

PART 1: PRELIMINARY/FIRST DRAFT BY-LAW SUBMISSIONS (June 2017)

The following table documents all formal submissions received from stakeholders, agencies, and members of the public with respect to the preliminary/first draft of the Township's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. A response/indication of how it was addressed is also provided.

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1.	June 14, 2017	Bert Hoytema	1. Section b of this by-law does not apply with the new provincial standards, which are supposed to be adhered to.	1. It would appear that the author is referring to Section 4.30 of the Draft By-law, which provides setback requirements from the Natural Environment Zone. In particular, the existing Zoning By-law 19/85 includes a provision that allows for a reduction of the NE setback requirement with support from the local Conservation Authority. It is understood that this existing regulation is working well for the Township and is generally accepted by the local conservation authorities, As such, it is recommended that this provision be carried forward.
2.	May 22, and June 23, 2017	Jennifer Passy, Upper Grand District School Board	1. There have been recent amendments proposed with respect to making the creation of secondary dwelling units more attractive in order to respond to the general shortage of housing and resulting costs. How does this by-law respond to Planning Act changes with respect to secondary dwelling units? 2. Section 4.9 starts off "unless otherwise restricted" and continues that "neither this provision nor any other provision of this by-law" shall restrict the height of certain named structures. It is our position that restrictions on height of buildings and accessory elements such as elevator/stairway penthouses, antennae, ornamental structures etc. should be restricted where these features are on buildings where they may cause shadowing to negatively impact the use and enjoyment of a school site. 3. If section 4.32.2 is all about shipping containers, is the "Agricultural and Industrial Zones" heading appropriate? 4. Section 4.30.1 (i) permits balconies to project 1.5 m into a require yard, but does not specify a setback from a property line. This type of encroachment, and other spaces such as porches, fire escapes, decks, etc. should still have a minimum setback from property lines. 5. I think the barrier free parking requirement for schools is excessive. If the calculation is based on Table 3.6: 1 /10 students of design capacity & 1 space/35 employees in the case of Aberfoyle PS which has a ministry rated capacity of 423 students and 38 staff (28 FTE) would require 43 capacity related + 1 or 2 staff related spaces = 44 or 45 barrier free spaces! Whereas, the total number of required parking regular parking spaces is 18	1. The existing Zoning By-law 19/85 permits secondary/accessory apartment units in single, semi, and townhouse dwelling units that are located within the Rural and Agricultural zones <u>only</u> . The Preliminary/First Draft Comprehensive By-law is more permissive in that these units are permitted in any single, semi, and townhouse dwelling units, <u>in any zone where these forms of housing are permitted</u> . This is in accordance with the 2011 Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act (also known as Bill 140) and the Wellington County Official Plan. New regulations have also have been added to the Draft By-law (Section 2.4) to establish updated performance standards addressing floor area, parking, servicing, and height, etc., also in accordance with Bill 140 and the County Official Plan. 2. The structures cited are typically narrow in design/construction and would have minimal shadowing impacts. Therefore, we are not recommending any changes at this time. 3. This sub-section of the Preliminary/First Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law is correctly titled because it applies to shipping containers that are being used in the Agricultural and Industrial zones. This has been clarified in the Sub-Section heading/title. 4. For all of the encroachment provisions identified, a 0.6 m minimum setback requirement from lot line has been added.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>classrooms X 1.5 spaces = 27 spaces. I may be misinterpreting the barrier free calculation, can someone please clarify the calculation for me.</p> <p>6. 10.1 Institutional Zone – has the Township explored other municipalities zoning by-laws which provide more uses which are consistent with the Province's promotion of the development.</p>	<p>5. The author is referring to bicycle parking requirements which are included in Table 5.6 (Section 5.2.15 of the Preliminary/First Draft By-law). Barrier-free parking requirements are identified in Table 5.5.</p> <p>6. Permitted uses for the Institutional Zone have been updated in the Preliminary/First Draft Comprehensive By-law based on the uses permitted in the Wellington County Official Plan.</p>
3.	July 12, 2017	Fred Natolochny, Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>1. We were not able to review the mapping, overall, but would be expecting the NE Zone to be reflecting the natural hazard mapping available from the conservation authorities when it is available.</p> <p>2. We note that Table 12.2 has "NE" while the list of applicable zones has "N".</p> <p>3. We accept the use of the (f) suffix for existing development in Aberfoyle. We would however question the "HR-3" being carried forward. The suggestion that residential development is an acceptable use in a floodway is not supported by the Provincial Policy Statement or by the GRCA policies.</p>	<p>1. At the time of preparing the preliminary/first draft By-law, new draft mapping had not been prepared. Therefore, the NE zone had not been updated at the time to reflect the latest natural heritage mapping from conservation authorities. Note: This was addressed in later versions of the by-law and the NE zone has been updated in accordance with the mapping of the Core Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan.</p> <p>2. Table 12.2 has been corrected to include 'NE' in the list of applicable zones.</p> <p>3. At the time of preparing the preliminary/first draft By-law, special provisions/exceptions had not been reviewed or updated. Note: a detailed analysis of all special provisions/exceptions was completed and the HR-3 exception has been removed.</p>
4.	July 17, 2017	John Morrissey Corridor Management Section Engineering Office Ministry of Transportation	<p>1. Under "General Provisions" the following should be included:</p> <p><i>In addition to all applicable municipal requirements, all proposed developments located in close proximity of a provincial highway, within the Ministry of Transportation control area will be subject to the approval of the Ministry of Transportation. In addition, owners should be aware that Ministry of Transportation permits must be obtained prior to any construction being undertaken.</i></p> <p>2. Under the "General Provisions" a provision for wayside pits and quarries and portable asphalt plant and portable concrete plants, and the zones in which these facilities are permitted. The by-law should be consistent with wording provided in the Provincial Policy Statement as follows:</p> <p><i>Wayside pits and quarries, portable asphalt plants and portable concrete plants used on public authority contracts shall be permitted, without the need for an official plan amendment, rezoning, or development permit under the Planning Act in all areas, except those areas of existing development or particular environmental sensitivity</i></p>	<p>1. Specific reference to the MTO control area/MTO permit requirements is not recommended to be included in the Township's Zoning By-law. There are additional permits and approvals that are required by the Province and other agencies, however, they are not listed in the By-law. However, to improve the usability of the by-law and to ensure that users are informed to the extent possible regarding land use controls and restrictions that apply to their properties, MTO requirements will be identified in a 'User's Guide', which will accompany the zoning by-law, for reference.</p> <p>2. This has been addressed in Section 4.27.1 b) of the Preliminary/First Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p><i>which have been determined to be incompatible with extraction and associated activities.</i></p>	
			<p>3. Figure 1.2 Central Business District Designation Morriston</p> <p>The proposed HR to CMU zone changes south of Badenock Street East should not be implemented at this time. MTO's Highway Access Management policies would not permit the rezoning for HR to CMU zoning. MTO would not object to the inclusion of an appropriate transitional policy such as a Holding Provision which informs present and future owners that development could take place once the Ministry of Transportation is no longer the road authority fronting the subject lands.</p>	<p>3. A holding provision has been added to the proposed pre-zoned lands, to inform landowners that only limited development can take place until the MTO is no longer the road authority fronting the subject lands - as requested by Ministry staff.</p>
			<p>4. Figure 4 – Proposed Zoning Changes Rural Employment designation Brock Road Industrial</p> <p>Property in the northwest quadrant of the Highway 401 and Brock Road South interchange is owned by the Ministry of Transportation. The existing zoning should remain in place.</p>	<p>4. The existing Agricultural (A) zoning has been maintained.</p>
			<p>5. Figure 5 – Proposed Zoning Changes Rural Employment Designation Highway 6 Industrial</p> <p>The ministry has begun the detail design for a new Highway 6 corridor between the north limit of Hamilton to Guelph, and property acquisition is progressing. The highway expansion in the vicinity of Highway 6, Concession Road 7 and Wellington Road 34 will have significant implications on land-use and access to the lands identified as "Existing Zones to be Prezoned to Industrial Zone (IND)". The expansion of Highway 6 in the vicinity of the identified property will include a new interchange, new access to municipal roads, changes to the Highway 6 and Wellington Road 34 intersection (closed), and changes to the Highway 6 and Concession Road 4 intersection (closed). Additionally, a complete modification to the Highway 401 and Highway 6 interchange will be constructed. Despite the upcoming expansion of Highway 6, it is unclear how access can be accommodated to these lands as access will not meet the Ministry of Transportation Highway Access Management Guidelines (AMG).</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the sewer and water servicing of these lands. Parallel sewer and water services will not be permitted within the Highway 6 right-of-way. Parallel installations will have to be setback 14.0m from the Highway 6 right-of-way. Sewer and water services which require a Highway 6 crossing shall be subject to MTO review, approval and permitting processes. MTO will not permit an installation within the 'footprint' of an interchange which is generally defined as being from ramp taper to ramp taper.</p>	<p>5. This comment appears to be 'for information' and would be taken into consideration by the Township as part of the processing of any Planning Act development application.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>6. Figure 7 – Proposed Zoning Changes Future Development Morriston</p> <p>The proposed A to FD zone changes at the south limit of Morriston should not be implemented at this time. MTO's Highway Access Management policies would not permit the rezoning for A to FD zoning. MTO would not object to the inclusion of an appropriate transitional policy such as a Holding Provision which informs present and future owners that development could take place once the Ministry of Transportation is no longer the road authority fronting the subject lands.</p> <p>7. Mapping</p> <p>All mapping should identify the Highway 6 South New Corridor (attached).</p>	<p>6. A holding provision has been added to the proposed pre-zoned lands, to inform landowners that only limited development can take place until such time as the MTO is no longer the road authority fronting the subject lands - as requested by Ministry staff.</p> <p>7. Mapping that identifies the Highway 6 South New Corridor has not been included in the Township's Zoning By-law at this time. Despite multiple requests for digital GIS data with the proposed alignment, this has not yet been provided by MTO staff, and therefore cannot be accurately mapped.</p>
5.	July 17, 2017	Tony Horvat STRK Services Inc.	<p>The current zoning for the property is:</p> <p>"A-7 (SLOVENSKI)</p> <p>Notwithstanding any provisions of this By-Law to the contrary, within any area designated A-7 on Schedule "a" hereto, the following special provisions shall apply:</p> <p>(i) Uses Permitted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a hall for meetings and banquets; - a travel trailer park containing a maximum of 60 seasonal tourist trailers; - outdoor recreation; - a single dwelling unit for a caretaker." <p>Slovenski Park has completed engineering studies regarding the on-site private well water system and sewage disposal system and these have been provided to the MOEE for approval as of March 31, 2017. Once MOEE approval has been obtained, the studies and proposed system enhancements will be submitted to the Township of Puslinch to support a re-zoning application which will seek approval for all the activates noted above as well as the existing 90 unserviced trailer sites. We anticipate that this re-zoning application will be submitted in 2017.</p> <p>We note that the current draft comprehensive zoning by-law does not address the Slovenski Park property nor associated uses. We look forward to reviewing the next draft zoning by-law and working with the consultants and Township staff to address usages on Slovenski Park property.</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the time of preparing the preliminary/first draft By-law, special provisions/exceptions had not been reviewed or updated. Note: a detailed analysis of all special provisions/exceptions has since been completed and additional comments are documented in Part 2 and 3 of this table.
6.	July 17, 2017	County of Wellington Planning and	<p>1. Amending By-laws</p> <p>The most recent consolidation of the zoning by-law was completed in September 2016. Since that time there are amending by-laws that have been approved or are near completion. Our</p>	<p>1. The amending by-laws identified have been consolidated into the new by-law.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		Development Department	<p>records show that the following amending by-laws need to be consolidated into the new by-law:</p> <p>By-law 66/16 D14/DRS (Bouck) By-law 77/16 D14/BON (Bonneville) By-law 02/17 D14/WEB (Weber) By-law pending D14/FER (Ferraro) By-law pending D14/CBM (CBM St. Mary's Cement)</p>	
			<p>2. Applications in Progress</p> <p>There are also other rezoning application that are in progress:</p> <p>D14/FAR (Farhi Holdings Corporation) D14/HAM (Hamilton) D14/LEA (Aberfoyle Snowmobiles) D14/DFA (Dufferin Aggregates Mill Creek Pit Expansion)</p> <p>We have received a letter from a landowner who intends to appeal the new comprehensive zoning by-law to preserve their application status (if Zoning By-law 19/85 if repealed and replaced) and/or address the 2-year amendment freeze under Bill 73. We would suggest that the Township consider how to address active applications so that the new comprehensive zoning by-law does not result in unnecessary appeals or the need for duplicate rezoning applications to be filed.</p> <p>Note as of January 17, 2017, the following additional applications are in progress and are identified in Section 1.1.3 of the draft by-law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 92 Brock Road and a portion of the lands behind it, as shown on the attached sketch. • 7272 Gore Road – kennel application for Freure – Othman D14/FRE • 6615 Concession 1 (Phil O'Dell) D14/ODE: • Portion of 66 Queen Street (DRS Subdivision): • The rear portion of 7115 Concession 2 Rd – subject to zoning application D14/UNI 	<p>2. At the time of preparing the preliminary/first draft By-law, applications in progress had not yet been addressed. Note: Section 1.1.3 of the Draft By-law has since been added to ensure that all other current zoning by-law amendment applications remain active. This Section identifies all properties to which an active rezoning application applies and states that these properties shall continue to be subject to the existing Zoning By-law 19/85. Once the active rezoning amendment is approved, it will be incorporated into the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law by way of a housekeeping amendment.</p> <p>With respect to the "two-year freeze" established by the passing of Bill 73, Section 34 (10.0.0.1) of the Planning Act now states that if a Zoning By-law is repealed and replaced, no applications for amendments to either By-law are to be made within two years of the day in which the existing By-law is repealed and replaced.</p> <p>It is noted that the Township intends to pass a new Comprehensive Zoning By-law that will repeal and replace the existing Zoning By-law 19/85. However, Section 34 (10.0.0.2) of the Planning Act also states that the above "two-year freeze" on amendment applications does not apply where a Council has declared by resolution that amendments are permitted. At the time of preparing the preliminary/first draft By-law, applications in progress had not yet been addressed. Note: in September 2017, Township Council supported a recommendation from Stantec Consulting that amendment applications to either By-law should be permitted throughout the Township within the two-year amendment freeze. It is recommended that a resolution to this effect be passed by Council at the time of adopting the By-law.</p>

