



COUNTY OF WELLINGTON

COMMITTEE REPORT



PLANWELL

To: Chair and Members of the Planning Committee
From: Jameson Pickard, Senior Policy Planner
Sarah Wilhelm, Manager of Policy Planning
Date: Thursday, September 09, 2021
Subject: **County Official Plan Review – Consultation and Engagement Overview**

1.0 Purpose

This report provides Council with an overview of the consultation and engagement completed to date for the Official Plan Review.

2.0 Background

Since the launch of the Official Plan Review project, Planning Staff have received comments and inquiries from local residents, developers and stakeholders. Through more formal means of engagement, the County has:

- consulted directly with Member Municipalities;
- completed one round of agency and Indigenous community circulations;
- held a Special Meeting of Council to broadly introduce the Official Plan Review project to the public; and
- hosted a Public information Centre (PIC) to gather public feedback on the June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 Report - Urban Structure and Municipal Growth Allocations (Phase 1 Report).

The following sections of this report provide more detail regarding the consultation and engagement to date and summarizes and responds to some of the major themes that have emerged from the feedback. Staff have also prepared comment summary tables in Appendix A. Complete comments are available in the project file.

3.0 Municipal Consultation

Municipal consultation is coordinated through a Technical Resource Team (TRT) made up of municipal CAOs or their designate, County Planning Staff and consultants, Watson & Associates (Watson). This group provides invaluable local knowledge and input into Watson's data and analysis. Most recently, the TRT has been reviewing and providing feedback on the draft Municipal growth allocations and early results of the land needs assessment. TRT meetings are supplemented through individual meetings with Member Municipalities as needed.

4.0 Agency Circulation

County Staff completed the first circulation to legislated commenting authorities, seeking feedback on the Official Plan Review and the Phase 1 Report. Comments were received from two Conservation Authorities (Maitland Valley Conservation Authority and Conservation Halton) which provided high

level feedback related to their core functions for the County to consider through the Official Plan Review. The Municipality of Perth East had no concerns.

5.0 Indigenous Community Circulation

County Staff completed the first circulation to the following Indigenous communities in Wellington seeking feedback on the Official Plan Review and the Phase 1 Report:

- Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council
- Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat
- Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation
- Métis Nation
- Saugeen Ojibway Nation
- Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation

To date we have heard from Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat, who expressed interest in archaeological studies or fieldwork and in reviewing draft Official Plan amendment documents.

6.0 Public Feedback

Planning Staff have been collecting and responding to public and stakeholder feedback since the project was initiated in September 2019. Through these individual discussions, Staff have engaged with close to 100 individuals from all across the County on various Official Plan policy topics. Through these discussions there have been some common areas of interest that have emerged, which are summarized below.

6.1 Secondary Agricultural Area Severances

We have received a number of inquiries about revising the Secondary Agricultural consent policies so that they would allow for consideration of an additional severance on properties that have had a severance past March 1st, 2005. County staff has completed a detailed analysis of the potential remaining supply of severances in the Secondary Agricultural designation in the Town of Minto, Town of Erin and the Township of Puslinch based on the current cutoff date. While this information is being considered in our growth management work to determine if there is a need to revise municipal growth allocations and/or Official Plan severance policies, no decisions have been made at this time.

6.2 Urban Centre Expansions

The County has received inquiries about expanding the urban centres of Aberfoyle, Arthur, Dratyon, Elora/Salem, Fergus, Harriston, Moorefield, Morriston, Mount Forest and Rockwood. The County is required by Provincial policy to ensure there is a suitable amount of designated land available in our Member Municipalities to accommodate future growth. At this time, Watson is in the process of preparing a draft Land Needs Assessment (LNA) as part of phase 2 of the County's growth management work. If there is a deficit of community and/or employment areas, urban centre boundary expansions may need to be considered. This would be part of a third phase of the municipal comprehensive review (MCR) where the County, in consultation with Member Municipalities, would evaluate proposed expansions. Staff will report to Council to develop a process for considering potential boundary expansion requests, including submission guidelines and an evaluation framework.

6.3 Hamlet Expansions

The County has received inquiries about expanding the hamlets of Arkell, Alma, Ariss, Ospringe and Wallenstein. There are 37 hamlets identified in the Official Plan that meet the definition of a rural settlement area under the Growth Plan. The boundaries of many of these hamlets were refined through the last 5-year review which took effect in late 2014 (OPA 81). Due to the lack of municipal services in hamlets and the policy to limit growth in areas without municipal services, the Official Plan caps hamlet expansions at a maximum of five residential lots/units.

