



April 18, 2022

File No. 21021

County of Wellington
Planning & Development Department
74 Woolwich Street
Guelph, ON
N1H 3T9

Attn: Meagan Ferris, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning and Environment

**Re: Planning Justification Report Addendum
Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Condominium &
Draft Plan of Subdivision
8243, 8268, 8282 Wellington Road 19, Township of Centre Wellington**

Dear Ms. Ferris,

At the request of the County, this addendum to the Planning Justification Report (“PJR” - dated February 2022) has been prepared to review the criteria presented in Policy 4.6.2 of the County of Wellington Official Plan. As this letter is an addendum to the PJR and supports the subject Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Condominium and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications, it is to be read in tandem with the submitted technical studies. The following table lists the policy criteria as well as a response.

Policy 4.6.2	Response
a) the need for the proposed use other than for aggregate operations, taking into account other available lands or buildings in the area;	The need for the proposed use is reviewed in detail in sections 2, 4 and 5.3 of the PJR.
b) the appropriateness of the proposed site for the use proposed taking into consideration the size and shape of the land and its ability to accommodate the intensity of use proposed;	The area of the Site that is proposed to be developed for residential use is approximately 42 hectares in area, which is sufficient to accommodate the lot sizes and level of development proposed. Due to the location of the Site in the rural area of the County, the lot sizes are appropriate to provide rural housing to complement the higher density and compact built forms located and planned in the urban areas of the County. Additionally, there are existing approvals on the SE Site for residential development, demonstrating the

	<p>appropriateness of the proposed residential use.</p> <p>Further details on the appropriateness of the proposal are contained in sections 2 and 5.3 of the PJR.</p>
<p>c) the adequacy of the proposed method of servicing the site;</p>	<p>The Site is proposed to be serviced by a private communal servicing system, the submitted Functional Servicing Report (“FSR” – dated January 2022 and Addendum to the FSR dated April 2022) indicates that the proposed servicing plan is adequate.</p> <p>Full details of the proposed servicing plan and its adequacy are contained in the submitted FSR (or see Section 7.1 of the PJR).</p>
<p>d) the compatibility of the proposed use with consideration given to the height, location, proximity and spacing of buildings; the separation between various land uses; impacts from noise, odour, dust or other emissions from the proposed use and from adjacent land uses; loss of privacy, shadowing or impact on cultural heritage resources and landscapes;</p>	<p>Specific building details such as height, location on lot, and building spacing will be finalized through the future detailed design process of the development applications. The Zoning By-law Amendment does not contemplate changes to the regulations of the R1A zone which is proposed for portions of the SE Site. A portion of the SE Site is currently zoned for residential use, reflecting the existing approvals on the land. Further details on the zoning of the site are contained in sections 4.5 and 5.3 of the PJR.</p> <p>The nearby land uses include a golf course, a low-rise residential neighbourhood and cottage/lake houses around Lake Belwood. These uses are not contiguous to the Site, separated by a County Road and local road, respectively, which is an appropriate separation from the proposed low-rise residential use. Agricultural uses are also located nearby, the impacts of which would be considered under Minimum Distance Separation (“MDS”). The submitted MDS Study (prepared February 2022) directs that MDS is not applicable for the Proposed Development (or see Section 7.8 of the PJR).</p>

	It is not anticipated that the proposed single detached built forms will result in a loss of privacy or result in shadow impacts on surrounding uses. The Site is not in proximity to identified cultural heritage resources or landscapes.
e) the impact on natural resources such as agricultural land and mineral aggregate deposits;	The Site is currently a golf course with residential permissions and has co-existed for many years with surrounding uses with no identified issues. Further information is contained in section 4.4 of the PJR.
f) the impact on biodiversity and connectivity of natural features and areas;	An Environmental Impact Study ("EIS" – dated February 2022) was undertaken by Beacon Environmental as part of the submission. EIS concludes that the Proposed Development can proceed in accordance with the applicable natural heritage policies of the County OP and GRCA (or see Section 7.7 of the PJR).
g) the exterior design in terms of bulk, scale and layout of buildings and other design elements;	Specific building details such as height, location on lot, and building spacing will be finalized through the future detailed design process related to the development applications.
h) the possibility that site contamination has occurred or the site may contain historic petroleum wells or associated works, and if so, demonstrate compliance with provincial regulations;	A Phase 1 ESA was undertaken by Golder Associates (dated February 2022). No historic petroleum wells or associated works have been found on the Site. Two Areas of Potential Environmental Concern ("APECs") were identified and a Phase 2 ESA will be required to obtain a Record of Site Condition.
i) methods of reducing or eliminating negative impacts;	The technical studies submitted outline mitigation measures where such impacts may occur.
j) other planning matters considered important by a Council.	Council concerns can be discussed and further addressed as the application continues through the planning process.

We trust this addendum is satisfactory in reviewing the various criteria of Policy 4.6.2 of the Official Plan. As demonstrated, the Proposed Development meets the intent of the criteria, further aligning the subject applications' conformity to the policies of the County Official Plan.

Sincerely,
GSP Group Inc.



Evan Wittmann
Planner



Hugh Handy, MCIP, RPP
Vice President