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>3. Accessory Apartment The following definition may benefit from further refinement with respect to intent and purpose. Accessory Apartment: A dwelling unit, which is located within and subordinate to a detached, a semi-detached, or townhouse dwelling. Is it the intent of the by-law to allow accessory apartments that are not separate self-contained dwelling units?</p>	<p>3. The intent of the by-law is not to permit accessory apartments that are self-contained dwelling units. To clarify this, the definition of 'accessory apartment' has been updated based on a best practice review of other definitions in the by-laws of comparable municipalities.</p>
			<p>4. Barn Setback Within the RUR Zone, special provision (3) establishing a 180 m setback to barns on adjacent property was removed through an earlier housekeeping amendment. We would expect Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) to address any related setbacks.</p>	<p>4. The special provisions referred to were included in Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law in error. These provisions have been removed.</p>
			<p>5. Commercial Zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscape We note that guideline A3.1 of the "Puslinch Design Guidelines" suggests a 3.0 m wide landscape area abutting Brock Road between Aberfoyle and Morriston. • Hamlet Commercial Zone Section 7.4.1 of the Official Plan provides for relatively small-scale development given the rural context and level of service available in Hamlets. We would question whether the following uses would meet the intent of this policy: "motel" and "shopping centre". • Shopping Centres As it currently stands, the zoning by-law only allows for one commercial mall at the southwest corner of Wellington Road 34 and Brock Road through a site-specific zone. The commercial mall at this location is limited in area to under ±40,000 ft² because the definition of "shopping centre" applies to larger developments which exceed 40,000 ft². A definition of "commercial mall" for this location with a maximum size limitation would provide increased clarity within the by-law. This property is well placed to meet the Township's retail needs and we wouldn't anticipate the need for other commercial malls. The new by-law would allow "shopping centres" as-of-right in the Hamlet Commercial (C1) and Highway Commercial (C2) zones without any limitations on size. Section 7.5.7 of the Official Plan requires an Official Plan Amendment for new retail centres of regional significance. Given the servicing constraints within Puslinch, we would question the appropriateness of this use. If it is maintained, we would recommend inclusion of a size cap so that it is clear that the scale is appropriate and in conformity with the Official Plan. • Transport Terminal 	<p>5. Commercial Zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This design guidelines has been implemented through the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. A 3.0 m wide landscape buffer requirement has been applied along rock Road between Aberfoyle and Morriston via Section 4.14.3 and Map B.4 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. • The permitted uses referred to (motel and shopping centre) were included in Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law in error. These have been removed as permitted uses in the Hamlet Commercial Zone. • Added definition for commercial mall, however, this use should not be permitted as-of-right in any zone. It is only permitted on one property within the Township as a result of a site specific Zoning By-law amendment. As noted above, a Shopping Centre has been removed as a permitted use. • The permitted use referred to (transport terminal) was included in Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law in error. It has been removed as a permitted use in the C2 and C3 Zones.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>A "transport terminal" is included as a permitted use in the C2 (Highway Commercial) and C3 (Agricultural Commercial) zones. We would normally consider this use appropriate to the industrial, rather than commercial, zone categories.</p>	
			<p>6. Industrial Prezoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• Brock Road Industrial Area</p> <p>Figure 4 denotes "Proposed Zoning Changes Rural Employment Designation Brock Road Industrial". There are two large parcels owned by the Ministry of Transportation along Highway 401 which are proposed to be prezoned Industrial (IND). The parcels are both land locked and it is unclear what, if any, development potential exists. We would recommend that the parcels remain Agricultural (A) at this time.</p> <p>• Highway 6 Industrial Area</p> <p>Figure 5 denotes "Proposed Zoning Changes Rural Employment Designation Highway 6 Industrial". The Industrial (IND) prezoning identifies lands subject to the "Puslinch Industrial Policy" found in section 9.8.3 of the Official Plan. In particular, we note Section 9.8.3b) which states the following:</p> <p>"Two large parcels of land to both the east and west of the Hanlon Expressway have been designated Rural Industrial. These lands have lower priority for development than the industrial lands in the "Puslinch Economic Area". Existing properties will not be further fragmented by severance or subdivision until a detailed concept plan is developed, in cooperation with the City of Guelph, which provides an appropriate connection between the City's industrial lands to the north and the proposed interchange on the Hanlon Expressway. This restriction will be reviewed periodically to determine if these lands should be available for development or whether the designation should be expanded to include additional lands. The sequence of development shall be further controlled so that the eastern side of the Hanlon develops first. Development immediately adjacent to the Hanlon shall be restricted in the degree and location of open storage and type of uses. The area to the west of the Hanlon Expressway will only be considered should no other suitable site be available."</p> <p>Given the above we have concerns with Official Plan conformity which relate to prezoning industrial lands in the Hanlon Expressway area. The above Township policy calls for a detailed concept plan to be developed; phasing; and restrictions on the degree and location of open storage, and type of uses immediately adjacent to the Hanlon.</p> 	<p>6. Industrial Pre-zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• The existing Agricultural (A) zoning has been maintained for properties within the Brock Road Industrial Area that are owned by MTO. The properties are not proposed for pre-zoning.</p> <p>• A holding provision has been added to the proposed pre-zoned lands, to ensure that the Official Plan requirements in Section 9.8.3 are addressed (related to the preparation of a detailed concept plan) prior to development.</p> <p>In addition, the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law includes an 'Industrial Design Overlay' Zone, which applies to lands within the Puslinch Industrial Policy Area of the Official Plan. The provisions of the design overlay apply in addition to the zone requirements, and address performance standards related to outdoor storage, building orientation, parking, loading, and service areas, building elevations, and landscaping.</p>
			<p>7. Industrial Zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• Prestige Industrial</p> 	<p>7. Industrial Zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• The 'Industrial Design Overlay' Zone (discussed above) applies to lands with Highway 401 frontage. The provisions of the design</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>We would suggest that the Township give consideration to an additional industrial zone or regulations which recognize the importance and prestige of lands with Highway 401 and Highway 6 North frontage by restricting the type of uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor Storage [A] With respect to outdoor storage, the "Puslinch Design Guidelines" are based on various priority areas within Puslinch which would benefit from enhanced design. While many of the guidelines are appropriately addressed through the site plan process, some may be included as performance standards within the zoning by-law. In this regard, we note the intention of the guidelines is to prohibit outdoor storage on sites with Highway visibility. • Outdoor Storage Use We seek clarification regarding the separate uses identified for "accessory outdoor storage and/or processing" and "outdoor storage use". It is unclear what the purpose of the two definitions is. • Outdoor Storage Screening The general provisions for outdoor storage (section 4.21) require screening with a 1.8 m (6 ft) fence/wall and allow storage up to 6 m (20 ft) in height. It is unclear how this will be effective in practice. The Township may also wish to consider other screening options, such as berms and/or landscaping. • Lot Coverage [A] We note that there is no maximum lot coverage identified for the Industrial Zone. Given a minimum of 15% landscaped open space is required, the maximum achievable lot coverage is 85%. Servicing considerations would also reduce the achievable lot coverage. A specific standard might provide more clarity for land owners. 	<p>overlay apply in addition to the zone requirements, and address performance standards related to outdoor storage, building orientation, parking, loading, and service areas, building elevations, and landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above comment. • This has been clarified. The Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law now includes distinct definitions for 'Outdoor Storage Use' and 'Outdoor Storage Area'. • Subsections 4.2.1 a (iv) and (v) have been modified to read: (iv) The outdoor storage area shall be screened by opaque fencing or masonry wall to the satisfaction of the Township. (v) No materials (other than machinery and equipment) in an outdoor storage area shall exceed 6.0 metres in height. • A specific standard has been included for clarity. A maximum permitted lot coverage of 75% is now identified.
			<p>8. Long Term Care Facility Definition The following definition may benefit from further refinement with respect to intent and purpose: Long term care facility: A residence which provides care to meet the physical, emotional, social, spiritual and person needs of persons. Long Term Care Facilities include Homes for the Aged established under the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act, as amended, Nursing Homes licensed under the Nursing Home Act, as amended and Chronic Care facilities.</p>	<p>8. Long term Care Facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition for Longer term care facility has been updated as per the applicable legislation. • A new definition for Retirement Home has been added to the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Long term care facilities have been introduced in the Urban Residential (UR) Zone as well as the Core Mixed-Use (CMU) Zone. The Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act and the Nursing Home Act were repealed on July 1, 2010. If considering including legislation as part of the definition, it may be helpful to reference both the <i>Long Term Care Homes Act, 2007</i> and the <i>Retirement Homes Act, 2010</i>. Also, the definition makes reference to Chronic Care facilities without defining what a Chronic Care facility is. The <i>Residential Tenancies Act, 2006</i> Ontario Regulation 516/06 may be helpful in explaining what a Chronic Care facility may be. It may also be helpful to determine the intent and purpose of this definition and what uses are planned to be permitted within it.</p> <p>Within the County of Wellington Official Plan, the Residential designation (Part 8: Detailed Urban Centre Policies) permits a variety of residential uses including rest homes, nursing homes and homes for the aged.</p>	
			<p>9. Agriculture-Related Uses and Agri-Tourism Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following new uses are defined in the draft by-law and listed as permitted in the Agricultural Zone: "agriculture-related uses" and "agri-tourism use" but unlike the new "farm business" use they do not have associated regulations. We would recommend that new special provisions be added to the agricultural zone or new general provisions be added to address performance standards for both. It may also be helpful if the definition of agriculture-related use included more detail about what uses are planned to be permitted. <p>10. Home Industry</p> <p>A "home industry" is defined in the draft by-law as: "a small-scale business or industrial use carried out on a rural or farm property which is an accessory use to an agricultural operation or a single detached dwelling." The above definition is very broad as we note Section 6.4.4 of the Official Plan states the following: "home industries which are small in scale with a limited number of employees, and minimal off-site impacts – examples include minor equipment repair, woodworking, crafts, and welding" In order to demonstrate policy conformity, we would recommend a more specific definition.</p>	<p>9. Agriculture-Related Uses and Agri-Tourism Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law includes a definition for 'Farm Business', which is consistent with the definition of 'On-farm Diversified Uses' - as per the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Examples are provided to clearly indicate what types of uses are planned to be permitted. An 'Agri-Tourism Business' is included as an example of a 'Farm Business', which is also consistent with the 2014 PPS. <p>The Draft By-law also includes a definition for 'Agri-Tourism Business' and examples are provided to again be clear about the specific types of uses that are planned to be permitted.</p> <p>Section 11.5 of the Draft By-law sets out special provisions for Farm Businesses, which are permitted as of right in the Agricultural Zone. As noted above, since an 'Agri-tourism Business' is defined as a specific type of 'Farm Business' in the Draft By-law, the special provisions of Section 11.5 would apply to both types of uses.</p> <p>The Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law also sets out a definition for 'Agriculture-related Uses, which is consistent with the 2014 PPS. To provide more clarity with respect to the types of uses that are planned to be permitted, additional detail has been added to the Draft By-law definition for 'Agriculture-related uses' and examples have been provided.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>It is noted that the 'agriculture-related uses' are only permitted as-of-right within the AC (Agriculture-related Commercial) Zone. This zone provides for and regulates small -scale commercial, industrial, and institutional uses in the Secondary Agricultural Area, in accordance with the Official Plan.</p> <p>Note: Additional comments and responses with respect to the above are documented in Part 2 and 3 of this table.</p> <p>10. Home Industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A more specific definition of 'Home Industry' has been provided, which is consistent with the definition of Section 6.4.4 of the Official Plan. It is noted that Section 4.12 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law identifies new general provisions for Home Industries in the Township, which regulate scale and number of employees, and other matters.
			<p>11. Other Zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Environment (NE) Zone We would refer to the Conservation Authorities for their comment. Future Development (FD) Zone One of the objectives for areas designated Future Development in the Official Plan is to: "limit development of such lands until an Official Plan Amendment including a proper site plan or concept plan for future uses has been submitted and approved" The only property with this designation in Puslinch is on the south side of Wellington Road 34 across from the County Aberfoyle Garage. The intent of the Official Plan policies is that this property would not be developed until such time as an Official Plan Amendment (and zoning by-law amendment) is approved. We would appreciate confirmation of the intent of provision 12.5.a) of the new regulations which would allow development subject to "a comprehensive review of the need and impacts of developing this land on the surrounding area...." This does not appear to conform with section 8.10.3 of the Official Plan. For other "prezoned" areas which are not designated Future Development in the Official Plan we would like to gain a better understanding of how the zone would achieve the desired outcome of the applicable Residential land use designation. 	<p>11. Other Zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response. Comments from the CAs have been received and reviewed. We are aware that there is only one property within the Township that is designated 'Future Development' by the Official Plan (located on Wellington Road 34) and that the intent of the applicable Official Plan policies is to limit development on this property until the most appropriate future land uses are determined and approved by the County/Township by way of an Official Plan Amendment. In recognition of the above, the Draft By-law has been revised and a Future Development 1 (FD1) Zone has been applied to the subject lands. The purpose of the proposed FD1 Zone is to ensure that the lands are protected for future land uses/development by restricting permitted uses to only agricultural uses, in an effort to prevent fragmentation, in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan. Any new development would require a Zoning By-law Amendment. Further, Section 12.5 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law has been removed and replaced with new proposed FD1 zone standards, which are also restrictive and will further limit future development.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>The FD zone was also applied (in the Preliminary First Draft By-law) to other lands in the Township that are designated 'Residential', but currently used for agricultural/other purposes. The intent in doing so was to recognize that there are limited residential lands left within the Township and there is a need to protect these lands for future residential development.</p> <p>However, in order to appropriately apply the Official Plan policies, and avoid confusion, a second Future Development 2 (FD2) Zone has been created and applied to these lands. The purpose of the FD2 zone is to permit only existing agricultural uses, as well as a single-detached residential dwelling, in accordance with the Official Plan, until future studies are completed to demonstrate that more intensive residential land uses can be accommodated, where appropriate. In limiting the uses permitted via the FD2 zone, the Township is protecting these lands from future lot fragmentation and the development of potentially incompatible/non-residential development.</p>
			<p>12. Overlays</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Protection (EP) and Floodplain We would refer to the Conservation Authorities for their comment. Source Protection Vulnerable Areas (SP) We would recommend a meeting between the project consultants and Mark Paoli, Manager of Policy Planning and Kyle Davis, Risk Management Official to discuss the proposed regulations and mapping. 	<p>No response. Comments from the CAs have been received and reviewed. Note: Additional comments and responses with respect to the EP and Floodplain Zones are documented in Part 2 and 3 of this table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response. Discussions with the Manager of Policy Planning and the Risk Management Official regarding zoning for Source Protection Plan. Note: Additional comments and responses with respect to the SPP zoning are documented in Part 2 and 3 of this table.
			<p>13. Mapping</p> <p>We look forward to the opportunity to review all of the mapping for the new zoning by-law, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> rural areas areas identified as "other proposed zoning changes take priority" changes to the Natural Environment (NE) Zone combined mapping which will indicate how the Zones and Overlays will be conveyed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response. At the time of preparing the preliminary/first draft By-law, new draft mapping had not been prepared or circulated. Note: new mapping has since been prepared and was shared with the second draft by-law. Comments are documented in Part 2 of this table.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Once the complete mapping has been provided we will be in a better position to determine Official Plan conformity.</p>	
			<p>14. Lot Size Table 6.2, 7.3, 8.2, 9.2, and 10.2 provide details of the zone standards. The by-law proposes a number of different standards from the current by-law. These changes include to varying degrees, reductions in required front yard, interior and exterior side yard, required rear yard, increased maximum lot coverage and reduced landscaped open space. We recognize that the current draft indicates that the lot area standards are under review. We appreciate the Township's willingness to revisit lot areas so that they will be of a size (and standard) that can adequately accommodate private services.</p>	<p>At the time of preparing the preliminary/first Draft Comprehensive By-law, an analysis of lot area standards was still under review. Note: based on the analysis completed since that time, a memo was prepared for the Township (Recommended Minimum Lot Sizes in the New Draft By-law, by Stantec Consulting Ltd., July 7, 2017) with respect findings. The following recommendations were included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A minimum lot area requirement of 4,000 m² (or roughly 1 acre) should be identified in the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law. This requirement recognizes the need to protect groundwater resources within the Township, while balancing the Township's goals for economic development. 2. The new Zoning By-law should also include special provisions to permit reduced lot sizes within appropriate zones, subject to the completion of hydrogeologic studies and water quality impact risk assessments. Such studies/assessments would be required to demonstrate (to the satisfaction of Township staff) that that sewage effluent is hydrogeologically isolated from existing or potential supply aquifer(s). 3. In order to implement recommendation number 2, it is also recommended that the Township develop and implement a transparent process for the review of proposals for reduced lot sizes.
			<p>15. Servicing Within the Description section of Table 2.1 there are a variety of servicing references: UR, HR, CMU, C1, I "where adequate services can be provided" RUR, RR "on individual services" IND "private water and sewage systems" C2, C3, C4, EX, DI no reference to servicing A, FD, OS, NE</p> <p>It is noted in the introductory paragraph of this section that these descriptions do not form a part of the By-law. Therefore, it may be helpful to provide regulations which clearly articulate standards to be applied for lots with individual on-site water and sewer services and standards that are intended to accommodate other servicing options, if that is the case. In addition, a consistent approach to servicing terminology would provide more clarity in the new by-law.</p>	<p>A new Section 4.23 has been added to the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to clearly articulate servicing requirements:</p> <p>Private servicing capability is a prerequisite to development within the Township. No building or structure shall be erected or used unless it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Township that the lot is of sufficient size and shape to accommodate the dwelling, individual on-site water and sewage system envelopes, while maintaining compliance with Ontario Building Code requirements and O.Reg. 903 made under the Ontario Water Resources Act.</p> <p>The language in table 2.1 has also be revised to use more consistent servicing terminology.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
7.	July 18, 2017	Jonathan Pounder, BSc. Env Coordinator, Environmental Planning Conservation Halton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 4.2 and 4.3 – A policy should be added prohibiting the creation of accessory apartments/employee accommodations within the floodplain or where flood free access cannot be achieved, as determined by a Conservation Authority. 2. Section 4.7 – A policy should be added prohibiting the erection of garden suites within the NE zone, floodplains, or environmental protection overlays, or in situations where flood free access, as determined by a Conservation Authority, cannot be achieved. 3. Section 4.31 – It is recommended an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) be completed to support any development proposed within 120 m of the Natural Environment Zone, unless otherwise stated by the Conservation Authority or County. It is also noted that a scoped EIA may be considered by the County or Conservation Authority. 4. Section 10.0 and 13 – It is recommended that a policy be added restricting vulnerable institutional uses (e.g., hospitals, schools, day cares, etc.) from the floodplain overlay. It is also noted that further discussion with Conservation Authorities is likely required as the policies associated with the floodplain overlays advances. 5. Figures – Conservation Halton has reviewed the figures associated with our jurisdiction (Figures 1.2, 3, and 7). It is noted that the lines illustrated on these figures for the watercourse in Morriston do not reflect our records. As such, revisions to these figures are required. Furthermore, through our review of the draft schedule it has come to our attention that there is a discrepancy between our mapping and the floodplain extents shown. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 13.2 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law includes an 'Aberfoyle Floodplain Overlay' Zone, which applies to lands that are subject to the special Aberfoyle Floodplain Policies of Section PA7-7 of the Official Plan. The provisions of the floodplain overlay apply in addition to the underlying zone requirements, and prohibit accessory apartment dwelling units. In addition, a prohibition against the establishment of employee accommodations and garden suites has also been added. 2. Garden suites have been added to the list of prohibited uses within the 'Aberfoyle Floodplain Overlay', as per Section 13.2 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Garden suites are not permitted within the NE Zone as per the list of permitted uses in Section 12.2. 3. Since the proposed 'Environmental Protection overlay' has the same effect, no changes are recommended. 4. These types of vulnerable institutional uses are included in the list of prohibited uses within the 'Aberfoyle Floodplain Overlay', as per Section 13.2 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. 5. Updated mapping has been obtained and incorporated into the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.
8.	July 18, 2017	Shawn Marsh	One thing I forgot to submit, regarding Pool houses, we are limited by the roof heights which adversely affects design. Typically, these are, pretty high end properties and the idea is for the pool structure to compliment the property. Is therefore a way to address this moving forward as it has been an issue up to now.	No change is recommended. Should an increase in height be desired by existing landowners, it is recommended that this be addressed through the Planning Act approvals process.