In the official plan, hamlet expansions may only be considered as part of a municipal comprehensive review however, new policies were added to the Growth Plan in 2019 to permit the minor rounding out of a rural settlement area boundary outside of an MCR. No decisions have been made at this time about considering hamlet expansions as part of the MCR.

6.4 Re-designations from Prime Agricultural to a Secondary Agricultural

The County has received inquiries about changing Official Plan land use designations from prime agricultural to secondary agricultural.

County Staff will be implementing the Provincial agricultural land base mapping into the County Official Plan through the Official Plan Review. As part of this process we are required to review and refine this mapping in accordance with refinement criteria prepared by the Province and outlined in the “Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in Ontario’s Greater Golden Horseshoe”. These criteria offer very limited circumstances under which the County is permitted to refine the Provincially identified Prime Agricultural lands. These refinements become even more limited when both the County Official Plan mapping and Provincial Agricultural System mapping for Prime Agricultural lands align. As a result, our focus will be on reviewing discrepancies between the County Official Plan mapping and agricultural land base mapping, identified candidate areas and aligning the agricultural land base with our neighbouring municipalities. Candidate areas identified by the Province are largely concentrated in Erin, Minto and Puslinch which are the only areas in Wellington with Secondary Agricultural land use designations.

6.5 Employment Area Conversions

The window for submitting urban employment area conversion requests has closed and we are currently seeking municipal comments on the requests. Once received, the requests will be further evaluated by Watson and included in the Phase 2 Report.

7.0 Stakeholder Feedback

The details of stakeholder feedback are included in Appendix A and preliminary staff responses are included below.

7.1 Wellington Federation of Agriculture (WFA)

WFA raises a number of important priority areas that they have for the Official Plan Review which are outlined in the table below. Planning staff value the input provided by WFA and look forward to continuing to collaborate on these matters.

| WFA Priority Area | Preliminary Response |
|---|---|
| Maintain the “Agriculture First” principles of the official plan | The County recognizes the importance of prime agricultural areas and the agriculture industry in Wellington and is not considering removing the Section 6.4.2 “Agriculture First” policies from the official plan. |
| Definitions and policies for Prime Agricultural Areas | Staff plans to review Official Plan definitions and permitted uses in prime agricultural areas to align with Provincial policies and guidance documents. |
| Agricultural impact assessments (AIA) | Where settlement area boundary expansion is justified, the County is required to determine the feasibility based on criteria under 2.2.8.3 of the Growth Plan. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to avoid prime agricultural areas where possible • to comply with minimum distance separation formulae • to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on the agri-food network through an AIA • to apply the PPS polices for the wise use and management of agricultural resources |
| Mapping of agricultural information | This request is outside of the scope of the Official Plan review, but is an idea that staff would like to discuss with WFA further. |
| Agricultural land base and agri-food network | Staff plans to implement the agricultural land base and agri-food network through the Official Plan review. |
| Secondary Agricultural land use designation | Staff does not plan to explore introducing secondary agricultural area designations into municipalities which don’t have it (Centre Wellington, Mapleton, Minto, Wellington North) as it would be contrary to the “Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in Ontario’s Greater Golden Horseshoe”. |
| On-farm Housing | County Staff have conducted a preliminary review of on-farm accommodations for agricultural workers and will be communicating directly with WFA on this matter in the near future. |
| Minimizing surplus farm dwelling lot size | Current surplus farm dwelling lot creation policies in the Official Plan require that the lot is to be kept to the minimum size needed for residential purposes. These applications can however, vary considerably and are reviewed on a case by case basis when there are environmental and topographic features or existing accessory buildings. |
| Drainage Act incident repository | This request is outside of the scope of the Official Plan review and is under jurisdiction of Member Municipalities, but is an idea that staff would like to discuss with WFA further. |

7.2 Ontario Stone, Sand and Gravel Association (OSSGA)

County Staff acknowledge the OSSGA's submission and note that we are not considering mineral aggregate policy changes at this point of the Official Plan Review. In response to the comments we also note:

- the County will be reviewing and refining the Provincial Natural Heritage System (NHS) mapping through a later phase of the project; and
- the County is not preparing a new Official Plan document, but rather, a series of Official Plan amendments to bring the existing plan into conformity with Provincial policy.

