunately, we did not get the response we wanted from the county for improvements. But as for this application.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: They are stating that the intersection can Accommodate the traffic, as proposed. Well, you know, say, you know, a long time in the future, I do not know if this is related to the application, but there's always options. Like, what we typically would run is called a signal horn, say, if you need a signal horn, right? Bypass, through that area. Well, sir, right now they have experts that review the traffic, and then the township peer reviews those experts, and for their application, it states the road infrastructure in place currently can support it. I would have a lot of comfort that there has been a lot of eyes on it, and it will transpire. I penned one note here.

Speaker unidentified: We have seen previous subdivision applications where there was a prohibition on air use. Is that inclusive of this subdivision through you, Mr. Mayor. The township planning consultant suggested that. So, there is no (inaudible), and the reason for those is because it adds more traffic.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: So that's on everybody's radar already, because it's, okay, it's a bit of a challenging environment right now in the sense that, you know, we want more housing, we want density, and this council, has some of the most permissive ARU rules for the rural. However, recognizing that this is not likely the right spot for it, so I hope that brings some comfort that there will not be even more vehicles.

Doug Pilkey, 16 Hume Road: Oh, and the Hydro-G stuff you brought up. Pump test. My concern there is there's, like, there's wells there. I think there's only wells. Yeah, I am 100% sure there's wells. So, what happens if some of those wells go dry.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Can Tony come down, please?

Tony Latimer, Applicant Hydrogeologist (D14-KUK): hydrogeologist, past president of the PGO, which is professional geoscientists in Ontario. So, to answer your question. The evaluation here has to meet the guidelines, provided by the Ministry of the Environment for private services for residential developments, and that dictates minimum requirements that needs to be done. And one of those is the drilling and test pumping of three wells. which was done here, spread across the property. Yes, there is an existing well just, east of Watson. So, they were there, and here, roughly was where they were. Yes. So that was done, and each of those wells was test pumped at I will use imperial gallons per minute, ten imperial gallons per minute, which is forty-five liters per second metric, or forty-five liters per minute metric. And they had no problems producing that water. And there was no interference between wells that we could detect in the test.

And the quantity was very good. And that was not really a surprise to me, because the aquifer system here is very productive. It is part of the Guelph gas port system, which the City of Guelph uses for municipal supply, and the City of Cambridge uses for municipal supply. I believe that Elora and other communities do as well. So, the quantity of water is there. When I analyzed the test data from the pumping tests, it showed me that there were the wells themselves could produce the water without a problem. They could meet the demands that the Ministry have specified for developments like this and they could do it safely without creating undue interference. So, there was not really a concern there for me. My role in the industry is groundwater supplies for municipalities, mostly and protection, making sure those supplies are there and secure is the number one priority. So, I came away from that testing program, and I wrote in the report that I was comfortable that the quantity of water was there to meet the needs of the development.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: I do not think that was the question from the resident. The question is, what if there is an impact on the neighboring water? Not concerned about having enough water for the subdivision. It is the impact on the neighboring as well. I was in the area chatting with people, and that came up to me, and I had kind of here, but when was the pump test?

Tony Latimer, Applicant Hydrogeologist (D14-KUK): It looked like one was 2006, and you did another one? So, there is a history here. Just a cut version. Yes. I would say 2022, and what we did is we worked with the township hydrogeologist to set up the pump test so that he made sure that it satisfied him.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: No, but that is not what we are talking about. What we are talking about is this resident that spoke to me said that during the pump test, they had silt infiltration on their well. So, the question from the resident is if there is an impact. what do you do? Is there a well interference protocol? Is there a response plan? That is what the resident's looking to hear, is that if somebody is well is impacted. A is it I will say post-construction, it is a build-out. Where is the responsibility? If it is posting build and during build because people worry about their own private wells is what it comes down to.