PART 2: SECOND DRAFT BY-LAW SUBMISSIONS (SEPTEMBER 2017)

The following table documents all formal submissions received from stakeholders, agencies, and members of the public with respect to the second draft of the Township's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. A response/indication of how it was addressed is also provided.

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
9.	September 18, 2017 Fred Natolochny, MCIP, RPP Supervisor of Resource Planning Grand River Conservation Authority	The one change that I would question is the removal from the previous draft of s 4.31 Setbacks from Watercourses. There is no indication of where or how this has been addressed (the removal of this section) and I was not able to see anything that would address the concern of watercourses that have not been identified and incorporated into the NE or EP zoning. We would be pleased to discuss this further if it would be helpful, but would advise that the removal of this section is a cause for concern to us. It has been a very useful general provision in the past.	Section 4.31 of the Second Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law was removed in error and has been put back in.
10.	September 28, 2017 Mark Reid	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessory Farm Employee Accommodation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Min. lot of 35 ha (85 ac), rather large for only 1 accommodation allowed b. Min of 100m² (1000ft²) is huge if you just need one employee c. No mention of temporary housing (as per Ontario Policy) mobile homes, etc. d. Within a 100m of principle dwelling? Why? Rather limiting on 85+ acres 2. Home Business (4.11) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prohibited: Contractor's yard (there are many in puslinch!), existing prohibition? 3. Outdoor Storage Areas (4.22) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Should exempt ag. Use in general b. There are numerous farms that have outdoor storage that would violate this and other provisions. 4. Shipping Containers (4.24.2) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Max 4 (one per acre): (b) should have no limit; one per acres should be sufficient for most farms (but there may be exceptions to this, as MANY farms use shipping containers (sea and tractor trailers) for storage. b. Location © may not be possible and should not be a restriction for Ag. Use as only the owner knows what areas are best for what use 5. Parking Spaces (5.2.2) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ag related use and animal clinics, could be required to have 50 to 100+spaces (for 2,200m² facility which many would be that large) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessory Farm Employee Accommodation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Based on an additional review of other municipal standards, the minimum lot area requirements has been reduced to 20 ha. b. The minimum required floor area has also been reduced to 75 m². c. Section 4.29 of the By-law identifies uses prohibited in all zones, and subsection xi, xii, xiii, and xiv specifically prohibits the use of various types of vehicles, and structure for human habitation (except where permitted otherwise in the By-law). These provisions would restrict the use of such vehicles and structures for farm employee accommodations. d. No change is recommended, based on an additional best practices review. 2. Home Business: The home business provisions have been updated in the second Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Home businesses are permitted in the Core Mixed Use, Commercial, Highway Commercial, and Agricultural zones. However, certain types of uses are specifically prohibited as home businesses, including contractor's yards, in order to ensure compatibility with surrounding residential uses.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Perhaps do it based upon office space only and increase the m2 per parking space b. Has this table been compared to existing land in Puslinch? 6. Farm Business (11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Way too restrictive and complicated. Ontario Policy Statements are to encourage on farm diversification so that Ag. Areas continue to be sustainable! 7. NE Zones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seemingly arbitrary increases; how was this determined? 2. Contradicts council's plea to the Province to alleviate the Green belt around the 401 3. Shouldn't a qualified person attend each property in person to determine? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Should simply leave it to the Conservation Authority to stake out as per the norm/existing method to determine NE areas! 4. 30m setback, arbitrary, no science behind it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. At least use the same as conservation (30m for significant, goes down from there). 5. (4.21 ii) There are parcels of land that would no longer be able to have any buildings built! 	<p>New regulations for home industries have also been included in the Draft Comprehensive By-law (Section 4.12), in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan, and are permitted accessory to a dwelling unit or an agricultural operation. The definition for home industry would permit uses such as carpentry shops, metal working shops, and welding shops, for example. However, the zoning by-law regulates size and scale of home industries in order to ensure compatibility with surrounding agricultural uses and to protect these lands for agricultural uses.</p> <p>A contractor's yard is only permitted as of right in the Industrial Zone by the Draft Comprehensive By-law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Outdoor Storage: An Outdoor Storage Use has been included as a permitted use in the Agricultural Zone where it is accessory to or in conjunction with a permitted principal use. 4. Shipping Containers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No change is recommended to this requirement, based on an additional best practices review. b. No change is recommended to this requirement, based on an additional best practices review. 5. Parking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Based on an additional review of other municipal standards, parking requirements have been updated as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Agriculture-related use – 1 per 100m2 ii. Animal clinic – 1 per 40 m2 b. This proposed parking standards have been identified based on a best practices review of comparable municipalities that are predominantly rural/agricultural communities. 6. Note: changes to the proposed regulations for farm businesses have been identified in later drafts of the By-law, as discussed in Part 3 of this document.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>7. 1. The NE zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law by implementing the Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. Since one of the goals/objectives of the zoning by-law project is to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act) the Core greenlands designation has been implemented through zoning.</p> <p>2. No response. The NE designation is based on mapping from the Conservation Authority and the County of Wellington, and not by the Province of Ontario via the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>3. It is not standard practice for the Conservation Authority to determine or confirm the boundaries of a natural feature unless a development application has been submitted and is under review.</p> <p>4. This setback requirement is an existing requirement in the Township's Zoning By-law that has served the Township and Conservation Authorities well in the past. Therefore, no change is recommended.</p>
11.	October 3, 2017 Jeff Buisman, B.Sc., B.E.S., OLS, OLIP <i>Ontario Land Surveyor</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subject property is 267 Brock Road. It is shown as a red box on the attached map. Trans X owns this "A" parcel as well as the IND-3 parcel to the north and uses it as one parcel. The parcels have merged on title. They use the majority of the parcel for the trailers of the trucking company. The front 3 acres is vacant. They want to sever the front piece and sell it as a Commercial property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the subject property is located within the Puslinch Economic Development Area, and subject to the policies of Section PA7-1 of the County Official Plan, which is intended to service the Township by providing locations for economic activity, and employment opportunities, Township staff have recommended that the proposed Highway Commercial (C2) zoning be applied to this property.
12.	October 6, 2017 Arthur Grabowski, WSP Group Pang-Yu Holding Company Inc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We respectfully request that Animal Clinics be included as a permitted use in the CMU zone, through the Township's Zoning By-law Review. We also request that the required lot area for the CMU zone be reduced to a minimum of 1000 sq. m consistent with the Township's current Zoning By-law 19/85. Furthermore, we request that the minimum required parking for an Animal Clinic be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Animal Clinics have now been included as a permitted use in the CMU zone. As a result of consultation with Township staff, and an Advisory Committee assembled for the purpose of completing the Zoning By-law project, it is our opinion that existing minimum lot size requirements may not be adequate to accommodate future development and associated individual on-site sewage systems.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
		reduced to a standard of 1 per 25 sq. m of NFA consistent with a Medical Office.	<p>It is also our understanding that the minimum lot sizes identified are not based on hydrogeologic studies and a water quality impact risk assessment. Therefore, there is a concern that the existing Zoning By-law is misleading with respect to minimum lot sizes and how/where future development may be feasible within the Township. There is also a concern that effluent discharges from on-site sewage systems could have an effect on groundwater and the present or potential use of adjacent properties. On this basis, minimum lot sizes in the urban areas have been increased. Refer to the response provided in Comment No. 6, (from Wellington County) #14 on page 12 of this summary document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on an additional review of other municipal standards, parking requirements for an animal clinic have been reduced to 1 per 40 m².
13.	October 11, 2017 Hazhaar Othman & Kristen Freure Shield K9 7272 Gore Road Puslinch, ON	<p>Section 4.13 of the draft zoning bylaw, will increase the prescribed distances between the kennel and neighbouring dwellings or commercial buildings from 300 feet (91 metres) to 200 meters. The bylaw also requires that the kennel be offset 50 meters from the property line, regardless of surrounding uses.</p> <p>We are opposed to these proposed regulations as it will become increasingly difficult to find a property that will meet these new separation distances. By their very nature, kennels need to be located outside of urban areas and we have spent considerable time over the last few years looking for a property that was located in a rural area but close enough to urban centres to be convenient for our customers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: changes to the proposed kennel regulations have been identified in later drafts of the By-law, as discussed in Part 3 of this document.
14.	October 12, 2017 Tony Horvat STRK Services Inc. 905-515-5881	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The creek area on the property is proposed to be Natural Environment (NE). Slovenski Park is opposed to the introduction of a new zoning designation without an Environmental Impact Study and a clear definition/location of the NE boundaries. It is requested that the NE designation be removed from the creek area that bisects the property. The man-made pond on the property is proposed to be zoned Natural Environment (NE). Slovenski Park is opposed to this designation as the pond <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Was man-made in the 1970's with alterations to be off-line from the creek in the 1980s, has no vegetation- it has a gravel/sand base disturbed by swimmers all summer has no fish as there is no habitat/vegetation to support fish and no connection to the creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: changes to the site specific zoning that currently applies have been identified in later drafts of the By-law, as discussed in Part 3 of this document.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
		<p>d) has a water elevation that fluctuates seasonally with ground water and the swimming depth of about 1.2 m is maintained by pumping in ground water about once a week during the summer months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed zoning excludes "farm ponds" however the term "farm ponds" are not defined. The Slovenski Park pond's only use is as a swimming area for its members. It was altered to be off-line from the creek in the 1980's at the request of MNR and GRCA to eliminate swimming disturbance in the creek. The result was recognized by the province with a certificate of appreciation and the granting of a conservation tax rebate (C.L.T.I.P.). It is requested that the NE designation be removed from the pond. The proposed zoning by-law uses the terms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -travel trailer park -campground -mobile home park -seasonal tourist trailers However these terms are not defined in the draft zoning document. Slovenski Park is a Cultural Centre where camping is permitted for members only – the trailers are not used by tourists or travelers. Camping has taken place on the property since 1964 and mapping from 1981 indicates 100 camping sites – a practice which continues to the present date. Would it be possible to receive a copy of all comments submitted to the Township regarding this by-law? 	
15.	October 25, 2017	<p>County of Wellington</p> <p>1.0 General Matters</p> <p>1.1 We would like to further discuss how to address active applications so that the new comprehensive zoning by-law does not result in unnecessary appeals or the need for duplicate rezoning applications to be filed.</p> <p>1.2 The definition of "agriculture-related uses" includes "animal clinics" which is also a defined term. We note that livestock are excluded from the "animal clinics" definition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Township may wish to consider an alternate definition for animal clinics in the rural area which includes livestock. 	<p>1.1 Section 1.1.3 of the Draft By-law has been added to ensure that all other current zoning by-law amendment applications remain active. This Section identifies all properties to which an active rezoning application applies and states that these properties shall continue to be subject to the existing Zoning By-law 19/85. Once the active rezoning amendment is approved, it will be incorporated into the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law by way of a housekeeping amendment.</p> <p>1.2 Given the agricultural and rural character of the Township, an additional use has been included in the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law for 'Agricultural Animal Clinic', which is permitted in the 'Agriculture-related Commercial' zone. '</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
		<p>1.3 We are in agreement with the addition of a commercial mall definition. The definition states that such uses are intended to primarily “...serve residents in the surrounding neighbourhoods...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We question how this would be regulated and would prefer a maximum size limitation for more clarity in the by-law. Should the “shopping centre” definition be removed? <p>1.4 Reference to Township of Centre Wellington should be removed from “waste disposal area” definition.</p> <p>1.5 The following special provision is included in various zones: “The minimum lot requirement may be reduced where site-specific hydrogeological studies have been completed and approved by the Township....”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest a wording clarification so that it is clear that the studies are completed by the land owner, not the Township. <p>1.6 If the Dry Industrial Special Provision (1) of Table 9.1 is meant to apply to all industrial uses, for clarification you may wish to consider adding it to the heading of the table: IND(1)</p> <p>1.7 References to “waterbodie” on mapping should be corrected.</p> <p>1.8 Add Industrial Design Overlay to Section 13.1</p> <p>1.9 It may be confusing to have two types of “special provisions” (footnotes to individual zone tables and to identify site-specific zones)</p> <p>1.10 We would suggest inclusion of a description of the purpose of the Environmental Protection Overlay. A good example can be found in Section 9.2.3.1 of the Township of Centre Wellington Zoning By-law.</p> <p>2.0 Pre-zoning</p> <p>2.1 For lands to be “pre-zoned”, we would like to discuss whether the necessary studies could be required and reviewed as part of the site plan process.</p>	<p>1.3 Since a Commercial Mall is only permitted as a Site Specific Special Provision (sp33), the associated maximum size limitation is identified in Section 14.0 of the Draft Comprehensive By-law. The definition for shopping centre was left in the Draft By-law in error, and has now been removed.</p> <p>1.4. Reference to the Township of Centre Wellington has been removed.</p> <p>1.5 The wording has been revised to clearly indicated that the studies are to be completed by the landowner, not the Township.</p> <p>1.6 The Dry Industrial Special Provision (1) has been added to the heading of the Table.</p> <p>1.7 The spelling of ‘waterbodies’ has been corrected.</p> <p>1.8 This has been added to the list in Section 13.1.</p> <p>1.9 Footnotes to individual zone tables have been renamed from ‘special provisions’ to ‘Use-Specific Special Provisions’. Site Specific zones have been renamed to ‘Site-Specific Special Provisions’.</p> <p>1.10 A description of the purpose of the Environmental Protection Overlay has been added.</p> <p>2.1 It is recommended that a Holding provision be applied to properties that are to be pre-zoned, which would state that necessary studies (as deemed appropriate by the County and Township) are required prior to</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
		<p>2.2 Lands on the east and west side of the Hanlon Expressway are proposed to be rezoned. In our previous comments we identified concerns with Official Plan conformity with Section 9.8.3. The Township policy calls for a detailed concept plan to be developed; phasing; and restrictions on the degree and location of open storage, and type of uses immediately adjacent to the Hanlon.</p> <p>We note a holding provision has been applied to the west side of the Hanlon Expressway which requires development on the east side of the Hanlon Expressway to be complete prior to development. It is not clear how this approach to zoning addresses the intent of the policy which is to ensure orderly development of the area (i.e. phasing, internal road patterns, etc.) and provision of adequate supporting studies.</p> <p>3.0 Source Protection Related Sections</p> <p>3.1 The Township should consider adding in the legislative references (ie Act or Regulation references) to the definitions of significant drinking water threat, WHPA and Source Protection Plan as they are defined terms from the Clean Water Act and regulations. SDWT and Source Protection Plan are defined in the Clean Water Act and WHPA is defined in O Reg 287/07 under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3.2 The following should be added at the end of the Definition of Existing: "...except as provided for in Section 13.3".</p> <p>3.3 Either in the first paragraph of Section 13.3 or in Section 2.1 (page 8), the Township should explain that the source protection vulnerable areas overlay is the exterior outline of the approved Wellhead Protection Areas A through C, Issues Contributing Areas and Intake Protection Zone – 1 present in the Township, pursuant to the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3.4 In Section 13.3.2 Grand River Source Protection Plan – Existing Uses and Activities, please add the following wording in quotes: Existing uses, activities, building or structures are permitted, as specified below "or except where otherwise indicated in the Grand River Source Protection Plan" That wording is in the original definition in the Grand River Source Protection Plan.</p> <p>4.0 Removal of Site Specific Zones</p> <p>4.1 We are supportive of efforts to streamline the document by reducing the number of site specific zones. We note however, a number of discrepancies with Natural Environment Zoning</p>	<p>the removal of the Holding Provision. This is in accordance with Section 13.5 of the Wellington County Official Plan.</p> <p>2.2 Note: changes to the proposed zoning on the east and west side of the Hanlon Expressway have been identified in later drafts of the By-law, as discussed in Part 3 of this document.</p> <p>3.1 References to legislation have been added to the source protection related terms from applicable Acts and Legislation.</p> <p>3.2 The suggested text has been added to the definition of 'existing'.</p> <p>3.3 The suggested text has been added to Section 2.1 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.</p> <p>3.4 The suggested text has been added to the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Note: also see comments and responses in Part 3 of this document, which apply to source protection related sections of the second draft comprehensive zoning by-law.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
		<p>which may have been based on more detailed resource mapping which were reviewed as part of a previous planning application. In these cases, the Natural Environmental Zone may have been changed in the new by-law to protect a smaller area than was intended by the site-specific zone mapping.</p> <p>The Township should be satisfied that the final Natural Environment mapping represents the most up to date resource mapping. The Township should also be satisfied that the new zoning maintains the original intent and purpose of the original site-specific zones.</p> <p>4.2 L. Ferraro Inc., North Side of HWY 401 at McLean Road</p> <p>We note that the property is zoned IND (sp83)(h7) but under Section 14.0 of the by-law the sp83 special provision has been left blank. It is our understanding that the land owner has requested removal of the outdoor storage prohibition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would not recommend that such change be made as it would be in conflict with the Township's Design Guidelines and the amending by-law recently approved by Council • We would recommend that this property be included in the Industrial Design Overlay. • Suggest that this property be included in Map A-4 rather than Schedule 'A' <p>5.0 Mapping</p> <p>5.1 Map B-1 is incorrect as it does not reflect the Greenlands designation in the Official Plan.</p> <p>We would also note that the Greenlands designation continues underneath the Core Greenlands designation.</p> <p>We appreciate having a discussion about the identification of the Environmental Protection Overlay as a separate map. It may be more clear for it to be displayed in conjunction with the Natural Environment Zone as they are interrelated. For example, the Greenlands designation continues underneath the Core Greenlands designation.</p> <p>5.2 Industrial Design Overlay and Special Landscape Requirements along Brock Road could be conveyed by use of a site-specific provision.</p>	<p>4.1 and 4.2 Natural Environment mapping has been updated to reflect the most up to date resource mapping as a result of approved planning applications.</p> <p>4.2 The site specific special provisions for the subject property were left out of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law in error. The provisions have been out back in. The property has also been included in the Industrial Design Overlay and is shown on Map A-4 rather than Schedule A.</p> <p>5.1 Map B-1 has been updated to accurately reflect the Greenlands Designation in the Official Plan.</p> <p>The Environmental Protection Overlay has been updated to be shown with the Natural Environment Zone.</p> <p>5.2 Site specific provisions have not been included to implement the Industrial Design Overlay or the Special Landscape Requirement.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
16.	October 13, 2017	Jennifer Passy, BES, MCIP, RPP Manager of Planning	Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised draft. I did notice that "waterbody" is spelled incorrectly on the map schedules, and a few minor typos. I don't have anything further to add.