7.3 Ontario Headwater Institute

County staff acknowledge the Ontario Headwater Institute's submission and note that the Official Plan Review, including the land needs assessment will be completed in accordance with Provincial policies. The Province is the approval authority for the phased amendments for the municipal comprehensive review and 5-year review.

7.4 Save Our Water

The Save Our Water comments and information have been previously submitted and considered as part of the Centre Wellington Tier 3 Study. While the Lake Erie Source Protection Authority Board approved the Centre Wellington Tier 3 Water Budget studies and associated new water quantity policies for Wellington County, the work still requires Ministry approval and therefore is not yet in effect. Notwithstanding the status of the new policies, staff note that the significant risk identification through the Township of Centre Wellington Tier 3 Water Budget and Risk Assessment does not indicate a physical limitation in the aquifer but rather some limitations in infrastructure that can be addressed through new wells as laid out in the Township's Water Supply Master Plan.

As part of the municipal comprehensive review, the County hired a consulting firm (WSP) to complete a high level review of existing municipal water and wastewater capacity based on data and information provided by Member Municipalities. The findings show that Centre Wellington, Minto, Mapleton and Wellington North each have existing water and wastewater servicing capacity to accommodate near-term growth. The results of the analysis also show that all of the Municipalities with municipal services in Wellington County include at least one urban centre that did not demonstrate sufficient water and wastewater capacity over the 2051 planning horizon. The WSP review will help member municipalities plan for future infrastructure enhancements to accommodate forecasted growth.

7.5 Members of Public with Heritage Concerns (Centre Wellington)

The County has received multiple submissions from two Centre Wellington residents with concerns about heritage preservation in Elora/Salem and Fergus as it relates to the residential intensification requirements of the Provincial Growth Plan. The current residential intensification target for Wellington is 20% annually and it applies to parts of Wellington's urban centres where development has taken place (built-up areas). The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) places a priority on intensification to make efficient use of land and infrastructure, and to support transit viability. In a May 2021 Staff report on the matter, the County requested that the Province consider reducing the target to 15%. This was justified in part, due to the high concentrations of

designated built heritage resources in the built-up areas of Centre Wellington. This request is still with the Province for a decision.

Planning staff is aware our responsibilities related to the Provincial interests listed under Section 2 of the Planning Act, the Provincial Policy Statement, Provincial Growth Plan, Provincial Greenbelt Plan and County/Township Official Plans. While planning staff also value the County's cultural heritage resources, Provincial and local planning interests and policies must be applied comprehensively and not in isolation of one another.

We note that policies are already in place in the County Official Plan setting out requirements for heritage impact assessment and conservation plans. This type of study determines if any significant cultural heritage resources are impacted by a development proposal, whether the impacts can be mitigated and by what means. This allows for residential intensification requests requiring planning approvals to be evaluated on a case by case basis within the context of the proposal.

8.0 Special Meeting of Council

A Special Meeting of County Council under section 26 of the Planning Act was held on June 29th, 2021 at 10 am to provide the Public with an opportunity, early in the process, to provide feedback on areas of interest in the Official Plan.

At the meeting Planning Staff gave a presentation followed by a question and answer period open to the public and County Council. There were 14 people who registered to participate at the meeting and several people who called in to listen.

Generally, public comments which arose at this meeting were related to site-specific requests for properties to be included in a settlement area boundary. We also received feedback from a participant who raised concerns about the amount of growth forecasted to Centre Wellington and the Township's ability to service this growth. The discussion that took place along with staff responses are included in the meeting summary in Appendix B.

9.0 Public Information Centre (PIC)

On June 23rd, 2021 at 7 p.m. the County Planning and Development Department held a virtual PIC on the Draft Phase 1 Report- Urban Structure and Municipal Growth Allocations. The PIC was intended to provide the public with an overview of the Phase 1 Report and an opportunity to ask questions about the work completed to date.

At the meeting Watson presented an overview of the Phase 1 Report, followed by a facilitated question and answer period. There were specific questions posed to participants to generate discussion and feedback. In total there were 43 participants who attended the virtual meeting.

The feedback at the meeting was varied and included comments on residential growth, employment growth, servicing and infrastructure and the general MCR process. The discussion that took place along with staff responses are included in the meeting summary prepared by Lura Consulting in Appendix C. Following the PIC, a public comment window was open to receive comments on the Phase 1 Report

until July 16, 2021. At the time of completing this report, the County received several submissions that are contained in Appendix A.

