



July 15, 2026 Council Meeting

July 15, 2026

Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the July 15, 2026 Council agenda items.

6.8 ERO Posting 026-0300 Proposed Planning Act, City of Toronto Act, Building Code Act and Municipal Act Changes

-does this apply to current in progress planning applications?

Staff are reviewing the impacts of these changes and will report back at a future Council Meeting.

6.13 Town of Whitby regarding the Review of the Ontario Land Tribunal and Enhancing Deference to Municipal Planning Decisions

-what are staff comments regarding support for this request?

Staff are in support of the Town of Whitby's support resolution and will prepare a resolution accordingly.

6.14 Township of Centre Wellington regarding Review of Township Road Salt Management Programs

-would like to support

Staff will prepare a support resolution accordingly.

6.19 Municipal Finance Officers Association Making Permanent the Doubling of the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund

-would like to support but have concerns with the last sentence of the proposed motion which prioritizes new infrastructure for new housing instead of renewal of existing infrastructure. Do staff have similar concerns to adopting proposed motion?

Staff have no concerns with supporting the resolution as written by the MFOA. However, should Council give direction to amend the resolution, the wording related to housing enabling infrastructure can be removed to simply state 'enabling infrastructure'.



9.4.3 11:20 A.M. Report COR-2026-037 Zoning By-law Amendment Application
Recommendation Report – To lift the holding provision 4 Brock Rd N (D14-HAR) ≠
-what is the date of the NPG report on p. 216?

The date of the NPG report on p. 216 is July 15, 2026 as noted under the “Meeting Date:”

9.4.1 11:00 A.M. Report COR-2026-035 Zoning By-law Amendment Application
Recommendation Report 6676-6679 Wellington Rd 34 (D14-ONT)
Second Submission

Letter from Netherly dated March 11, 2026

“As per the Air & Noise ECA, the Owner must ensure that the noise emissions from the facility comply with the limits set out in Ministry

Publication NPC-300.” What is the sound level to be complied with? Who will monitor to ensure compliance?

Sound emissions from the facility must comply with the limits in MECP Publication NPC-300. Receptors are in either Class 2 or Class 3 areas. The limits apply at a point of reception (POR) which is either at the exterior façade of a dwelling or any outdoor area within 30 m of the dwelling. POR7 and POR8 are in a Class 3 area while the remainder are Class 2 due to their proximity to Wellington Road 34. The limits are in the Table below.

Table B-1
Exclusion Limit Values of One-Hour Equivalent Sound Level (L_{eq} , dBA)
Outdoor Points of Reception

Time of Day	Class 1 Area	Class 2 Area	Class 3 Area	Class 4 Area
07:00 – 19:00	50	50	45	55
19:00 – 23:00	50	45	40	55

Table B-2
Exclusion Limit Values of One-Hour Equivalent Sound Level (L_{eq} , dBA)
Plane of Window of Noise Sensitive Spaces

Time of Day	Class 1 Area	Class 2 Area	Class 3 Area	Class 4 Area
07:00 – 19:00	50	50	45	60
19:00 – 23:00	50	50	40	60
23:00 – 07:00	45	45	40	55



Enforcement is by the MECP. There will be no on-going monitoring however, the ECA does require an acoustic audit within 6 months after the commencement of operations at the



site. The MECP could do random reviews but this is relatively rare. Any further investigation or monitoring of noise levels would be complaint driven.

p.171 re “Harden repeatedly asked for engineer drawings that show an appropriate liner for the pond to mitigate risk of groundwater contamination, which were eventually provided to the Township’s consultants in May 2026. While these drawings are only conceptual, it is the hydrogeologist’s opinion that the system can work.”

The Harden letter dated March 5th and included in the second submission does not support the temporary waste disposal site. If there is an updated letter from our hydrogeologist a copy would be appreciated.

Your letter of March 5 states “It remains our opinion that the proposed activity is a water quality threat to groundwater resources and should not be permitted.” The planning report states “While these drawings are only conceptual, it is the hydrogeologist’s opinion that the system can work”; has your opinion in the March 5 letter changed? If so why?

Staff received the following response from the Township’s Hydrogeologist:

It remains my opinion that this hydrogeological setting that includes relatively rapid infiltration of water, poor natural attenuation of contaminants, local water well use for drinking water and known impact of site activities on water quality is inappropriate the proposed activity. There are far better natural conditions available elsewhere that will not threaten water supplies with the proposed activity of releasing untested water onto the site. The Township and County have introduced policies to limit the impact on groundwater resources and in my opinion, can be used to prohibit the proposed activity.