PART 3: THIRD/FINAL DRAFT BY-LAW SUBMISSIONS (OCTOBER 2017)

The following table documents all formal submissions received from stakeholders, agencies, and members of the public with respect to the third/final draft of the Township's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. A response/indication of how it was addressed is also provided.

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
17.	October 11, 2017	Hazhaar Othman & Kristen Freure – Othman	<p>We are writing this letter to the Council of the Township of Puslinch to state our concerns with the proposed amendments to the Township's comprehensive zoning bylaw specifically as it pertains to permitted uses within the Agricultural Zone.</p> <p>We own the property at 7272 Gore Road and purchased this site with the intent to establish our existing dog training and boarding business here. Under the existing zoning by-law this property is zoned Agriculture which permits a number of agriculture related uses. The agricultural areas throughout the Township allow for the breeding, raising boarding and training of livestock of all kinds. This bylaw includes a restriction on the operation of a kennel as of right but it is our understanding that a kennel may be permitted through a site specific zoning amendment. We are aware that a number of existing kennels were set up in this manner within the Township and it was our intention to do the same on this property.</p> <p>We have only just been made aware that the Township is reviewing their comprehensive zoning bylaw and that proposed changes are being recommended that would make the use of a property for the raising, boarding or training of dogs and/or cats extremely difficult if not impossible.</p> <p>Section 4.13 of the draft zoning bylaw, will increase the prescribed distances between the kennel and neighbouring dwellings or commercial buildings from 300 feet (91 metres) to 200 meters. The bylaw also requires that the kennel be offset 50 meters from the property line, regardless of surrounding uses.</p> <p>We are opposed to these proposed regulations as it will become increasingly difficult to find a property that will meet these new separation distances. By their very nature, kennels need to be located outside of urban areas and we have spent considerable time over the last few years looking for a property that was located in a rural area but close enough to urban centres to be convenient for our customers.</p> <p>We feel that the proposed extension of distances and land area are excessively onerous and are designed to discourage individuals from operating kennels in the Township which are considered small businesses. We also feel that the new proposed distances force individuals interested in establishing a kennel to purchase large agricultural properties thus wasting many acres of prime farm land and exacting an excessive financial cost. Kennels are a necessary business to any community as over 40% of Canadian households have dogs. Quality, affordable training and boarding services are important businesses and already have limitations on where they can locate.</p>	<p>The following revised zoning by-law requirements for Kennels are recommended based on the comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Kennels are prohibited uses unless specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law.</i> b. <i>Where specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law, no land, building or structure shall be used for a kennel, unless the land, building and structure is in compliance with the following regulations and any other applicable provisions of this By-law:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>the minimum required lot area shall be 3 ha;</i> ii. <i>the kennel shall be located no closer than 125 m from any existing residential dwelling, or commercial or institutional building on any other lot;</i> iii. <i>a secure, chain link fence enclosure shall be installed and maintained around any outdoor run or outdoor common play area;</i> iv. <i>any pen area for the housing of dogs shall be constructed with solid walls and roofing;</i> v. <i>dog activity is not permitted in any outdoor run or outdoor common play area between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m</i> c. <i>In no case may a kennel contain anything other than single level dog runs.</i>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>It should be noted that we have no issue with the proposed amendments that are reasonable from a community and animal welfare standpoint. The proposal that all dogs be kept indoors between 7am and 8pm, be kept in properly constructed runs with solid walls and that the kennel have a fence around it are all realistic stipulations.</p> <p>We purchased our property at 7272 Gore road in Dec 2016 with the intention of moving our business, Shield K9 to the premises, growing the business and eventually building our dream home on the property. Prior to purchase we checked the existing bylaws and found them to be quite reasonable towards small business and kennels specifically. There was also an existing kennel on the property that the previous owners had been using for a commercial breeding operation. As cleaning up the property and making improvements to the existing structures has taken some significant time and expense we are now making our kennel application in and are dismayed with the proposed amendments to the bylaw. Our property would no longer meet some of the proposed distance requirements if the amendments were to pass. If the Township were to apply these proposed amendments to our kennel application we would be forced to close down our business and thus lose our livelihood and the significant money invested in the purchase of the property.</p> <p>We get along well with our neighbors and want to be productive members of the community. We have no issue with meeting reasonable requirements for operating a kennel and small family business. We find that the existing bylaw is more than sufficient for this and wish to formally note our objections to the proposed changes to the zoning bylaw found in Section 4.13.</p> <p>Further, we wish to be notified of any and all matters pertaining to the proposed zoning bylaw including any future meetings and/or decisions of Council. Please ensure that this letter is forwarded to members of Council and to the consultants who are undertaking this review.</p>	
18.	October 23, 2017	Stephen May CBM St Marys Cement Lands Manager - Western Region	<p>CBM Aggregates, a division of St. Mary's Cement, owns and operates a number of Licenced gravel pits in the Township of Puslinch. These properties are currently zoned "Extractive Industrial" (EXI) to permit extraction, in accordance with their Aggregate Resources Act licenses and Site Plans.</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposed zone mapping released with the September 2017 update of the Comprehensive Zoning By-Law draft and note that there are changes proposed to the boundary and extent of the existin g"EXI" zoning within several of our Licenced properties, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. McMillan Pit (Lic #57371'- 4237 Sideroad 20 South 2. Aberfoyle North Pit (Lic # 5563 and Lic# 5520) - Pt Lots 23,24 & 25, Concession 7, Brock Road 3. Neubauer Pit (Lic# 6252841-7203, Concession 2 	The final draft By-law has been updated to maintain existing mapping on properties within any Aggregate Resources Act License within the Township of Puslinch. Licensed properties will maintain their present zoning, as shown on Schedule "A" of the Township of Puslinch Zoning By- Law 19/85 (September 2016 Consolidation).