10.0 Future Engagement

As the Official Plan Review progresses, the County will be scheduling additional public consultations to gather more feedback. The County has retained LURA Consulting to develop an engagement strategy related to the Phase 2 work. We note that the Official Plan Review project webpage and the digital mailing list is the best source of information for additional opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage in the Official Plan Review.

Engagement with Indigenous communities will be distinct from, but concurrent with, public and stakeholder engagement. LURA Consulting is also helping the County develop an Indigenous engagement strategy. Planning Staff have reached out to the County’s Indigenous Advisory Committee about the Official Plan Review and will seek their advice about the development of the strategy.

11.0 Next Steps

The next steps for the Official Plan Review are as follows:

- review feedback provided through Phase 1, refine results and finalize Phase 1 Report;
- draft first MCR Official Plan Amendment for consideration of settlement area hierarchy, formatting/housekeeping changes and other areas as appropriate;
- continue with Phase 2 work which includes the release of the draft land needs assessment;
- hold additional engagement to share the results of Phase 2 and provide an opportunity for Member Municipalities, Indigenous communities, the public, stakeholders and agencies to comment.

Recommendations

That the report “County Official Plan Review – Consultation and Engagement Overview” be received for information; and

That the County Clerk circulate the report to member municipalities for information.

Respectfully submitted,



Jameson Pickard, B.URPL
Senior Policy Planner



Sarah Wilhelm, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Policy Planning

| | |
|------------|--|
| Appendix A | Public and Stakeholder Comment Summary |
| Appendix B | Virtual Special Meeting of County Council Meeting (June 29 th , 2021) Meeting Summary |
| Appendix C | Virtual Public Information Centre (June 23 rd , 2021) Meeting Summary |

Appendix A

Public and Stakeholder Comment Summary

Table 1A COUNTY-WIDE Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|--|
| 004 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns with negative impacts of Provincial policies for future growth in the County of Wellington, particularly in areas with no municipal servicing. • Provincial policies need to be changed to allow flexibility for municipalities to allow limited growth on private services in the County. |
| 016 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concerns related to the demolition of barns in the agricultural area, in part, due to surplus farm residence severances. • Suggest that these structures may have cultural heritage significance that should be protected. • Request an amendment to the Official Plan to include policies that would preserve barns during surplus farm dwelling severance applications. |
| 035 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry about the timing of completion for the County Municipal Comprehensive Review. |
| 036 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments submitted inquire about the status of the County Official Plan Review process. |
| 044 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the County to create more walkable communities with developments that are high density and compact. • Continued expansion into farm fields is not the answer. |
| 043 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General inquiry about the status of the population, household and employment numbers for the County’s member municipalities. |
| 063 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed changes to the County of Wellington processes and policies related to public engagement. • Comments provided suggestions on practices to improve the solicitation of public input and create a more transparent engagement process. |
| 070 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments sought clarification regarding several aspects of the Official Plan Review including timing of completion, agricultural system mapping refinements and opportunities for public consultation. |

Table 1B COUNTY-WIDE Stakeholder Comments

Wellington Federation of Agriculture

| Comment Summary |
|--|
| <p>Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <p>The Wellington Federation of Agriculture (WFA) has provided comments for the County's consideration as it undertakes its Municipal Comprehensive Review of its Official Plan. The WFA want to underscore the importance of Agriculture and Agriculture Planning, by providing some main areas to be prioritized and addressed within the review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Maintain the "Agriculture First" principals that protect and support agricultural uses and normal farm practices.2. Align definitions and policies to reflect the updated Permitted Uses in Prime Agricultural Areas as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement3. Prescribe an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) be conducted for all zoning changes for the potential impacts of non-agricultural development on agricultural operations and the Agricultural System, to avoid, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts – i.e.<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Settlement boundary expansionsb. Aggregate zoning, extraction permits and land rehabilitation standards.4. Mapping – develop a rationalized, interactive mapping tool for the County to provide current, accurate agricultural information. A consistent and comprehensive mapping tool for Land used under Normal Farm Practices with identified setbacks, like buffers and natural heritage that will not further restrict farmland already regulated under other legislation – i.e. Nutrient Management, MDS5. Agricultural Systems –<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. <i>Agricultural Land Base</i> - WFA support ground-truthing of agricultural land use throughout the County, for the consideration of verifying land classes and associated mapping. WFA recognize that a Land Evaluation and Area Review (LEAR) study focuses on identifying Class 1, 2 and 3 land and often overlooks the considerable value of Class 4 through 7. Although Class 4 through 7 are not defined as prime agricultural land, their value for pasture, and other permitted use such as animal/crop house, on-farm worker housing, food processing and farm repair/manufacturing facilities and other diversified or secondary uses should be considered as part of a systematic planning approach in defining <i>Prime Agricultural Areas</i>.b. <i>Agri-Food Network</i> – WFA advocate for planning policies that support the required infrastructure, services, and assets to maintain the viability of the agri-food sector.6. Wellington County has some of the most fertile and productive land in Ontario. The residential growth within Wellington County has created the economics for increased requests for zoning Land as Secondary Agriculture as a strategy of creating secondary building lots. The rezoning of Agricultural Land should demonstrate Agricultural use, so should therefore be rezoned A2, to retain the Agricultural nature of the land. WFA feel the practice of allowing rezoning to Secondary Agricultural Land should be stopped as the Agricultural use of the land is lost.7. The complex requirements for housing and transportation infrastructure within agricultural businesses has highlighted the need for flexible on-farm agricultural housing for agricultural workers. WFA ask the County to include within their Official Plan expanded provision for on-farm housing that can become the foundational framework at the municipal building and planning departments. |