Tony Latimer, Applicant Hydrogeologist (D14-KUK): So, the first thing is. where would the responsibility be? Well, the responsibility, I am not sure where it would lie, the, because they are private wells that we are talking about here, and it is the owners, they look after those. So, the testing programs indicate that those types of interference problems are not going to happen, except the turbidity problem has a potential to happen, because the water in the aquifers through fractures, and when the wells get drilled, they disturb the rock. and can mobilize some of the finer grains in the rock that can move through these fractures and potentially show up at another well. But through the development process of the well, which is when the well gets drilled, it is pumped to remove the fines so that it can produce clear water. This is a procedure in developing a well. That process is short-term difficult. So maybe the answer to your question, what could be done is whenever a well is going to be drilled for one of the lots as they progressively get built, that a notice is made to the local residents that this is taking place and therefore, there's some awareness, right?

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: But is it safe to assume, if you are drilling three wells and doing a max pump, I will call it a max pump test, you said. Ten gallons per minute. But it is a lot of water.

Tony Latimer, Applicant Hydrogeologist (D14-KUK): Yes. To mirror if all these houses, their wells were on at the same time, or is that process just to show that there is enough water? Because in my mind, I'm not a hydrology guy, is that these wells would not be on all the time, not have the impact, so that, what you call turbidity, is just a direct result of the test versus what would happen that wouldn't be replicated once all the homes are established. So, the test was 6 hours in duration, right? So that is a period to get enough information to interpret the test and get the confidence that it can produce the required demand. It can produce more than required demand for the 3 lots, the 3 wells, those well supplies produce more of the quantity than a single lot would need, but we have to interpolate that to make sure that there's enough for 40 or 50 lots at the time we did this. I will say it is fifty lots now. The turbidity problem, I do

not know when that happened in relation to the test. It might have been shortly after the well was drilled because they moved it in, so the development was not complete. Or it may be unrelated. It could potentially be related to a problem that was at that well. Now, in fairness. The person says, well, how, you know, what is this, you know, what happened at the time we were doing the work? But problems can happen in private wells that can be due to a whole bunch of issues unrelated to testing, so I cannot really speak to the turbidity. I am saying that that might be an explanation for.

Discussion (individual speaker changes): So, the concern back you come back to what the interference we do not expect any interference at... I'll call it adverse interference, where the water level, when you're pumping a well, one of the... a new well, may have an effect on the water level on an existing well, but it doesn't interfere with that existing well's ability to do its job and supply the water to the house. I think the... The main concern is, if there is an impact, is there a process? And I do not even know if staff can answer that, but it is... For you, Mr. Mayor, I...

Rob Stovel, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-KUK): I think we could have our hydrogeologist work with the Township's hydrogeologist and prepare as a condition of approval a well interference program.

Discussion (individual speaker changes): that would be wonderful, because as I said, that was, some feedback that I had received. People worry about their water, so the reality of it. I can... I will try to... connect you with the people with which I was chatting. For maybe you can have some dialogue. Well, I have done... Exactly. I understand totally. Does that... I am trying to help; I am trying to help. Yes. Is there any further? No, those are my two main concerns. Okay, great, thank you. We will turn to the online.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: If there are any attendees that are listening online that would like to speak to this application, just use the raise your hand function. It is located in the bottom right-hand corner of your Zoom screen. Any questions from members of council. I do have a couple. Answer the area for D. teal section. Is that the park, or is that stormwater on the layout of the subdivision? Is that the stormwater management plan, or is that the park? We are going to have to go back. Where is the park located in the in the post? So, where I am going with that is I also depend about the forest, and what I am trying to avoid is conflicts. because if, say, the developer retains ownership and there's houses there. What we encounter in the township is people dumping their leaf litter, you know, we'll throw over the fence, and then it becomes, you know, they'll call and complain, and then we'll say it's a civil matter, and they want us to take action, and we don't have jurisdiction, so I support the comments from PDAC to look at that. I thought I could not read it, and I maybe should look at it in more detail, but maybe a layout where the park is adjacent to the forest, and the forest becomes accessible to the public. Have some consideration for that, because if it's our property that people are dumping, then we can act on that, behavior, whereas if it's retained by yourselves, then we're going to be a civil matter, and people will worry. I am just foreseeing some conflicts, so I want to take that into consideration. What I heard from you is the school bus pickup will be on, Arkell or Watson Road, but what I wrote is that that is an interim pickup location until the subdivision is complete. The roads are assumed, then I would work under the assumption that then the school bus pickup would move inside the subdivision. So, in the interim the children would have to be noticed the public road.