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>4. Mast-Snyder Pit (Lic# 1298171.- 605 Downey Road To ensure consistency with existing aggregate extraction approvals, we request that there be no mapping changes within any Aggregate Resources Act License within the Township of Puslinch. Licensed properties should maintain their present zoning, as shown on Schedule "A" of the Township of Puslinch Zoning By- Law 19/85 (September 2016 Consolidation). Once these properties have undergone final rehabilitation and the Licenses have been surrendered by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, these lands could be re-zoned in recognition of the completed rehabilitation and to accommodate subsequent land uses at that time.</p>	
19.	October 28, 2017	Rob Stovel	<p>I reviewed the zoning mapping as it relates to the Cox lands. I don't know if the two new licences on Lot 13, Con 5 were mapped El or not.</p> <p>Also, I wanted to let you know that Cox Construction has rehabilitated a substantial portion of the pits in the Lot 10-13 area, i.e. former Nigro Pit and portion of the main Puslinch Pit.</p> <p>I believe that a few years back, Council saw the ag rehab at the main pit. It might be useful to consider zoning these lands Agricultural in the new by-law. Perhaps we could discuss this on Nov 6-9 when I return from vacation.</p>	<p>The zoning on the lands would be changed to Agriculture once the MNRF has confirmed to the Township that the rehabilitation has been finalized. If this process is done before the Comprehensive Zoning By-law has been approved, the Township will amend the zone mapping for the lands to Agricultural. If it has not been completed by that time, then the mapping can be amended in a future housekeeping.</p>
20.	October 31, 2017	Doreen Tschantz	<p>We are writing this letter to the council of the township of puslinch to state our objection to the proposed amendmmts to the existing by-law and specifically section 4.12, which extends the prescribed distances between the kennel and the neighbouring dwellings or commercial buildings from 300 feet to 200 metres, the stipulation that the kennel be offset for 50 metres from the property line, and the increased land size requirement from 3 acres to 15 acres.</p>	<p>The following revised zoning by-law requirements for Kennels are recommended based on the comments received:</p> <p>a. Kennels are prohibited uses unless specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law.</p> <p>b. Where specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law, no land, building or structure shall be used for a kennel, unless the land, building and structure is in compliance with the following regulations and any other applicable provisions of this By-law:</p>
21.	October 31, 2017	Laura and Matt Davey	<p>We are writing this letter to the council of the township of puslinch to state our objection to the proposed amendmmts to the existing by-law and specifically section 4.12, which extends the prescribed distances between the kennel and the neighbouring dwellings or commercial buildings from 300 feet to 200 metres, the stipulation that the kennel be offset for 50 metres from the property line, and the increased land size requirement from 3 acres to 15 acres.</p>	<p>i. the minimum required lot area shall be 3 ha;</p> <p>ii. the kennel shall be located no closer than 125 m from any existing residential dwelling, or commercial or institutional building on any other lot;</p> <p>iii. a secure, chain link fence enclosure shall be installed and maintained around any outdoor run or outdoor common play area;</p> <p>iv. any pen area for the housing of dogs shall be constructed with solid walls and roofing;</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
				v. dog activity is not permitted in any outdoor run or outdoor common play area between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m c. In no case may a kennel contain anything other than single level dog runs.
22.	October 31, 2017	Caitlin Port, MES, MCIP RPP, MHBC	As part of the Comprehensive Zoning By-Law Review, the zoning of the property should be updated to "Extractive Zone (EXI)", to coincide with the Licensed area of the property and to recognize the property as a legally-existing extractive use.	Zoning has been updated as noted.
23.	November 1, 2017	Betty Andersen P.L.5C1F	PART 4 General Provisions, Section 4.1 Access Provisions (page 32 of draft by-law) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As written, this entire section of the by-law lacks clarity regarding the future status of, recognition and legitimacy of existing privately held lots that have existing legal access to a public road via a private road where an easement agreement or declaration of right-of-way has been registered on the title of all affected land holdings. For older existing developments in Puslinch Township of this type there is likely no "subdivision agreement" in place with the municipality. In particular, this circumstance likely exists for older long established multi-lot residential developments around Puslinch Lake. The new zoning by-law must not have the effect of creating legal non-conforming lots as a consequence of having their access to a public road via an easement agreement granting right of use and access via a private road. • Clause ii. of this section should be clarified as to what substantive access matters will be dealt with in a "subdivision agreement" with the Township and the circumstances in which such an agreement may be employed (i.e. can such an agreement be used in the case of a single lot created by consent where access to a public road is via a private road and/or multiple lots created via a plan of subdivision with or without direct legal access (frontage) on a public road. • There appears to be NO recognition of existing single lot subdivisions that were established via the consent process where legal access is via an easement agreement or declaration of right-of-way. This same access deficiency exists in respect of any newly proposed freehold parcels to be created by consent. An example of this type of development exists where one lot has direct frontage on a public road and another lot exists to the rear of the lot with direct frontage on a public road and access to the lot without road frontage is via an easement agreement or declaration of right-of- way across the lot with public road frontage with said instrument registered on the title(s) of both lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To address this comment, the following provision has been added to Section 4.1: (v) has access to a private road that legally existed on the effective date of this By-law. • Access matters and circumstances in which a subdivision agreement is required are not appropriate for a zoning by-law. • Note: Clarification is required with respect to this comment.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
24.	November 6, 2017	Fred Natolochny Supervisor of Resource planning Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>Table 12.1 (page 88), "Conservation use" is only permitted in the OS zone, but could perhaps be considered within the other zones on this table.</p> <p>Section 12.4c. (page 89) begins with "or", possibly remaining from the last draft</p> <p>The last entry in Table 13.1 specifies "a regulated area according to a Conservation Authority," is a feature, where the erecting of a building or structure will not be permitted without the conservation authority approval. This would be applicable across all 3 conservation authorities. 13.2 (page 91) consider deleting "as well as lands to which Grand River Conservation Authority Regulation S0/06 applies (and such lands have been mapped by the GRCA)".</p> <p>Section 13.4 Aberfoyle Flood Plain Zone Overlay (page 93) provides additional information on development potential within Aberfoyle, through application of an (f) prefix on the mapping. Table 2.1 has Floodplain Overlay applying to the limits of the Regulatory Floodline without identifying Aberfoyle. This is reflected in 13.1 where Floodplain is the overlay identified. For consistency, perhaps all references could be to 'Aberfoyle Flood Plain Overlay' so flood plain areas outside Aberfoyle can be differentiated.</p> <p>Section 13.4 (page 93) also refers to Schedule B-3 for mapping of the Aberfoyle Flood Plain Zone Overlay (f). While B-3 is specific to this overlay, it also shows on A-3. In both of these maps it is identified as "Flood Special Policy Area". The term "special policy Area" in relation to flood policies has a different interpretation and is not an appropriate descriptor in this situation. We request the mapping be changed to 'Aberfoyle Flood Plain Overlay'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Conservation use' has been added as a permitted use to additional zones on the table in accordance with the Official Plan. • This has been corrected. • The suggested text revision has been made. • All reference to the 'Aberfoyle Floodplain Zone Overlay' has been updated to 'Aberfoyle Floodplain Special Provisions Overlay' for consistency. This edit differentiates floodplain areas outside Aberfoyle from the lands that are subject to the overlay • Reference to the 'Flood Special Policy Area' is currently wrong on Schedule B-3 of the Draft By-law, and has been renamed to 'Aberfoyle Floodplain Special Provisions Overlay'.
25.	November 6, 2017 (OPEN HOUSE)	Ken and Jane Williams 7376 Wellington Road 34	<p>When we saw the new plan overlay versus the old map it appears part of our agriculture land is now conservation land. Could we please get clarity on that as we are curious why.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most updated data from Wellington County and the Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection. As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
				<p>mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data. From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u> It is also noted that since agricultural uses are permitted within the Natural Environment zone, there is no impact or change to the agricultural uses and activities that are permitted in the property.
26.		Owner - 16 Hume Road	Communicated verbally to GRCA: Wetland boundary does not reflect what's present on site	GRCA staff inspected the site November 14 th , 2017 with Mr. Pilkey. Wetland confirmed. Limits of wetland may change under site specific review based on evaluation of growing season. No change to mapping recommended.
27.		Owner - 4675 and 4614? Concession Road 11	Communicated verbally to GRCA/Stantec: Appears NE Zone has changed, and doesn't appear to reflect GRCA feature	NE Zone reflects Official Plan Core Greenlands designation.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
28.		Owner - Gore Lots 5N, 6N, 7S 8S	Communicated verbally to GRCA/Stantec: NE Zone appears correct, the EP Overlay beyond GRCA regulation limit – questions what overlay layer is composed of	NE Zone reflects Official Plan Core Greenlands designation.
29.	November 13, 2017	Lisa Brown 4588 Nassagaweya Puslinch Town Line Con 11 PT Lots 16 and 17 RP 61R263Parts1&2PTRP 61R2185 Part 1 24.55 Acres	This letter is in regards to the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law for the Township I, Lisa Brown, oppose the Comprehensive Zoning By-law that these lands, noted above, be deemed prime agricultural. This is a formal written notice to the Township of Puslinch, to identify that I oppose this decision.	There are no proposed changes to the classification of agricultural lands as part of the Township's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. The proposed By-law implements the Agricultural land use policies of the current County Official Plan.
30.	November 13, 2017	Trevor Hawkins, M.PL, MCIP, RPP Planner cc. Haz Othman and Kristen Freure Carol Wiebe, MHBC Planning	Section 4.13 of the proposed Comprehensive Zoning By-Law contains a series of performance standards specific to kennels. Some of those standards regulate the operation of the kennel (e.g. fencing, construction of pen area and the limitation of outdoor dog activity to the hours of 7am to 8pm), however, the proposed By-law also contains minimum lot standards and minimum separation distances. Specifically, the By-law proposes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum lot area of 6 ha (14.826 acres) • A minimum front yard of 30 m • A minimum interior side yard of 50 m • A minimum exterior side yard of 30 m • A minimum rear yard of 50 m • Minimum separation of 200 m (656 feet) from any existing Residential Dwelling, or Commercial or Institutional Building on any Other Lot <p>It is these performance standards that our client has concerns with. Specifically, the required lot size and minimum yards required to operate a kennel and the significant increase in separation distance compared to the current regulation.</p>	The following revised zoning by-law requirements for Kennels are proposed based on the comments received: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kennels are prohibited uses unless specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law. Where specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law, no land, building or structure shall be used for a kennel, unless the land, building and structure is in compliance with the following regulations and any other applicable provisions of this By-law: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the minimum required lot area shall be 3 ha; the kennel shall be located no closer than 125 m from any existing residential dwelling, or commercial or institutional building on any other lot; a secure, chain link fence enclosure shall be installed and maintained around any outdoor run or outdoor common play area; any pen area for the housing of dogs shall be constructed with solid walls and roofing; dog activity is not permitted in any outdoor run or outdoor common play area between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m In no case may a kennel contain anything other than single level dog runs.
31.	November 15, 2017	Vicki Dickson / Jeff Born 4614 Conc 11	Please accept this letter as notice of disagreement to the designation of our farm to Natural Environment as shown on the map within the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Update.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most updated data from Wellington County and the

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>We purchased this farm in 2014 with the full intent of continuing to farm the lands as they have been farmed for the previous century. We expect to continue to farm without any new restrictions imposed as part of these impending changes.</p>	<p>Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection.</p> <p>As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data.</p> <p>From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u> <p>It is also noted that since agricultural uses are permitted within the Natural Environment zone, there is no impact or change to the agricultural uses and activities that are permitted in the property.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
32.	November 15, 2017	Dianne Paron MF Property Management Ltd.	<p>We had discussed some of the provisions of the existing ML Zone which have not been carried over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - minimum and maximum dwelling unit size (this came out of the original OMB hearing in 1999) - specific grandfathering of dwelling units larger than maximum size that were legally in place before March 2000 ML Zone created (I can provide a list of them if needed, there's 5 or 6 as I recall) - 1 parking spot per lot versus the minimum 2 for single detached dwelling - Maximum sizes of permitted additional buildings (eg. recreation building) - Maximum height 1 storey - Building separation: dwelling units – 3.5m; accessory building – 1.2m (this too came out of the original OMB hearing in 1999) - Maximum coverage 35% (but we <u>like</u> the 40%, makes more sense now that 3-season rooms are allowed, the reason for the many variances in the 38-39% relief range. In particular where there are no basements) <p>As discussed there may in fact be valid reasons for why some things weren't included, perhaps it was considered that it was no longer necessary? The parking spot one is critical though.</p> <p>We also discussed some "permitted uses" that might not be suitable for the Mini Lakes (or Millcreek for that matter) property, for example Accessory Apartments. Another issue might be allowing recreational vehicles and boats to park on lots in those communities where the lots are smaller than the estate/farm property lots more typical to the Township.</p> <p>A couple of other things that I have since noticed as well, not included in the draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of "carport" (which is in the 1985 By-law) which distinguishes it from "garage". Unless I have totally missed it somewhere. In particular for the Mini Lakes property, some of the lots could accommodate a carport but not a garage (but perhaps the increase in allowable coverage takes care of that) • We had talked at the committee in the early meetings about possibly including a definition of "crawl space" and I know the CBO was trying to come up with a definition for it. Perhaps the decision was to just let the OBC determine whether it's allowable or not, when a building permit application is submitted. <p>In the Site Specific Special Provisions #70 (OS Parent Zone) I'm wondering if we shouldn't 'tweak' the wording to say "Sewage treatment and disposal" rather than just "disposal" – that would then specifically cover the sewage treatment plant already situated on that parcel, that receives the waste from the 300 homes and treats it, as well as the disposal system that it finally disperses to. I know for a fact that there will be a building permit application made within the next few months for alterations to that sewage treatment plant and it might save an interpretation issue!</p>	<p>The provisions of the existing ML and Millcreek zone have not been carried over in error. They have been incorporated into the Final Draft By-law.</p> <p>The suggested addition regarding site specific zoning provision #70 has been addressed.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
33.	November 16, 2017	David & Nathalie Freure 29 Eagle Lane Cambridge ON N3C 2V4	I wish to register my objection to these new rules. The new rules are too restrictive and are not necessary. The old rules are quite sufficient to avoid conflict with neighbors and I can determine no planning justification to change them.	<p>The following revised zoning by-law requirements for Kennels are proposed based on the comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Kennels are prohibited uses unless specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law. b. Where specifically permitted by an amendment to this By-law, no land, building or structure shall be used for a kennel, unless the land, building and structure is in compliance with the following regulations and any other applicable provisions of this By-law: c. the minimum required lot area shall be 3 ha; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the kennel shall be located no closer than 125 m from any existing residential dwelling, or commercial or institutional building on any other lot; ii. a secure, chain link fence enclosure shall be installed and maintained around any outdoor run or outdoor common play area; iii. any pen area for the housing of dogs shall be constructed with solid walls and roofing; iv. dog activity is not permitted in any outdoor run or outdoor common play area between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m d. In no case may a kennel contain anything other than single level dog runs.
34.	November 16, 2017	John and Jim Clark 4240 Victoria Road 5 RR1 Puslinch NOB2J0	I'm writing about our land Lot 30 Con8. I would like Puslinch Township could put this land into the Village of Morriston for Future Development.	<p>The subject property is not currently located within the Settlement Area/Urban Centre of Morriston. It is currently designated 'Secondary Agriculture' by the Official Plan and is part of the County's Rural System, which is focused on resource development, and not intended to accommodate significant growth or future development.</p> <p>The Wellington County Official Plan sets out growth forecasts for the County's Urban Centres to the year 2041 (Section 3 of the Official Plan). The Official Plan states that in the event that any settlement boundary expansions appear to be required to accommodate the growth projections in Tables 2 through 8, the need for any such expansions must be confirmed through a municipal comprehensive review in accordance with the requirements of policy 2.2.8.2 of the Growth Plan, as amended, and section 4.8 of the County Official Plan.</p> <p>To-date, it has not been determined that there is a need for any such settlement boundary expansions to-date and a municipal</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
				comprehensive review has not been completed. On this basis, a Settlement Boundary expansion it include the subject property could not be justified or permitted under the Provincial or County planning frameworks.
35.	November 20, 2017	Rob Stovel	I wanted to make sure that the lot area and the site specific provisions for the DRS lands were accurately implemented in the new by-law. The lot area requirement, for instance, is not what was shown in 19/85 (see attachment).	The site specific provisions have been carried forward.
36.	November 20, 2017	Rob Stovel	I wanted to make sure that Cox's lands on Lot 13 were included in the new zoning by-law as EX1 Enclosed is sketch showing the lands in question. I also noted that the south L/2 of Lot 13 is extracted and undergoing rehabilitation. But it won't be finished in time to be included in this update.	The EX1 zone is carried forward.
37.	November 20, 2017	Dennis Lea	<p>I have attended all meetings and open houses regarding the proposed zoning by-law make-over. I have submitted several emails for proposal none of which have been responded to. Last night I asked one simple question and it could not be answered. The question was re-directed to you rather than directing it to the chief building inspector. It is the CBO's responsibility to interpret and apply zoning by-laws, not yours, not council's, no one else's. To date, I'm frustrated by an apparent non-democratic process taking place. There is an opportunity here to fix weaknesses in the current zoning by-law and I sense a reluctance to do so.</p> <p>I have read and agree with AIRD & BERLIS's letter to the township, that matters of site alteration cannot be addressed in zoning by-laws, however matters of "environmental protection" and the "health and safety of persons" can. Section 10, subsection 2-5, and 2 -6 of the MUNICIPAL ACT empowers a municipality to make by-laws respecting the "environmental well-being of the township" and "the health and safety of persons".</p> <p>For your consideration I'm proposing the following. Under restricted uses please add the following: Respecting the environmental well-being of the township and the health and safety of persons, no land may be used for the placing or dumping of fill unless that fill conforms to the standards set out in Table 1 of Ontario regulation t53/O4.</p> <p>If included as a restricted use, it would become "applicable law" with respect to the building code. I live adjacent to a commercial dumpsite containing over five thousand truckloads of UNTESTED fill coming from 22 different source sites. I have access to a video showing trucks dumping their load and rather than forming a pile, the material flows over the surface like cake batter. This dumpsite by the way has a "qualified person" on duty during dumping.</p> <p>WE NEED PROTECTION and I don't see a township caring to do so. We are six to seven months into this make-over and I have not received feedback on any of my submissions. I'm frustrated. Its never too late to do the right thing.</p>	Since the legal opinion provided to the Township confirms that matters of site alteration cannot be addressed in zoning by-laws, it is recommended that none of the suggested changes be made.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
38.	November 22, 2017	Mrs. Beverlev Wozniak 7088 Wellington Rd 34	<p>After attending the Official Plan and Puslinch Bylaw meetings, in my opinion both the County and the Township of Puslinch are going backwards instead of moving forward regarding the placement of the future employment lands the other side of Highway 6 to Guelph. This is the wrong side for what the Township has in mind. With the future bypass purposed by MTO, a lot of the lands will be lost and access will not be straight forward and will cause Problems.</p> <p>In my opinion the Employment Land area should be along Con. 7 from Mclean Rd. to Maltby Rd., there is already employment land along this Road, Capital Paving, CBM, landscape business, driving range, Persian Development, already zoned, plus lands that are already stated by the County as employment land. Along Con. 7 and County Rd- 34, the infrastructure is there already, a well established road system, hydro, gas line, fibre optics and lots of land with easy access and good to go right now.</p> <p>So lets do the right thing at the beginning and move forward and make the right decision, save time and money etc.</p> <p>So let's swap the previous employment land and put the employment land in the right place, along Con 7 where is should have been in the first place.</p>	<p>The location of Designated Employment Lands is not a matter that can be addressed through the Township's Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review. This is an Official Plan matter that would need to be addressed at the time of a Municipal Comprehensive Official Plan Review, in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement.</p>
39.	November 24, 2017	Brian Zeman, MHBC	<p>Comments on Mapping: Based on our review of the mapping we offer the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Creek Pit Proposed Zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no A (sp1) zone on the south parcel, this zone is located on the adjacent property to the east; however this zone is shown on the interactive mapping for the site and should be deleted. - A Zoning By-law Amendment has been submitted to rezone the southernmost extent of the property to EXI-?? with a small portion zoned OS-??. Based on previous correspondence with the Township it is our understanding that the Township is going to defer approval of the new Zoning-By-law on this site so it continues to be subject to the existing Zoning By-law. This revision was being made to ensure the Zoning By-law. Amendment application remains active and Dufferin does not need to file a Zoning Bylaw amendment application under the new Zoning By-law. See attachment A for additional information (letter dated March 6, 2017 from MHBC to the Township). • Aberfoyle Pit #1 Zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The OS-72 zone includes a portion of Dufferin's internal haul route to access the entrance/exit. Can the Township please confirm there are no issues and this does not need to be identified as a site specific permitted use? 	<p>Comments on Mapping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All mapping corrections have been made based on the comments. • Active applications have been addressed by Section 1.3.1 of the proposed by-law. • The Township has confirmed that there are no issues.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>In addition, upon review of Map B-1 containing the Environmental Protection Overlay, we offer the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mill Creek Pit - The Special Provisions provided in Section 13.2 should not apply to this site. - The Environmental Protection Overlay located in the southernmost portion of the site should be revised to correspond with the Official Plan Amendment submitted on September 6, 2017. - Remove all Environmental Protection Overlay north of Concession 2 that is within the approved limit of extraction. - Remove the stream feature north of Concession 2 that is within the approved limit of extraction. - Notwithstanding the above comments, based on previous correspondence with the Township it is our understanding that the Township is going to defer approval of the new Zoning-By-law on this site so it continues to be subject to the existing Zoning Bylaw. This revision was being made to ensure the Zoning By-law Amendment application remains active and Dufferin does not need to file a Zoning By-law amendment application under the new Zoning By-law. - Aberfoyle Pit #1 - The series of ponds should be exempt from the Special Provisions in Section 13.2 restricting development as they are located within the approved limit of extraction. - Aberfoyle Pit #2 - Remove Environmental Protection Overlay within the approved limit of extraction. <p>Comments on By-law Provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Draft By-law provides definitions for 'Aggregate Processing Facility' and 'Portable Asphalt or Concrete Plant' which are not included in the list of permitted uses in the EXI Zone. We are requesting that these uses be included in Table 9.1. In addition, we are requesting that since Aggregate Recycling is referred to in the definition for 'Aggregate Processing Facility' that it also be included in Table 9.1 to ensure it is clearly identified as a permitted use. - As noted above, the special provisions in Section 13.2 should not apply to any licensed areas within the Township, including those owned and operated by Dufferin. - Footnote (2), under Table 9.2 for Industrial Zone Standards, we are proposing that an additional note be added that states: <i>v. Where two or more EXI Zones are adjacent to one another, extraction shall be permitted within the setbacks in accordance with the Aggregate Resources Act Site Plans.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to the EP Overlay have been made as noted. • Changes to permitted uses and zone provisions have been made based on the comments, in accordance with the Provincial Standards for aggregate licensing. • The EP Overlay zone has been updated and no longer applies to licenced areas in the Township. • The use-specific special provisions referred to (under table 9.2) have been removed from the by-law, since they are addressed by the Provincial Standards for aggregate licensing and should not be addressed through municipal zoning.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES														
			<p>Special Provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The special provisions in place for the aforementioned properties should be updated as per the below table to correlate to the proposed special provisions in the Draft Zoning By-law and not the existing special provisions. <table border="1" data-bbox="948 407 1723 662"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="948 407 1723 448">Special Provisions</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="948 448 1338 488">Existing Zoning By-law</th> <th data-bbox="1338 448 1723 488">Proposed Zoning By-law</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="948 488 1338 521">A-13</td> <td data-bbox="1338 488 1723 521">A (sp10)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="948 521 1338 553">EXI-5</td> <td data-bbox="1338 521 1723 553">EXI (sp58)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="948 553 1338 586">EXI-2</td> <td data-bbox="1338 553 1723 586">EXI (sp56)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="948 586 1338 618">OS-8</td> <td data-bbox="1338 586 1723 618">OS (sp72)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="948 618 1338 651">NE-4</td> <td data-bbox="1338 618 1723 651">NE (sp75)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EXI-56 should not include the provision that reads "no building or structure shall be located closer than 14 m from any boundary" as this was not included in the existing special provision EXI-2. NE-75 and A-10 language should be updated to state "the lands may be included within a licence issued by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry" similar to the existing OS-2 and OS-3 zones, instead of listing "sand and/or gravel extraction" as a permitted use 	Special Provisions		Existing Zoning By-law	Proposed Zoning By-law	A-13	A (sp10)	EXI-5	EXI (sp58)	EXI-2	EXI (sp56)	OS-8	OS (sp72)	NE-4	NE (sp75)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All site specific updates and corrections have been made.
Special Provisions																		
Existing Zoning By-law	Proposed Zoning By-law																	
A-13	A (sp10)																	
EXI-5	EXI (sp58)																	
EXI-2	EXI (sp56)																	
OS-8	OS (sp72)																	
NE-4	NE (sp75)																	
40.	November 28, 2017	Hugh Handy GSP Group	<p>Based on our review Section 11 and specifically 11.5, we are concerned about requiring a home to be built before being permitted to run a farm business. As an example, if a person wanted to use an agricultural parcel for a "pick-your-own" operation (farm business defined under Section 3), they would have to build a house first. We do not believe this is supportive of agricultural and would ask that the regulations be revised to not require an associated/principal residence on the same property.</p> <p>Further, we note that Section 11.5 g. states that "Farm businesses shall be operated by the person or persons whose principal residence is the dwelling on the lot, and a maximum of two (2) persons other than the residents of the dwelling on the lot are permitted to be employed in the farm business." Section 11.5 c limits the size of the farm businesses. With that in mind, we would question the need to control the number of employees and the ongoing enforcement issues that may be inadvertently caused by implementing this regulation.</p>	<p>The following revised zoning by-law requirements for Farm Businesses are recommended based on the comments received:</p> <p>The following regulations apply to farm businesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A farm business shall be located on a lot having a minimum lot area of 3.0 hectares and containing a permitted agricultural use. A maximum of three (3) farm businesses shall be permitted on a lot. Farm businesses shall not exceed the following size limits: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the area of the lot permanently, temporarily, or seasonally devoted to farm businesses shall not exceed the lesser of 15 percent of the lot area or 1 hectare, including the area of existing and new buildings and structures and any other areas of the lot used primarily for the farm businesses, excluding existing driveways shared with a 														