Wellington Federation of Agriculture

Comment Summary

8. WFA ask for the continued support of minimizing the lot size of the retained residential property within a surplus housing severance.
9. It has often been said that good drainage makes for good neighbours. As adjacent roads, ditches and residential areas develop and change in the rural landscape agricultural considerations and resulting consequences need to be tracked. The importance of the historical knowledge of drainage related activities and disputes are essential in conducting a fulsome future investigation. A County based Incident Repository needs to be created and house issues related to the Drainage Act, as they become particularly important in preventing unintended Agricultural drainage impact and resolution of incidents.

Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (OSSGA)

Comment Summary

Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report

Comments received from the OSSGA provide an overview of the importance of the Aggregate industry in Ontario and a review of the complex policy regime applicable to the industry. The following outlines the key points that OSSGA would like to put forward for consideration by the County during the Official Plan Review:

1. In Wellington County, there are two (2) Provincial Plans that are to be implemented. OSSGA is promoting a simplified approach whereby municipal Official Plans simply reference the appropriate Provincial Plan policy in their OPs when speaking about aggregate policy (see Table 1). This simplified approach should eliminate the confusion that arises from multiple policies with similar, but varying language and ensure that as the Provincial Plans evolve in the future, the aggregate policies in OPs will not be out of conformity.
2. OSSGA is very interested in municipal refinements to the Provincial Natural Heritage Systems (NHS) and would like to understand and discuss your approach. Mineral aggregate policies are closely tied to Provincial NHS and associated mapping to ensure that an appropriate balance between these provincial interests is achieved. Therefore, it is important to OSSGA that any refinements to Provincial NHS mapping be in keeping with criteria released by the Province. Furthermore, it is important that mineral aggregate policies in OPs continue to be tied to Provincial NHS mapping. Therefore, it may be simplest to clearly distinguish Provincial NHS mapping in OPs so Provincial NHS mapping can be directly referenced in mineral aggregate policies.
3. The interrelationship between natural heritage and aggregate resources is a key matter where the specific balance intended by the PPS and Provincial Plans determines how both Provincial interests are met. The list of protected natural heritage features and level of protection (e.g. no negative impact test) that relate to aggregate is required to be consistent with the PPS and conform with applicable Provincial Plans. Going beyond, (more features or higher levels of protection) would not be consistent or conform. This should be kept in mind when preparing aggregate policies relative to natural heritage mapping.
4. Providing clear reasonable mechanisms to permit new and expanded mineral aggregate operations is a critical component to be included in a Municipal Official Plan. Provincial Plans establish where such operations are permitted. Ideally, the Official Plans would conform by also permitting mineral aggregate operations in the appropriate Provincial Plan areas (without any OPA requirement). If an amendment to

Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (OSSGA)

Comment Summary

the local Official Plan is necessary, then we would recommend that there should not be the additional requirement for a Regional Official Plan Amendment.