Rob Stovel, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-KUK): Yes, that is my understanding, Mr. Mayor, because there is some comment.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: You either received a comment with school bus pickup, or somebody that I heard in the presentation. So just want to be clear that the interim on the busier road eventually it would be in a more protected area.

I do not know if we have jurisdiction for this or not but is it possible to get signage? put up that there is a train nearby, and it honks its horn. I remember seeing one for, near the airport there, and it is like, you are in a takeoff zone for airplanes, and it was there permanently. That way, because what we encounter is the first people buy properties, and they are aware, and if it flips over the second, third owner may not be aware. It is some sort of signage that indicates that

there are two road crossings. The Transport Canada requirement for horn glass is X. just so people know because I just foreseen again, some complex hope. Does this proposal? Is it dependent on OPA 131 being approved?

Rob Stovel, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-KUK): Through you, Mr. Mayor, no, sir. This is a separate one.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Because I know the growth was inside. Okay, 130. I mean, unless you have some inside information I have heard. you know, December, maybe? I have not heard an update on whether that is going to be approved, so I was just curious if it was contingent on that.

Rob Stovel, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-KUK): No, sir, I have not heard.

No, it is not contingent on that growth is established, and part of the proposal is good to go. Okay. No, because, you know, there is a bunch of people in the community waiting for that, the A131 group, so I was not sure if this was contingent on it. That is all I have, probably. It is all good. Great. This council has any other comment. All right, thank you for your presentation. It is good. Next thing you want to enforce. It is 5.3.

5.3 Zoning By-law Amendment D14-HAS – 7248 Gore Road (Emerald Lake)

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: This public meeting involves an application by Emerald Lake. Zoning by-law application D14HAS, property location municipally known as 7248 Gore Road, Township of Puslinch. Ferguson effect of the proposed zoning by-law amendment is to amend the Township Puslinch Zoning By-law 2018-023 as amended, which seeks to recognize and bring the existing campground operation into compliance with the zoning by-law and to prevent various uses within the Trout. Travel Trailer Park. And the water park included tent camping, cabins, and short-term accommodation, assembly hall, accessory uses for the Travel Trailer Park, and a modified definition of private park to accommodate the water park use. Additionally, the ZBA would also permit an increase in the number of recreational sites from 200 to 272. Amendments to the boundaries of the NE zone and the EP overlay are proposed based on the scoped environmental impact study.

Small southeastern portion of the land is proposed to be rezoned to Agriculture (A) to facilitate a future consent application, which will merge this portion with the adjacent property at 7260 Floor Road. And I will turn it over to you.

Jennifer Gaudet, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-HAS): Thank you. Good evening, everyone. My name is Jennifer Gaudet. I am an associate planner with MHBC. I am here today with, the owner, Drago, in the back there, Mr. Hassis, and online, we have Cheryl-Anne, who is a biologist, and I also have John Levy, who is. a civil engineer, so they will be there to answer questions. Next slide, please. So, I am sure everyone is familiar with the site's location. It has been developed as a resort commercial use, the Emerald Lake Resort and Trailer Park, since the 1980s. It was previously used as a quarry. You will see it has frontage on Gore Road, and that line bisecting is a rail corridor. So essentially, the southern half of the site functions as the resort trailer park, with the community center in the center, and some baseball diamonds, stuff like that. And on the north side is the water park and volleyball fields, a concession stand, those types of uses. They do operate as one. Thank you.