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
				<p><i>permitted principal use on the lot and areas that produce a harvestable crop; and</i></p> <p>ii. <i>the total floor area that is permanently, temporarily, or seasonally devoted to farm businesses shall not exceed 500 m² including the floor areas used within all principal buildings or structures and accessory buildings or structures on the lot.</i></p> <p>d. <i>Retail sales that form part of farm businesses shall be subject to the following regulations:</i></p> <p>i. <i>The total floor area devoted to retail sales shall not exceed 50 percent of the total floor area of all buildings and structures used in conjunction with the farm business, to a maximum of 250 m²;</i></p> <p>ii. <i>A maximum of one (1) retail outlet shall be permitted on a lot; and</i></p> <p>iii. <i>The primary source of the majority of the product sold shall be products produced by, or derived from, the principal agricultural use(s) on the lot.</i></p> <p>e. <i>Farm businesses that include overnight accommodations shall be limited to a permitted bed and breakfast establishment.</i></p>
41.	November 28, 2017	Sheena McLeod	<p>I am contacting you because we have reviewed the map of our lot and have noticed that a large portion of a backfield has been designated NE. In the past, this area was a farmed field with different crops. We have not farmed it for several years and trees have grown on the field. In the past this would have been zoned as secondary agriculture and we believe that is how it should remain. Please accept this as our formal request to review the designation before the new zoning is implemented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning has been reviewed and is correct. • The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most updated data from Wellington County and the Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection. As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data. From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
				<p>on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u> It is also noted that since agricultural uses are permitted within the Natural Environment zone, there is no impact or change to the agricultural uses and activities that are permitted in the property.
42.	November 28, 2017	Wellington Federation of Agriculture	<p>The WFA proposes that the Town of Puslinch should only highlight the NE zone, and use language that will allow agricultural owned properties to work with Conservation Authorities to determine the correct NE location and any setbacks required, rather than "drawing a line in the sand" as its currently proposing to do.</p> <p>Other Areas of concern within the Draft Zoning By-Law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessory Farm Employee Accommodations - Very restrictive; should simply state that they are allowed, and as per Ontario Policy should be mobile if possible. Outdoor Storage Areas - Many farm store equipment and materials outdoor. Restricting where should not be done in Ag. Zones. <p>Farm Businesses - Should not be subject to site control plans, which can be very costly. Work should be done to reduce the highly restrictive and potentially costly language. Ontario Policy states that more on-farm diversification is needed. This section will restrict this, not help.</p>	<p>No changes are recommended based on this comment. Since agricultural uses are permitted within the Natural Environment zone, changes to the delineation of the NE zone boundaries will have no impact or change to the agricultural uses and activities that are permitted on the property.</p> <p>It is also noted that the NE zone has been updated to implement the Core Greenlands Designation of the County Official Plan, to bring the Zoning By-law in conformity – as required by the Ontario Planning Act.</p> <p>Changes to the Accessory Farm Employee Accommodations have been made.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
				<p>Permitted uses have been updated in the agricultural area to permit Outdoor Storage Areas accessory to or in conjunction with a permitted principal use.</p> <p>The following revised zoning by-law requirements for Farm Businesses are recommended based on the comments received:</p> <p>The following regulations apply to farm businesses:</p> <p>f. A farm business shall be located on a lot having a minimum lot area of 3.0 hectares and containing a permitted agricultural use.</p> <p>g. A maximum of three (3) farm businesses shall be permitted on a lot.</p> <p>h. Farm businesses shall not exceed the following size limits:</p> <p>iii. the area of the lot permanently, temporarily, or seasonally devoted to farm businesses shall not exceed the lesser of 15 percent of the lot area or 1 hectare, including the area of existing and new buildings and structures and any other areas of the lot used primarily for the farm businesses, excluding existing driveways shared with a permitted principal use on the lot and areas that produce a harvestable crop; and</p> <p>iv. the total floor area that is permanently, temporarily, or seasonally devoted to farm businesses shall not exceed 500 m² including the floor areas used within all principal buildings or structures and accessory buildings or structures on the lot.</p> <p>i. Retail sales that form part of farm businesses shall be subject to the following regulations:</p> <p>iv. The total floor area devoted to retail sales shall not exceed 50 percent of the total floor area of all buildings and structures used in conjunction with the farm business, to a maximum of 250 m²;</p> <p>v. A maximum of one (1) retail outlet shall be permitted on a lot; and</p> <p>vi. The primary source of the majority of the product sold shall be products produced by, or derived from, the principal agricultural use(s) on the lot.</p> <p>Farm businesses that include overnight accommodations shall be limited to a permitted bed and breakfast establishment.</p>
43.	November 29, 2017	Mr. Barclay Nap	1. I'd like to reiterate my concern with the definition called "farm business" as I do believe that a word is missing;	1. The terminology has been updated to say 'Farm Related Business'.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>-I'm guessing "farm related business" or "farm related activity".</p> <p>-The use of "farm business" in the rest of the proposed by-law causes confusion, but adding "related" into the mix eases much of that confusion.</p> <p>2. The second definition concern I'd like to reiterate is "farm produce sales outlet"; -I think this is meant to say "farm product sales outlet".</p> <p>3. In regards to the "farm product sales outlet" definition, I have concerns about "the sale of products not produced on the farm or by the farm corporation is prohibited"; -on-farm stores, such as what Herrle's in St Agatha and Springfield Farms in Milton have, include products from other farm and food businesses. This helps fill the store and gives customers more choices and more reasons to stop at the store. -if you're good at one producing one product, it hurts your product's quality if you diversify producing items from your farm too much. -if I had a farm product retail shed I would love to sell Burrs and Bees honey, Drumlin Farm's lettuce, Burnhaven Farm's beef and Rootham's jam.</p> <p>4. Sticking with the definitions section, it's not clear to me what is the difference between a commercial and a farm greenhouse, and the difference between a commercial greenhouse and a garden centre; -I've been to greenhouses on farms that grow produce in great quantities all 12 months of the year and they sell wholesale to grocery stores and retail their seconds locally. -these would fall under commercial in the definitions. -most garden centres I visit have green houses, some sell from the greenhouse such as Richters Herbs in Goodwood and Terra Nurseries in Waterdown. -Even Vissers sold from inside their greenhouse when they had garden plants. -I would call these garden centres.</p> <p>5. In General Provisions 4.3 for Accessory Farm Employee Accommodations; -I feel that a minimum area of 20 hectares or 49.4 acres is very large and could be restrictive for small equine establishments. -the maximum floor area of a such an accommodation being 75 m² or 807.3 ft² is very large. -I believe that many farm businesses use trailer homes for accommodations for farm workers, I couldn't find dimensions for a trailer home, but if one was to upscale to a park model home, the floor size is 538 ft² or less as per CSA Z241.</p>	<p>2. The terminology has been updated to say 'Farm Product Sales Outlet'.</p> <p>3. The definition for 'Farm Product Sales Outlet' has been updated to remove the limitation identified and to state that "the primary source of most of the product sold shall be products produced by, or derived from, the principal agricultural use(s) on the lot".</p> <p>4. The term commercial greenhouse has been eliminated from the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.</p> <p>5. No changes are recommended. The provisions are in keeping with - and in some cases less restrictive than - other municipal zoning by-laws.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>-having an accessory farm employee accommodation sharing the same driveway as the principal dwelling and 100 m or 328 ft from it would not allow for a farm business with multiple livestock locations to have the hired hand be at a location other than on the main farm.</p> <p>-having a hired hand close to the location of a livestock barn would be beneficial for a farm business, as that hired hand could keep a close eye on the livestock that those in the principal dwelling could not.</p> <p>-this point could be moot with technology usage and many cameras, but for any barn at a distant location to be connected to a farmer who has time to monitor his computer screen, we need consistent high speed internet in this area.</p> <p>-I am curious what is meant as temporary as mentioned in the definitions, is it seasonal temporary or the accommodation can only be used for so many years?</p> <p>-I am thankful that council and staff did think to include farm employee accommodations as an option</p> <p>6. I am glad to see grain systems exempt from Height Restrictions, as they do get over looked</p> <p>7. In regards to setbacks from Natural Environment zone (4.31) and Permitted Uses note #1 (12.2) , I would like to make mention that there are several structure that should be considered to be exempt from such set backs;</p> <p>-maple sugar shacks tend to be located in forests.</p> <p>-this can be for logistical reasons as transporting sap isn't always reasonable.</p> <p>-for agri-tourism and retail purposes, visitors want to experience a sugar shack in a forest, such an activity is highly sought after at the Elmira Maple Sugar Festival.</p> <p>-we don't have that many sugar shacks in Puslinch, but it's something that would do well for attracting our urban neighbours to bring their money here, if there was encouragement to build more sugar shacks and put a farm product sales outlet with them.</p> <p>-as well, it is common for horse shelters to be set up in areas that will be considered Natural Environment.</p> <p>-there is a lot of land in this Township that was cleared by early farmers but either has not been kept up by certain land owners and Natural Heritage flora has invaded or the drainage has gotten poor causing lands to get wetter and only to be good for seasonal pasture (until drainage improvements are done), choice pasture isn't always available.</p> <p>-either way, horses don't detract from Natural Heritage areas.</p>	<p>6. No response.</p> <p>7. No changes are recommended based on this comment. Agricultural uses are permitted within the Natural Environment zone.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>8. In Use Specific Provisions For Farm Businesses, which I am calling "farm related businesses, I am not in favour to the limit of "a maximum of two persons other than the residents of the dwelling on the lot are permitted to be employed in the farm business";</p> <p>-in the definitions, a pick-your-own is listed as an example, if we take Marcy's Berries in Valens as an example, they employ a number of young people to pick, oversee and charge patrons during the berry season, I'm guessing close to ten.</p> <p>-I think this could hinder a pick-your-own.</p> <p>-I realize that township staff aren't going to be going around to be hard on people, but all it takes is one bad neighbour to force the township's hand.</p> <p>9. I see that a bed and breakfast is allowed in an Agricultural zone but not in any other zones;</p> <p>-if I could comment on this to maybe be expanded, as personally the only time that I have used a bed and breakfast, I stayed at one because I was using public transit to get around that area.</p> <p>-I'm not saying Puslinch is going to become a tourist attraction over night from this proposed by-law, but the easier it is to stay here, the more likely a greater range of people can come here and spend more time with our local businesses.</p> <p>10. In regards to micro-brewries, distilleries and wineries:</p> <p>-I read in the definitions that a "farm related business" may be a micro-brewery, distillery or winery</p> <p>-but in Permitted Uses I see they are allowed in Core Mixed Use, Commercial, Highway Commercial zones, but not Agricultural-Related Commercial or Agricultural zones</p> <p>-so I am a bit confused</p> <p>-I have found some examples of micro-breweries/distilleries/wineries such as Willibald Farm Distillery that is located on a farm in North Dumfries and there is Stone Hammer and Wellington Breweries that are located in commercial areas in Guelph, so I can see both sides, but the Permitted Uses and the Definition example don't seem to come together here</p> <p>11. If I could add, I think the Industrial zone could possibly also be a spot to hold a micro-brewery/distillery/winery;</p> <p>-just think about enticing Wellington Brewery to move to Puslinch in the Industrial zone beside the 401, where tens of thousands of motorists can see their logo each day.</p> <p>-if nothing else at least they'd be using much better water.</p>	<p>8. Farm Businesses has been revised to "Farm Related Business". Farm business provisions in Section 11.5 have been updated and the maximum number of employee requirement has been eliminated.</p> <p>9. The By-law has been updated to include a bed and breakfast establishment as a permitted use in the Urban Residential, Hamlet Residential, and Rural Residential Zones.</p> <p>The definition for 'micro-brewery, distillery and winery' is: any premises that may be operated in conjunction with a restaurant where beer, wine or liquor may be produced onsite, as well as consumed on the premises, or sold or distributed.</p> <p>10. It is correct that a micro-brewery, distillery, and winery is identified as a type of 'farm related business'. Since farm related businesses are permitted as of right on an agricultural lot, this use would therefore be permitted in the Ag. Zone, subject to the use-specific special provisions for farm related businesses.</p> <p>However, as shown in the definition above, a micro-brewery, distillery, and winery can be operated in conjunction with a restaurant and consumed on the premises. Since a restaurant-type use is not a permitted use in the commercial agricultural zone, it is not recommended that a micro-brewery, distillery, and winery be permitted as of right in the commercial agricultural or industrial zones.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>12. The maximum height of Accessory Buildings & Structures on Agriculture zones of 7 m or 23 ft can be considered low for some farm businesses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -farm equipment is getting bigger and so is the need for storage sheds to house them. -heated sheds are becoming popular as the environment can be controlled which makes making repairs more comfortable. -combines can be 12 to 15 feet high, depending on bin extensions put on them, with a width of about 10 to 14 feet depending on tire size (but without a header on, the part at the front of the combine that cuts the crops down), this results in a large door needed -if a combine is using one door of a farm machinery shed, at least one more door is needed for other machinery to go in and out, unless there is a big enough door for both to use. -this would result in a wide shed and cause the peak of the shed to be higher than 23 ft. <p>13. There are some differences in the Provincial Policy Statement's definitions and the proposed by-law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the definitions for "agriculture uses" and "agriculture-related uses" are different then in the proposed by-law, is there a need for a difference? -"agri-tourism business" is used the proposed by-law and "agri-tourism uses" in the Provincial Policy Statement, is there a difference? 	<p>11. It should also be noted that a micro-brewery, distillery, and winery could be permitted as an industrial (processing) use in the industrial area.</p> <p>10. The terms included in the current draft by-law are consistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement. They are intended to work in conjunction with the proposed agricultural zone standards to maximize the flexibility available to farmers on their agricultural properties, as-of-right. Although the terms do not match the PPS exactly, the terms are consistent with provincial policy direction.</p>
44.	November 30, 2017	Sarah Wilhelm County of Wellington	<p>1.0 General Matters</p> <p>1.1 We would prefer to see a maximum size limitation for commercial malls.</p> <p>1.2 In the Extractive (EXI) Zone, there appear to be three definitions which may be able to be combined: "aggregate processing facility", "gravel pit", "mineral aggregate operation". We note the terminology used in the Official Plan is "mineral aggregate operation".</p> <p>1.3 The Use-Specific Special Provisions for Extractive Zone setbacks (2) may be misleading to the public as the province establishes operational standards that apply to licenses which may be varied through the Aggregate Resources Act site plan process.</p>	<p>1.0 General Matters</p> <p>1.1 A Commercial Mall is only permitted via an existing site specific special provision that has been carried over from Zoning By-law 19/85. Commercial malls are not permitted as of right in any zone by the draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. A maximum size limitation for commercial malls is included in the applicable site specific special zone provisions in Section 14.0 of the By-law..</p> <p>1.2 Permitted uses within the Extractive (EXI) Zone have been updated and terminology has been updated to be consistent with the Official Plan.</p> <p>1.3 The Use-Specific Special Provisions for Extractive Zone setbacks (2) have been removed from the by-law. Since the setback requirements are consistent with the Provincial Standards for</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>2.0 Pre-zoning 2.1 In our previous comments of October 25, 2017 we identified a concern with respect to how the Township could require the necessary studies that would normally be submitted with a rezoning application, as part of the site plan process. We would recommend the use of a Holding Provision. We would also recommend an update to the complete application requirements for Site Plans under Section 13.15 of the Official Plan. The Township may also wish to develop standards or guidelines for Site Plan applications to provide direction to applicants with regard to submission of complete applications (including necessary studies and reports).</p> <p>3.0 Source Protection Related Sections 3.1 The Township should consider adding in the legislative references (ie Act or Regulation references) to the definition of WHPA as it is defined in O Reg 287/07 under the Clean Water Act. WHPA does not appear to be a defined term and we would recommend that it be added.</p> <p>3.2 In the Puslinch ZBL and in the County OP, reference is made to County RMO. Although Kyle Davis is appointed across the County and funded by the County, technically the County does not have a requirement to appoint an RMO. Therefore, we would suggest replacing the term County RMO or Township RMO with RMO. If clarification is needed, RMO could be a defined term in the Puslinch ZBL. The definition is in the Clean Water Act copied below: risk management official" means the risk management official appointed under Part IV; ("responsable de la gestion des risques") of the Clean Water Act.</p>	<p>aggregate licensing, they are not required to be included within the Township By-law.</p> <p>2.0 Pre-zoning 2.1 A Holding Provision has been added to all pre-zoned lands which requires the necessary studies that would normally be submitted with a rezoning application, as part of the site plan process. <i>It is also recommended that an update to the complete application requirements for Site Plans under Section 13.15 of the Official Plan be initiated, and that the Township develop standards or guidelines for Site Plan applications to provide direction to applicants about the submission of complete applications (including necessary studies and reports).</i></p> <p>3.0 Source Protection Related Sections 3.1 A definition of Wellhead Protection Area has been added to Section 3 as follows: An area that is related to a wellhead and within which it is desirable to regulate or monitor drinking water threats.</p> <p>3.2 References to 'County's Risk Management Official' have been replaced with 'Risk Management Official' in 13.3 and 13.3.1. A definition for this term has also been added to Section 3.0.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>4.0 Removal of Site Specific Zones 2.2 126 & 128 Brock Road South (at Gilmour Road) 128 Brock Road South is currently zoned Highway Commercial Site Specific (C2-3), which permits a broad range of uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an art gallery; • conference or meeting facility; • a personal service shop; • professional office; • a public office; • garden centres or nurseries • log cabin/model home display; • a restaurant; • miniature golf; • a refreshment room; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a retail store engaged in the sale of gifts, antiques, tourist shop, furniture, home and garden or landscaping improvement supplies, farm produce, or domestic arts and crafts; • model railway; • a specialty food store; • a variety store; • outdoor activity area; • a recreational or entertainment facility. <p>We note that Highway Commercial Zoning is proposed to replace the C2-3 Zone and also extend onto 126 Brock Road South which is currently zoned Agricultural (A). Given the nearby residential uses, we have concerns regarding compatibility as it relates to the full range of Highway Commercial uses, particularly automotive related uses and drive-through service facilities.</p>	<p>4.0 Removal of Site Specific Zones</p> <p>2.2 It is recommended that the existing C2-3 Site Specific Special Zone provisions for 126 & 128 Brock Road South (at Gilmour Road) be carried forward; however, they should also be modified to permit a more limited range of uses that would be compatible with surrounding land uses.</p>
45.	November 30, 2017	Robert Milburn Milburn Auto Sales 219 Brock Road N Puslinch, Ontario.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zoning must have a vision (It was a surprise when Nancy said (that Zoning does not provide for vision in to the future). 2. Removable of zoning from the property directly south of 219 Brock Rd N. (this takes away our compatibility with this property). 3. Future development sight have enough land to support the needed influx of new companies to this township, to help support, employment and tax base in the township. 	<p>It is recommended that the existing C2-2 Site Specific Special Zone provisions that apply to 195 Brock Road North be carried forward, with some modifications to permit a more limited range of uses that would be compatible with surrounding land uses.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			4. To maintain the availability of allowing a severance (secondary agriculture changing to agriculture). 5. Look at adding zoning to the property north of the dealership (will call that 219 B approximately 8 acres). 195, 219, 219B, all three properties would have a compatibility with each other all "C" type zoning.	
46.	November 30, 2017	Philip C. O'Dell, p.Eng., M.A.Sc. President O'Dell Engineering Ltd.	1. <u>Comments on the Re-Application of the Natural Environmental overlays in Puslinch Township</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments apply to the following specific properties in the Gore concession of Puslinch Township: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lot 5N (Back part) - Lot 6N (Back part) - Lot 75 (Front part) - Lot 8S (Front part) • It was observed in the proposed Puslinch zoning Bylaw that the Natural Environment overlay (NE) has increased on the subject properties in a way that might potentially limit and/or constrain the activities and application of the subject property. Specifically, the revised overlay takes the NE zone on 5N (approx 20 acres) and 6N (approx 15 acres) from the previous location buffering the wetlands north to abut concession 1 along the full length of the properties at the road. This has a significant adverse effect on the future uses of both lots. • And specifically the overlay has expanded the NE zone to include the areas of high ground composed of fields and mixed brush on Lots 7s (approx 25 acres) and 8s (approx 50 acres) which were previously classed as secondary Agricultural land. These parts property should be returned to a zoning that equates to the former Secondary Agricultural classification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning has been reviewed and is correct. • The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most updated data from Wellington County and the Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection. As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data. From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u> • In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
				<p>associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p> <p>It is also noted that since agricultural uses are permitted within the Natural Environment zone, there is no impact or change to the agricultural uses and activities that are permitted in the property.</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Agricultural Related commercial" references but fundamentally changes the current definition of secondary Agricultural Area" from a zoning that permitted a wide range of uses to make these various unusable for agriculture areas suitable for people to live and run typical rural small businesses and contribute to the township on properties that would otherwise be waste land. The "agricultural" limitation should be broadened to accept the concept of new small commercial and institutional type businesses. (Noting that I believe in my reading that new small industrial and only existing institutional businesses are allowed in the A zone under the proposed by-law.) "Commercial Use" is not defined however the term is used in the County Plan and a definition of "a small retail or service based business" would probably address the needs' Institutional" is now defined for use in the whole bylaw through the entire "Institutional Zoning" section. This is a great improvement' Museum,, definition includes a requirement to be open to the public which is inconsistent with other provincial definitions which include the category of a "display museum" and that recognizes a museum may have more than one location not all of which are open to the public'. More specifically the Museum itself, or a/the section of the museum in the Township' is accurately described as "dedicated to the preservation, restoration, storage, and conservation of artifacts, but the actual act of displaying is not necessarily at the specific Museum location and it may be such that the primary or exclusive method of display is through temporary locations showing the artifacts to the public in more socially beneficial locations than would be gained through the costs of a fixed site. 	<p>Note: Clarification is required with respect to this comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law defines and uses the term 'Retail Store'. No response. The definition of museum has been updated based on a best practices review.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest remove "open to the public" and add underscoped "...for the purpose and promotion of education, study, and...". This would retain the need to engage a wider group without requiring regular open hours and would be more consistent with other law and regulations. • Public use, is defined and included by the county but it is not used in the zoning table' It does appear in the later sections so it might benefit from cross referencing as has been done to great effect with other zoning applications' • Is there a provision for existing land locked properties to exist? This specifically applies to naturally severed" parcels such as those north of the railway tracks close to Gore Rd' in the Gore Concession. This need to be grandfathered or they need some sort of mandated access'. • The limitation of no more than two non-resident employees of a Home industry seems unduly restrictive. Considering the nature of such businesses is often multi generational and something to be encouraged as a core characteristic and value of our Township, I believe it would be more appropriate to allow at least 5 non-resident on site employees and an larger number of seasonal or temporary on site employees (I would look at the fruit operations in particular but I would guess 15 to 20 is a reasonable number). • Following the definition of "warehousing" from 3.0, it is very broad. In a plain reading it would apply to virtually any home industry which purchased any volume of anything to be held for incorporation into the intermediate or end product of the home industry. By prohibiting "warehousing" as defined, you have essentially eliminated any "home industry" from existing legally. <p>This is particularly caused by the "a building or part thereof" aspect of the warehousing definition which captures any business that buys and stores anything that is subsequently sold intact or after incorporation into a product.</p> <p>Suggest the definition of warehousing be adjusted to tightly address businesses that exclusively take in, hold, and deliver intact goods without a service or value added component (a logistics business) OR to add a requirement that a business that is purely warehousing products for onward transfer is prohibited in the AZone but that warehousing as the normal part of a small commercial, industrial, or institutional business would be allowed in the A Zone when associated with an allowed activity.</p>	<p>Note: Clarification is required with respect to this comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is addressed by Section 4.1 Access Provisions of the proposed by-law. • This requirement has been removed from Section 11. 5 of the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. • This definition has been updated based on a best practices review.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone A appears to eliminate the concept of the "secondary agriculture" zone but adds back some aspects of the former secondary agriculture zoning. The new bylaw limits aspects which are core to the rural nature of Puslinch, specifically rural institutional uses such as churches, schools, and museums, by freezing their number at the time of enacting of the bylaw. Suggest that Note I to the table be eliminated or modified to allow a route to enable new entities supporting this core rural flavour be allowed to establish themselves. 	<p>Note: Clarification is required with respect to this comment.</p>
47.	November 30 th , 2017	Tony Horvart	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to address Puslinch Council at the Public Meeting of November 29, 2017 regarding the draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law. As noted previously, and at the meeting, Slovenski Park has objections to the current proposed draft bylaw. These objections are due to mapping errors which have been acknowledged by the Grand River Conservation Authority and the proposed change of zoning from a single site specific zone (Agricultural) to a split zoning which includes Agricultural and Natural Environment on the isolated off-line pond, creek and north east area of the property. We understand that the consultant will be meeting with the GRCA to discuss these issues Slovenski Park would be pleased to participate in any meeting in order to assist with increasing the accuracy of information and attempting to resolve the issues. The meeting could take place on the Slovenski Park property. We look forward to your response.</p>	<p>The following is noted based on consultation with the GRCA, the following notes and recommendations are made with respect to the proposed zoning at Slovenski Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GRCA has indicated that the NE zone should continue to apply to watercourse features since the Conservation Authority has the authority to regulate flood prone areas. The GRCA has also indicated that the NE zone may be removed from the pond. The definitions for the following have been reviewed and will be updated/included for clarity in the draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -travel trailer park -campground -mobile home park -seasonal tourist trailers All comments submitted to the Township regarding this by-law are included in this document. <p>Based on consultation with Township staff and the GRCA, the following is recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Agricultural and Natural Environment zoning as proposed should continue to apply; Notwithstanding the above, the NE zone should be removed from the existing mad-made pond; The existing uses and zone provisions as permitted by the applicable site specific special zone should continue to apply; A Holding Provision be applied to permit a maximum of 100 seasonal tourist trailers. The lifting of the holding provisions would be subject to the approval of requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MOEE) regarding the developments