5. We also want to understand the approach Wellington County intends to take in order to transition active applications. For example, applications that started under the old Official Plan but remain active or are appealed can lose their status when the new Official Plan comes into effect if not properly addressed in the Repeal By-law.
6. Given the two-year moratorium under Section 22(2.1) and 34(10.0.0.1) of the Planning Act, we want to understand the approach Wellington County intends to take in order to make aggregate available that is consistent with the PPS. If the process to establish a new or expanded mineral aggregate operation is to include the requirement for any OPA (upper or lower tier), then an exception to the moratorium would have to be set out in the policies of the Official Plan. The same should be required for Zoning By-law amendments where new comprehensive zoning bylaws are going to be required to implement the Official Plan.
7. The PPS now includes the explicit requirement to identify deposits of mineral aggregate resources. The Official Plan should clearly identify quality mineral aggregate resource areas (bedrock resources as well as sand and gravel resource areas) on a Schedule that forms part of the plan and is consistent with Provincial resource mapping.
8. The Official Plan should include policy that protects resource areas as well as existing mineral aggregate operations and adjacent lands from incompatible development and activities that would preclude or hinder their expansion or continued use (to be consistent with Policy 2.5.2.4 of the PPS).
9. As per the PPS 2.5.2.1, demonstration of need for mineral aggregate resources shall not be required.
10. The Official Plan should recognize the interim nature of extraction and provide appropriate direction for rehabilitation with pits and quarries. In particular, extraction on prime agricultural lands should be permitted as an interim use with limited exceptions in accordance with the PPS and, rehabilitation is taken into account in assessing negative impact for natural heritage features.
11. Accessory, ancillary and associated uses are to be accommodated (recycling, asphalt and ready mix concrete batching).
12. Wayside pits and portable plants should be permitted without the need for Official Plan amendments or rezoning.
13. The Official Plan should describe and protect a road network to facilitate delivery of aggregate.
14. The provincial jurisdiction for regulation of pits and quarries through the Aggregate Resources Act should be respected and recognized in Official Plans (e.g. regulating depth of extraction and fees).

Comment Summary

Comments on Draft Phase 1 MCR Report (June 16, 2021)

The Ontario Headwater Institute provided comments to the County to consider through its Municipal Comprehensive Review. These comments ask the County to take a high level path to protect the terrestrial and aquatic integrity of our region. They ask the County to:

1. Ensure conformity in future land use planning to the following section of the Provincial Policy Statement:
2.2 Water
2.2.1 Planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by:
a) using the watershed as the ecologically meaningful scale for integrated and long-term planning, which can be a foundation for considering cumulative impacts of development.....
2. Ensure that local Land Need Assessments require a watershed or sub-watershed plan to be considered complete, ready for public comment, and to be presented for ratification by Council; and,
3. Recognize that most downstream areas of many of South-central Ontario’s watersheds have been intensively developed, creating poor ecological conditions that include reduced and fragmented natural habitat as well as poor water quality and leaving headwater areas as de facto reservoirs of regional forests, wetlands, wildlife, and water quality & quantity. As a result, we ask you to consider special protection for your headwaters areas, as development based on past protocols will probably be inadequate to prevent serious negative cumulative impact to the whole watershed.

Table 2A CENTRE WELLINGTON Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|--|
| 010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in expanding the urban centre of Fergus or to develop their rural lands for Country Residential purposes. |
| 017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in the Official Plan Review process and desire to develop lands in Fergus at a higher density than previously approved once necessary services are available. |
| 022 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to expand the urban centre of Fergus. |
| 027 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to expand the urban centre of Elora. • Comments provide an overview of the property and surrounding context and describes various development scenarios that could be acceptable for the lands in question. |
| 058 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to expand the urban centre of Fergus. • The comments included a review of two properties and surrounding context and a review of the applicable policy basis for the inclusion of these properties into the Fergus settlement area. • Both requests asked for the lands to be considered through the Official Plan Review process. • One of the requests also sought to initiate a private Official Plan amendment to proceed in advance of the Official Plan Review process. |
| 072 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of number of matters that the County should consider through the MCR including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Building complete compact communities that offer the range of services in a dense and compact way. These communities promote a better quality of life, human health and a sense of place. Comments suggest dispensing with the small town feel and planning for well-designed cities. – Providing a greater diversity of housing options rather than the single family dwellings. The missing middle form of housing offer better options for addressing the shortage of attainable and affordable housing. – Comments also suggest that the County should increase the affordable housing target in the Official Plan from 25% to 35% and promote a better variety of housing options by increasing the Greenfield unit density target from 6.5 units per gross acre to 15 units per gross acre. – Comments conclude by suggesting that we need to focus on higher density in our urban centres and avoid endless subdivisions like other communities. |
| 075 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to expand the urban centre of Fergus. |