Just so this is a zoomed-out version that sort of mustardy color is an environmental overlay. So, I will speak to that in more detail coming up. slide. So, in the Official Plan, it's, designated to allow the resort commercial use, so there is no Official Plan amendment, that we have requested. Next slide. It is all about the zoning by-law amendment. So, there is no development proposed. The purpose of the application, as the mayor mentioned, is just to legalize the existing uses. And the reason this is coming up now is because the owner is looking to sell the trailer park and retire. So, as part of that process, just making sure, you know, the I's are dotted and Ts are crossed, and that's also why there's a related; might have to zoom in a little bit, but if you see by the A, yes, exactly, that orange. lot. There is the owner's residential lot, despite the agricultural zoning. So, there is a related zoning portion in there just to take part of the resort commercial, put it in the agricultural zone as part of a lot line adjustment, and that's because having both properties in the same ownership over the years, his backyard encroached a little

bit, so just to make sure that the lot lines are as they should be as part of the sale. And as part of the zoning by-law amendment, we did go through an environmental impact study, and that was to look at, all the natural heritage features in and around the park. And as part of the zoning, we are just looking to rectify the natural environment zones to reflect, one, their findings of where those limits are, and then B, our recommended buffers. So, we are still working on some of the refinements of that through the peer review process. We actually had a meeting today with Dugan to go through that in more detail. So, once we have the comments from yourselves and from the public, we are going to be making a resubmission to address the peer review comments.

And part of that will be a slight revision to our zoning bylaw amendment, just to reflect Some of NPG's questions about, how we are wording the different, distinctions between the tent sites versus the RV sites and cabin sites. And then also. working through some of these environmental zone boundaries. Next slide, please. Yes. So, I just covered this part of the reason we are asking for the site to go from 200 to 272 sites is because there is an existing site-specific zone that limits us to two hundred sites. That was established, decades ago, and over the years, that detail was lost. And some additional sites were put in, so now we are at 272, so we are just looking to legalize those. We are not looking to add any more, or do another development area, relocate them, just looking to legalize what is there right now. So, as part of it, we prepared a planning justification report, which MHBC prepared. We also did an MDS calculation.

As I mentioned before, we have. civil engineer who is online who can speak to it in more detail, but we have had a nitrate impact study, as well as a functional servicing. It is privately serviced communal services, so it is part of the ECA process, so he can get into that if there are any questions. And then we also had a noise study, just looking at the rail line, and we also had the environmental impact study, and all of the studies do support the proposal. We are just working through some of the peer review comments to make sure we have addressed Any outstanding comments or questions that have arisen through the review process? Slack. And that is it, in a nutshell. Here to answer any questions, that you may have, or that members of the public may have. Okay, thank you. I will turn it over to the Township Council.

Max Fedchyshak, Township Planning Consultant: Good evening, through the chair. My name is Max Fedchyshak, I am a planning lead for Planning Solutions, and I will be running through a quick presentation regarding, zoning bylaw application D14-HAS for 7248 Gore Road. So as far as the presentation, I will go over the development process, location of the development, provincial county policies, and the zoning bylaw. I will also describe the proposed development zoning bylaw amendment being applied for, and then we will review comments received today by the township, county agencies, and the public. Then I will be available for any questions or comments. In terms of the development process, the zoning bylaw application has been submitted to the township and is currently under review. We are here tonight for the public information meeting to provide an overview of the application, and a future recommendation report will be prepared and presented to Council at a later date.

As for location of the subject lands, the lands are municipally known as 7248 Gore Road and are located on the north side of Gore Road, approximately five hundred meters west of the Gore Road and Concession Road 7 intersection. For the policy context, the subject lands are considered rural lands, and natural heritage, as per the provincial planning statement. The County of Wellington Official Plan designates lands as recreational, greenlands, and core greenlands. And with the Township Zoning By-law zoning the site as Resort Commercial, Site-Specific Zone RCSP47 for the north portion, Resort Commercial RCSP43 for the south, and Natural Environment Zone and Environmental Protection Overlay. The zoning bylaw amendment application is required to, as was mentioned, bring the current resort commercial operation into compliance. The south parcel features various camping facilities and sites, including RV sites, tent camping sites, sports fields, washrooms, recreation center, and a maintenance yard.