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
48.	December 13, 2017	Tyler Shantz, BES Planner Ministry of Municipal Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For consistency and clarity, the overlay title in Map B-2 should be changed from "Wellhead Protection Area" to "Source Protection Screening Area". This is appropriate because there are ICAs and an IPZ-1 included in the screening area where significant threat policies apply. In addition, changing the overlay title will clarify that the screening area only includes those vulnerable areas where significant drinking water threats could occur as identified in the SPPs and not all vulnerable areas within the municipality (i.e., doesn't include HVAs or SGRAs). Additionally, it is recommended the Township refrain from using the term "Zone" in the title of Section 13.3 "Source protection Vulnerable Areas Zone Overlay," and re-name it "Source Protection Screening Area Overlay" to be consistent with the rest of the document. It is recommended that the Township not identify overlay areas as 'zones,' otherwise the by-law may appear to be changing or possibly creating overlapping zones on the same lands. <p>Regulation of land uses, not activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source protection plan policies are written to achieve the objectives of the CWA, therefore municipalities must consider how their zoning by-laws may achieve source protection conformity in appropriate language. Some source protection policies direct actions to address drinking water threat activities, whereas the powers of zoning by-laws under the Planning Act are limited to the regulation of land uses. Specific threat activities may be identified in zoning by-laws by regulating their associated land uses. For example: "handling and storage of organic solvents" is not a land use, however, "facilities for the storage of organic solvents" is a land use and could therefore be effectively regulated. It is recommended that the municipality review its zoning by-law regulations to ensure that these address land uses, rather than the activities set out in the CWA. The municipality should also exclude the term "activities" from the zoning by-law provisions where possible or more closely link it with "facilities for" (or similar) any listed activities. Since there is no authority under the Planning Act to regulate activities, parts of these sections may not be operable through the zoning by-law. MOECC suggests revising the following sections to address the above comments about activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> section 3.0 'Definitions' section 13.3.1 'General Regulations for the Source Protection Vulnerable Areas Overlay' <p>Retroactively prohibiting existing uses that are drinking water threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning regulations cannot be applied retroactively to a use that already legally exists. In most circumstances, existing legal non-conforming land uses for vulnerable 	<p>on individual on-site sewage systems required to service the additional 40 units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overlay title in Map B-2 has been changed from "Wellhead Protection Area" to "Source Protection Screening Area". The title of Section 13.3 has been updated as suggested. The definition of 'activity' in Section 3.0 has been deleted and all references to 'activity' in Section 13.3 have been deleted. Subsections 13.3.2 and 13.3.3 have been removed.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>areas are managed or prohibited by the source protection plan using policies or instruments outside of the land use planning framework. MOECC recommends revisiting sections of the zoning by-law that address existing threats, activities or land uses to ensure that they only apply to future land uses. Section 13.3.1 'General Regulations' already addresses future threats, and the zoning by-law has general provisions to regulate legal non-conforming uses in section 4.17. Given the above, MOECC recommends removing sections 13.3.2 and 13.3.3 as the information contained in these sections is already addressed by section 13.3.1 of the zoning by-law. MOECC notes that existing activities or uses are managed by policies in the SPPs that are implemented through other legislation, and not through decisions on planning matters. The management of existing uses would not trigger Planning Act decisions and therefore these sections of the zoning by-law may not be operable.</p>	
49.	December 19, 2017	<p>Tom Krizan, Thomasfield Homes</p> <p>Note: on January 3, 2018, additional correspondence with respect to this matter was received from Astrid J. Clos, Planning Consultants. The Response provided in this table address the comments from Thomasfield Homes.</p>	<p>Thomasfield Homes Limited is the owner of the property located at 7764 Wellington Road #34. We have reviewed the third draft of the comprehensive Zoning By-law and it has come to our attention that the "Resort Commercial (C4-6)" zone under Zoning By-law No. 19/85 (attached) is being removed from our property within the third draft of the proposed Zoning By-law.</p> <p>AS many in the Township will recall, this property is location of the former Corwhin ski hill and golf course. Thomasfield Homes is also a golf course operator within the City of Guelph and we object to the removal of the "Resort Commercial (C4-6)" zone and its zoning permissions on our property and request that the C4-6 zone be reinstated immediately.</p> <p>We have received no formal notice of the Township's proposal to remove the current zoning permissions from our property, nor any justification to explain why the Township deems it appropriate to remove our current zoning permissions.</p> <p>We request that this correspondence be circulated to Council and the consulting team working on this project so that this situation can be corrected immediately.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the existing C4-6 Site Specific Special Zone provisions that apply to 7764 Wellington Road #34 be carried forward.</p>
50.	January 9, 2018	<p>Melissa Aldunate Manager of Policy Planning and Urban Design City of Guelph</p>	<p>The By-law proposes to rezone lands at the southwestern border of the City from Agricultural, Specialized Highway Commercial and Natural Environment to the Industrial and Natural Environment. Overall the City suggests that rezoning the lands is premature and requests that the lands not be zoned at this time. If the Township moves head with rezoning the lands, the City requests refinements to the proposed zoning to better reflect the policies of the County Official Plan and key parts of the City's Official Plan.</p> <p>Implementation of Wellington Official Plan policies</p>	<p>Based on the comments received, and to recognize the importance of the subject industrial lands along the Hanlon to the future economic development of the Township, it is recommended that lands designated Rural Industrial be zoned Future Development 3 (FD3). The purpose of the FD3 Zone is to acknowledge that the lands are intended and protected for future industrial development by restricting permitted uses to only what is existing on the effective date of the by-law, to prevent future fragmentation of the lands. The use of an FD zone will protect the lands for future industrial development</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>Zoning the lands for industrial uses through the comprehensive zoning by-law update would make them available for development. The City is not aware of any analysis showing the need for making these lands available for development at this time. Additionally, there are no provisions in the proposed zoning by-law to ensure that lands east of the Hanlon Expressway are developed first.</p> <p>The County's OP requires that a concept plan be developed in consultation with the City prior to fragmenting or developing the lands. While holding provision has been proposed to implement the requirements for a concept plan, it is not the appropriate tool for this . Furthermore, the City would not have the right to appeal the lifting of a holding zone thereby not fulfilling the County OP's requirement for a concept plan. A concept plan for the lands should be developed in consultation with the City prior to zoning these lands.</p> <p>Protection of groundwater resources</p> <p>The zoning proposes to limit industrial uses to dry industrial uses where no municipal services are available. However, many of the proposed commercial uses and specific industrial-type uses are not restricted to dry operations. Allowing these uses as of right is potentially problematic given the ongoing concerns with the City and Township's shared groundwater resources. Examples of the potentially problematic uses include: feed or flour mill, medical marihuana production and laboratory or research facility. The City recommends that potentially wet uses be removed as permitted uses, and/or that all commercial and industrial uses be required to be dry where municipal services are not available.</p> <p>These lands are partially within the wellhead protection areas for City water supplies. As such, the Township is the source water protection authority for the City's wellhead protection areas. The City trusts that the Township will implement controls on potential threats to drinking water in accordance with the applicable provisions of Grand River Source Protection Plan.</p> <p>Suitability of specific commercial and industrial uses in this location</p> <p>It is not clear how several of the proposed uses are complimentary to the primary industrial uses and/or are not normally found in urban centres. Examples include: postal courier outlet, equipment rental establishment, commercial self-storage, commercial fitness establishment and caterer's establishment. The City objects to permitting a building supply store as defined. It seems to permit a major retail building supply store such as Lowe's or Home Depot. The City expressed similar concerns with permitting major retail through the County's last 5-year Official Plan review (OPA 81).</p>	<p>until such time that it is determined that these lands should be available for development in accordance with Section 9.8.3 of the County Official Plan. Other Requirements of Section 9.8.3 of the Official Plan would also be met.</p> <p>Industrial uses would not be permitted as-of-right in the recommended FD3 zone, rather, a zoning by-law amendment would be required. Therefore the comments no longer apply.</p> <p>As per the proposed Source Protection Overlay in Section 13.3, the Township is implementing controls on potential threats to drinking water in accordance with the applicable Source Protection Plans.</p> <p>Additional complementary commercial and industrial uses would not be permitted in the recommended FD3 zone, and therefore the comments no longer apply.</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