Table 2B CENTRE WELLINGTON Stakeholder Comments

Save Our Water

| Comment Summary |
|---|
| <p>Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <p>Members of Save Our Water, provided feedback on the Phase 1 Report- Urban Structure and Municipal Growth Allocations, through participation at our Public Information Centre and through written submissions. The following is a summary of the comments provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The County has hired a consultant for a high level water and wastewater analysis of the urban areas and that this analysis is now done. If I heard this correctly, then I am puzzled why this analysis did not raise the Significant Risk identification of Centre Wellington's water as a factor regarding growth allocation to this urban area. Certainly the sustainability of Centre Wellington's future water sources should be a consideration. Would you please elaborate on this high level analysis?2. Would you please explain how this [the municipal growth allocations] fits with the County Source Protection Policy that says "The County shall take into consideration water quantity through the Tier 3 Study when allocating projected growth". How does this new policy factor into the decisions? Is the Watson team familiar with this policy? <p>I understand that for practical purposes a major consideration has to require that a municipality has a water and wastewater system and is not on private wells and septic's, and that these criteria mean that some municipalities will receive higher growth allocation. And so for these reasons it is reasonable to assume that additional growth will be allocated to Fergus and Elora, along with the water requirements to service that growth, despite the risk to the water system as is identified with Tier 3 risk assessment.</p> <p>It seems to me that Wellington County is being put in an impossible situation – being required to allocate growth numbers to 2051 when you can't ensure there can be water infrastructure and source to service that growth, and being required to follow the new Source Protection policy, approved by the County, that requires that you take Tier 3 water budgets into consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. The draft Watson allocation of growth to Centre Wellington poses a considerable challenge to the township. It is difficult to put this new target together with Centre Wellington's Water Supply Master Plan, which concludes on page viii: <p>"It is recommended that implementation of the preferred solution commence immediately with replacement of the F5 and F2 wells in Fergus. This timeline is based on determination of the WSMP that firm capacity of the existing system is approximately equal to the anticipated 2019 maximum day demand."</p> <p>Here is the WSMP report: RPT-2019-07-05-CW WSMP Draft-60565830 (5.54 MB) (pdf) Conclusions are in the Executive Summary and the timeline for new water on page 120. Projects that required implementation in 2020 and 2021-2 are currently in the investigation stage.</p> <p>This immediate (2019) need for new wells is not what the township had anticipated when the 2041 targets were set in 2016. This means that the township is starting out now in 2021 with the goalposts farther away than they were in 2016 when the first targets were set.</p> <p>The attached third party report, issued June 10, 2021, presents data and issues related to Centre Wellington's serviced population and water supply in 2020. It also shows 4 and 5 year trends back to and including 2016. The report reinforces the imminent need for new water sources. I hope you will find it helpful that the water system analysis is translated throughout into numbers of residents and housing</p> |

Save Our Water

Comment Summary

units. I should add that this spring the Fergus well F1 underwent successful rehabilitation, which adds more capacity to this well than is reported.

Members of the Public with Heritage Concerns

Comment Summary

The County has received multiple submissions regarding the need to protect and conserve cultural heritage resources in Elora/Salem and Fergus. The following is a summary of the comments provided in the first submission.

- Comments provide a detailed overview of the legislation and Provincial policies applicable to the protection and conservation of cultural heritage resources in Ontario.
- Comments suggest that the County has not demonstrated, at this time, how it will manage intensification in delineated built-up areas to ensure that the cultural heritage protection requirements under the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement and Growth plan are met.
- Comments suggest a separate target applicable to the settlement areas of Fergus and Elora be provided or alternatively a restriction for intensification in the Fergus & Elora Heritage areas be implemented.
- Comments request that specific information be provided which demonstrate how the proposed intensification targets support and maintain the unique cultural heritage resources that exist and how the target is in compliance with applicable legislation and policy.
- Comments request a copy of the phase 1 report to be provided in a PDF format.

The following is a summary of the comments provided to the County through a second submission.

- Comments provide a detailed overview of the applicable legislation and Provincial policies applicable to the protection and conservation of cultural heritage resources.
- Comments provide an interpretation that the heritage areas in Fergus and Elora constitute a constraint recognized by the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan that must be considered in the development of healthy and sustainable communities.
- Comments indicate that the County has not completed necessary technical studies or public engagement necessary to justify growth targets in Fergus and Elora heritage areas in accordance with applicable legislation and policies related to cultural heritage protection.
- Comments indicate that at the recent Special Meeting of Council on June 29, 2021, County Staff did not demonstrate how applicable legislation and policies related to cultural heritage resource conservation and protection were addressed.
- Comments conclude with a request for an explanation from County of when then next public engagement session will be to explain how the County plans to address applicable legislative and policy requirements for the protection of cultural heritage resources.