The north parcel features various, more recreational facilities, including volleyball courts, splash pad, basketball courts, pavilions, washrooms, change rooms, Emerald Lake, a water body as well. So, it is the north one. The zoning bylaw amendment is proposed to revise the existing

site-specific provisions for each parcel. For the south parcel, or the RCSP43 zone, the application seeks to recognize a private park, assembly hall, cabins as short-term accommodations, and tent camping as permitted uses. Also to permit a maximum of 272 recreational vehicle sites within a travel trailer. Taylor Park. permit a twenty-one maximum of 23 of the RV sites to be used for tent camping, 21 to be permitted as, cabins to be permitted as short-term accommodation, to also permit assembly hall, which can include a fitness room, indoor pool, and hot tub as accessory uses. Also, permissions for accessory uses related to a laundromat, washroom, shower facilities.

And it is also proposed to remove existing permissions related to concession stand, picnic shelters, variety store, laundromat, baseball diamonds, and washrooms. As mentioned, there is also a slight change to allow for the Rule A for future severance. For the north portion, the application recognizes a private park as a permitted use. Special provisions are proposed to include water slides, splash pads, and sports courts. Campground uses or golf courses are excluded. Permissions are also removed, including day picnicking, concession stand with food sales, pools, water slides, water activities, mini golf. And others, and across both portions of the property, mapping changes are proposed to recognize updated staking of environmental features on the lands related to the environmental protection and environmental overlay zones. Regarding comments, NPGs provided technical comments related to the site plan, planning justification report, draft bylaw, EIS, and the environmental noise and vibration letter. GEI has provided comments requesting further information regarding septic and stormwater management.

The township's ecological consultants have requested EIS updates to address natural heritage features and development impacts. And wildlife buffers. The building department has requested a scaled site plan showing all existing buildings on the property. PDAC was held for this application a few weeks ago, or heard this application, I should say, requested confirmation of building permits for all buildings and clarification of nitrate levels. The county has also provided comments related to further discussion being required regarding natural heritage policies, confirmation, conformity of existing camp trailer sites with applicable recreational area and tent and trailer park policies. The county has requested confirmation of new cottage areas with policy, and, well and thin source water protection has encouraged the applicant to provide a maintenance plan, and CPKC, the rail authority, has requested the inclusion of warning to the room. For next steps, the application will continue to be reviewed, and comments have been provided to the applicant, and the applicant's working at addressing those. So, once we receive a revised submission, a future recommendation report will be provided.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Great, thank you. Is there anybody in the gallery here that needs to ask questions? Just please state your name and address for the record, please.

Wayne Fisher, neighbouring property owner: My name is, Wayne Fisher, and I am the property owner directly to the west of their property, and we have been neighbors for, over 30 years. And as of this date, we have had no issues, and no, problems, no impact on my property, from their operation of their water park and their campgrounds, and I have had no trespassing issues, no noise issues, no garbage issues. Every time I have gone over there, it is impeccable, well looked after, managed, and I just want to give my support to them, to the Council, to approve this application.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Thank you for taking time tonight, Wayne. Thank you. Okay, anybody online? If there are any attendees that are, joining us remotely via Zoom, if you could just use the raise your hand function located in the bottom right-hand corner if you have any questions for this application. Any questions from Council.

Councillor Sara Bailey: Just a quick question for Max. Just to clarify, I heard you say water slide as a use, but does it also include the blow up like the water park.

Max Fedchyshak, Township Planning Consultant: That is in the water? Regarding the zoning? Yes. We are working with the applicant to fine-tune a lot of the language to make sure that everything that is existing right now is recognized and is permitted. Yes, if I may add, part of that is because the new zoning bylaw has a very broad definition for private park.