No.	DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
			<p>Several of the proposed industrial uses including Feed and Flour Mills, Grain Storing and Drying, and Sawmills have the potential for odour and dust that could negatively impact the lands within the Clair-Maltby secondary planning area and that will include residential and other sensitive uses. These uses are not appropriate adjacent to the settlement area boundary.</p> <p>Enhancement of the City's major gateway on the Hanlon Expressway</p> <p>The City requests that the zoning include regulations that prohibit outdoor storage in Hanlon-facing yards; and that a landscaped strip, consisting of trees, shrubbery or a berm be located between any outdoor storage area and where the storage area is visible from a public road in order to create a continuous visual screen. Furthermore, uses that detract from the visual image of the gateway including automotive related uses, recycling plants, Transport Terminals and standalone outdoor storage uses should not be permitted within these lands.</p>	<p>The proposed FD3 zone would address this comment. Urban design requirements could be implemented through the zoning by-law at a later date.</p>
51.	January 15, 2018	T. Scott Peck, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Hamilton Conservation Authority	We would like all of our lands outside of the Natural Environment zone to be zoned Open Space.	This has been updated in the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.

PART 4: ONLINE SUBMISSIONS

The following table documents all formal submissions received from stakeholders, agencies, and members of the public with respect to the third/final draft of the Township's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. A response/indication of how it was addressed is also provided.

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ONLINE SUBMISSIONS (www.puslinchforward.ca)			
9/22/2017 22:18:43	Unknown	A search for the Millcreek residential community (7513 Wellington Road 34) has no result - Millcreek (owned by Killam Properties, currently MR Zone) appears to be included as part of the neighbouring Mini Lakes community (Plan of Subdivision 61M203 + WCECC#214 condominium, currently ML Zone) at 7541 Wellington Road 34. They are very different communities, with different owners, and different ownership structures, and need to be separated in the mapping. That way as well Millcreek will be searchable on its own by use of its fire code. Thanks!	The Millcreek Residential Community has been rezoned to Rural Residential and the existing zone provisions and requirements have been carried over into the new Zoning By-law via a site specific special provision.
9/26/2017 13:12:21	Unknown	A certified professional should be involved before changing any area from A to NE with a site visit, as the proposed changes do not represent an accurate change of what is present on the property.	The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most updated data from Wellington County and the Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection. As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data. From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning. In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the
9/26/2017 13:12:59	Unknown	A certified professional should be involved before changing any area from A to NE with a site visit, as the proposed changes do not represent an accurate change of what is present on the property.	
9/26/2017 13:16:09	Unknown	Proposed changes do not reflect what is actually there. has anyone physically inspected the area?	

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.
9/28/2017 19:07:03	Unknown	We are looking to purchase a severed piece of this property for use as an Animal Clinic, more specifically a Veterinary Dermatology Specialty Referral Center with no boarding and only consultations and diagnostic testing. I do not see Animal Clinic listed in the CMU. Can this be added? Do I need to have a lawyer involved in this process. And as we are considering purchasing this property in the near future pending zoning allowance for a veterinary clinic, do you foresee any issues and can we move ahead with the purchase and development or will there be a delay pending zoning bylaw approval.	An Animal Clinic is now permitted within the CMU zone in the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.
10/11/2017 8:39:59	Unknown	Can you explain the difference in A sp15 and A 32	The name of the site-specific provisions changed, and the text was edited to reduce the length of the provisions. No changes are proposed to permitted uses or zone standards.
10/11/2017 18:54:58	Unknown	Farmers Markets are listed as a permitted use in the Core Mix Use (CMU) zone, Industrial (IND) zone and in Agricultural (A) zones but not in areas zoned as open space (OS) which is the proposed zoning for where the Aberfoyle Farmers' Market is currently located. Would this inclusion effect the market being located in the ORC and if so how?	This has been corrected in the Final Draft comprehensive Zoning by-law.
10/13/2017 10:27:41	Unknown	The areas designated NE are just overgrown areas such as abandoned fences and other low areas etc. These areas dry up in late spring and stay dry until the following spring. This designation should be changed.	<p>The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most updated data from Wellington County and the Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection.</p> <p>As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch</p>

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data.</p> <p>From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p> <p>In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p>
10/20/2017 17:16:09	Jeff Buisman, OLS	I am acting as agent for a possible severance and zone change for the front portion of this property. The client would like to rezone the front portion (in front of the ditch leading to Carol pond) to highway commercial. I will send an email with more information to Kelly Patzer.	No response.
10/27/2017 15:28:07	Dan	Can you please tell me how this property is be mined under the current zoning?	Note: clarification is required with respect to this comment.
10/31/2017 17:38:05	Mary Christidis	I object to the transition from Estate Residential to Rural Residential. I would like my home to remain Estate Residential.	No change is recommended to the zone names based on this comment.
10/31/2017 17:40:01	Mark Wineberg	I do not want the area rezoned from Estate Residential to Rural Residential. I would like it to remain Estate Residential.	No change is recommended to the zone names based on this comment.
10/31/2017 17:42:17	Mary Christidis	I object to the reduction of the Natural Environment	The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most updated data from Wellington County and the Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection.</p> <p>As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data.</p> <p>From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p> <p>In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p>
11/1/2017 10:12:03	Elizabeth Richardson	We do not wish to be rezoned from Estate Residential to Rural residential. The existing zoning is key to protecting the character and property value in Fox Run and other Estate Residential subdivisions.	No change is recommended to the zone names based on this comment.
11/13/2017 16:07:38	David Freure	Please note that upon close examination of the proposed zoning map, it appears that the location of my residence and associated surrounding area is zoned "Natural	The Natural Environment zone has been updated in the new Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law to correspond with the most

PUBLIC AND AGENCY SUBMISSION TABLE (UP-TO-DATE AS OF JANUARY 17, 2018)
 TOWNSHIP OF PUSLINCH COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW PROJECT

DATE	AUTHOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>Environment". It appears that the agricultural zoning depicted is far too small and does not cover enough area to accommodate my residence and associated uses surrounding it. I object to my residence and portions of my property ending up as a legal non conforming use, as would occur under this proposal.</p>	<p>updated data from Wellington County and the Conservation Authorities, as shown on the existing Core Greenlands designation of the Wellington County Official Plan. This has been done to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the Official Plan (as required by the Planning Act). Mapping for the NE zone includes flood prone areas, hazardous lands, and natural heritage features that have sensitivity or significance and require protection.</p> <p>As a result of updating the mapping to be consistent with the Official Plan, on some properties, the NE zone is greater than what is shown on the mapping in the current Township of Puslinch Zoning By-law 19/85. This is because the current mapping is not reflective of the most up-to-date mapping and data.</p> <p>From a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Core Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p> <p>In addition, the new proposed Environmental Protection Overlay zone corresponds to the Greenlands designation in the County Official Plan, and indicates that a physical feature is present that may require further review or permissions prior to development approvals or the issuance of a building permit. The existing Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan is not currently implemented in the existing Zoning By-law 19/85, therefore, this mapping and associated regulations are new. However, from a policy and regulatory perspective, mapping updates to incorporate the most current data do not have an impact on individual properties. Since the County's Official Plan already includes these lands within the Greenlands designation, <u>they are protected by the applicable policies of the Official Plan, which are now implemented through zoning.</u></p>