That said, the engineering solutions necessary to limit the risk and as presented, are reasonable. As is the proposed groundwater monitoring program. This is not dissimilar to the engineered solution to the Storm Water Capture Areas (SWCA’s) presented by the City of Guelph in the Clair Maltby Secondary Plan Area whereby an ECA will be obtained, private wells will be tested and theoretically, the Reasonable Use Policy of the MECP will be adhered to. There are ECA’s for sewage treatment on the moraine also (Danby) as well as storm water infiltration. The moraines are recognized for their ability to collect and infiltrate vast quantities of water that supports private and municipal drinking water. All of these proposed activities contaminate the groundwater somewhat and dilution in the aquifer is relied upon to make it all acceptable.



“The protection and maintenance of hydrogeological functions are key objectives in the County of Wellington Official Plan which are outlined in Section 4.9. These matters are either under the jurisdiction of the Provincial ECA (with enforcement via MECP) or can be addressed through the proposed holding provision, thereby bringing the proposal into compliance with these sections of the County Official Plan.”

Q – for clarity, who can and how can the protection and maintenance of hydrogeological functions be addressed through the holding provision? **Through the site plan approval, staff/consultant team will ensure that the detailed design and layout of the facility provides for appropriate treatment of the various intersections of water on the site. Without satisfactory drawings and an agreement, staff/consultant team will not recommend removal of the Hold (H).**

Has it been demonstrated, with evidence rather than assumptions, that the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement and satisfies the provincial interests in Section 2 and Section 3 of the Planning Act specifically in regards to the protection of ecological systems and water resources? I.e. how have the potential impacts been *demonstrated*? **The consultant planner’s opinion is that the proposal meets consistency with the 2024 PPS and conforms to the Wellington County Official Plan (and specifically, the policy route open for Temporary Uses). The applicant has provided technical studies and responded to staff/consultant team questions. A Holding (H) provision is recommended to ensure the detailed design of the facilities and relevant technical studies are updated to reflect the final site design.**

“With respect to the Official Plan 4.9.4 (and other sections such as 2.2 with respect to groundwater) “h) **protect** the hydrogeological functions of the moraine systems in the County”.

Q - What is meant by “protect”? For me, the quality of groundwater is not being protected; it is being mitigated. Protection is preventing any risk not mitigating an unknown risk! Please clarify the difference between protecting groundwater and preventing any adverse impact to groundwater. **There is no relevant policy definition of “protect” so the consultant planner has referred to the Merriam-Webster dictionary: “to cover or shield from exposure, injury, damage, or destruction.” In his opinion, protecting is about guarding or defending. On prevention, again with the Merriam-Webster dictionary: “to keep from happening or existing; to hold or keep back.” There is some overlap in the terms but in his opinion the policy test is “prevention”—there are many ways to achieve this, including preventative barriers such as a treatment train system, monitoring.**

“The applicant indicated a willingness to work with and communicate with the neighbours on issues management and the operation.”

Q - How will communication happen? **Staff/consultant team does not have those details. This might be a question best put to the applicant/operator, who is delegating to Council on this item.**



9.4.8 Report COR-2026-043 Zoning By-law Amendment Application Request for Council to Deem the Application Complete 401 & Mclean Rd W (D14-PLL)

- p. 351 re proposed bylaw of concern regarding the following items
 - landscaping along McLean Road not mentioned
 - shipping containers of unknown quantity are mentioned but not discussed in Justification Report
 - does not cap the maximum storage but leaves it open ended over 25%
 - hours of operation not mentioned

Staff will provide these comments to the applicant and the Township's Planning Consultant for consideration in review of the application.

9.4.9 Report COR-2026-044 Reporting Out from Council Update

- re Note 1; how does this affect the proposed property we have identified for Rural Employment south of the 401?

County of Wellington Staff have provided the following response:

County planning staff put forward a policy basis for designating the Rural Employment Area lands south of Highway 401 in the recommendation report for OPA 131 (link: [County OP Review OPA 131 Recommendation Report](#)). The County's provincial policy review included section 4.5.2.5 of the 2024 PPS on page 5 of Appendix C. We hope that the province will agree with our interpretation that this location should be considered a "strategic site" and that the proposed Rural Employment Area land use serves a greater long-term public interest. However, the final approval of OPA 131 rests with the Province and they may, or may not, choose to modify OPA 131 in response to their own policy analysis.

10.2 Approval of Amendment of License and Site Plan #5710 - Minor Site Plan Amendment (Cox)

- are staff aware of the nature of the restoration of the lands to be surrendered?

Staff has no further information other than what has been provided in the public documents. If there is other information the Council is seeking, please advise and staff will reach out to the MNR accordingly.