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
OCTOBER 7, 2026, PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

Jennifer Gaudet, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-HAS): That includes most of the site-specific uses. So, we do not need them anymore. We are indifferent whether we keep it as a site-specific, or we incorporate it into the new definition, but we are not getting rid of Waterpark.

Councillor Sara Bailey: It is just that it would now be permitted as in the base zone. Okay, in the base zone. Yes. Just trying to get my definitions right, too, but I did not know if there was a distinction between what was on the land versus what was floating.

Jennifer Gaudet, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-HAS): Oh, yes, everything would stay the same, is the proposal. And that is the accessory use, or that would be permitted as of right a private park, which is permitted in the RC zone.

Councillor Sara Bailey: Thanks.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: Same comment. I have a couple of questions. You spoke to that you want to do a severance after this process, and I'm just concerned that I just want to make sure that this process is not going to prohibit the severance after, because the severance date is being moved to May 26. And if this process is considered changing lot lines in the severance, then you, when you go to do that. Later, you may run into that hurdle.

Jennifer Gaudet, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-HAS): So, I could be completely off base, but make sure we have submitted the application already, and it is in the agenda, it is just the election pushes the timing.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: So, what I am trying to say is, it may be advantageous to combine the two as one. If you do them separately, I am concerned that you are going to if run into that severance date hurdle, you will not get over it. This council has advocated for it. I have taken it to the committee. I have never had the committee at the county, give relief. from that severance date. So, if you are fine, you are fine, but that is just my heads up. I don't want to see that transpire because your focus is on legalizing the main property, and because you did some small lot line adjustment, that's considered a severance, and next thing you know, you're not able to complete your plan.

Jennifer Gaudet, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-HAS): Thank you for that.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: You're welcome. I appreciate that you are legalizing the use. It sounds as though you were legal for two hundred, and over the years, increased to 272. I will also say Emerald Lake is an economic driver for Puslinch. It draws a ton of people into the community. People here have used it, lots of positivity coming out of there. However, you are seventy-two units over what you are permitted to have, and I give you credit for legalizing the use, because usually it is somebody called and complained, and you are in a whole pile of trouble. That is not the case here. However, if it were to go through a normal process to expand, there would be parkland dedication fees paid, because it is a development. So, I am going to ask staff, has that been considered as part of this legalization, that there is really a post improvement legalization. Is it eligible like, should it be eligible, or should it be captured? To pay parkland dedication. And I would use the golf course in Puslinch as an example. They did some development. They paid parkland dedication as a similar.

Township staff (speaker not confirmed): That will be looked at through the site plan process. Okay. And we will make that determination and review if we have received cash or... Okay, no question. Throw this on the radar, I am good. The MSB, I am supportive. It is a wonderful facility for people to visit.

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: I do. I will say that you have a lot of work to do with the buildings. Needing to be proven that they have permits or conform, and so, depending on your plans, like. There is a lot of work to go in yet. So

Jennifer Gaudet, Applicant Planning Consultant (D14-HAS): I did. That was one of the comments during the committee, and we have provided the building permits to Ms. Farncombe. I do not know if she was waiting to circulate until the full submission, but

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: That is on our radar. We did provide that. Yes, it is just... I just see it is going to be a lot of work, so depending on timing for retirement, keep on the cloud permit,



THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH
OCTOBER 7, 2026, PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
VIRTUAL MEETING BY ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION
& IN-PERSON AT 7404 WELLINGTON RD 34

keep on the comments. Yes. Keep engaged with staff, and you can get through this process. Those are my comments. Anybody else has one more? Great, no hands online. Good.

6. CLOSING

Mayor James Seeley, Chair: 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.ca or by phone at 519-763-1226, extension 4, or contact Township staff during regular business hours. Only those persons who leave their names will be provided further notification. If you wish to speak to the proposal when it is brought before Council in the future, you must register as a delegation to the Municipal Clerk prior to the meeting.