Table 3 ERIN Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|---|
| 002 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments asking if Secondary Agricultural residential severance policy will change the March 1, 2005 date to allow an additional residential severances off properties that have been severed past this date. |
| 026 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission provides a review of recent Provincial policy changes and their implications on land need and growth management in the Town of Erin. The comments provide a summary of key trends and issues which the County should consider as part of their Official Plan Review process. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new market based approach used for growth forecasting analysis and the ability plan higher than the 2051 forecast, The impacts of Covid-19 on the market and trends of out migration from the GTHA, The demand for ground related housing and the increase in demand in Erin once infrastructure upgrades are completed, and Impacts on employment and an increasing demand for centrally located employment areas such as Erin. |
| 026 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the Erin Village urban centre. Comments building on the previous submission (above) and included a review of the soil composition of the lands and their limitations for farming, as well as a review of existing development in the area and opportunities to logically extend the Erin village boundary. Comments conclude with a recommendation that given the extension of the growth horizon to 2051 it is a reasonable time to include these lands in the settlement area of Erin. |
| 028 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the hamlet of Ospringe. |
| 061 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments asking if Secondary Agricultural residential severance policy will change the March 1, 2005 date to allow an additional residential severances off properties that have been severed past this date. |
| 071 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to convert lands from a prime agricultural to a secondary agricultural Official Plan designation through the Municipal Comprehensive Review. |

Table 4 GUELPH/ERAMOSIA Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|------------|---|
| 001 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the hamlet boundary of Ariss. |
| 003 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowner interest in re-designating lands from Prime Agricultural to Rural Employment Area through the Municipal Comprehensive Review. |
| 030 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the urban centre of Rockwood. Comments sought more details about the necessary steps needed to bring the lands into Rockwood Settlement area. |
| 041 | <p>Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the urban centre of Rockwood. Comments provide an overview of the area and rationale for the inclusion of the subject lands in the settlement area of Rockwood. Comments highlight existing infrastructure to service the lands and a logical extension of the existing boundary. |
| 062 | <p>Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inquiry about how the Phase 1 Report addresses growth in the County’s hamlet areas and interest in adding lands to the hamlet area of Ariss. |

Table 5 MAPLETON Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|------------|---|
| 020 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the hamlet boundary of Wallenstein. |
| 033 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the urban centre of Drayton. |
| 033 | <p>Comments on Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments were provided in support of Settlement Area boundary expansion request for Drayton. The information provides a high level review of the forecasted population and housing growth in Township. The Comments conclude raising concerns about the amount growth allocated to the Township and suggests that it can accommodate more based on future servicing upgrades. |
| 055 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the urban centre of Moorefield expanded. |
| 069 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inquiry in to the potential to expand the hamlet boundary of Alma. |

Table 7 MINTO Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|--|
| 055 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the urban centre boundary of the Harriston. |
| 068 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand the urban centre boundary of Harriston. Comments provided an overview of factors that make the lands in question a good candidate to be added including proximity to municipal services, road frontage and utilities. |

Table 8 PUSLINCH Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|---|
| 006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A request for the consideration of a severance in the Prime Agricultural Official Plan designation. |
| 008 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A request to consider the re-designation of two rural properties to a Rural Employment Area Official Plan designation. |
| 014 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments regarding matters the County should consider through the Official Plan Review include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The growth that has been forecasted for Puslinch is inadequate and does not present a viable growth scenario for the Township. Updated forecasts should present a more balanced and fair approach. County projections forecast a stagnant growth scenario for Puslinch. It is understood that Puslinch is constrained due to the fact there are no existing municipal services and that provincial policy limit County staff and Council. However, development in certain areas of Puslinch on private or communal services have been successful in the past and should continue to be supported. There are existing policies in the County Official Plan that must be modified particularly, the 1 km buffer policy to city limits. This policy is arbitrarily applied and should be considered on a case by case basis. Policies and mapping related to the Agricultural System and Natural Heritage System mapping of the Province, should be evaluated. Previous LEAR studies completed by the County, and approved by OMAFRA, reflected a more tailored approach reflective of the nuances of Puslinch. Comments provide several recommendations for the County to consider during the Official Plan Review including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The lands currently designated as secondary agricultural north of Audrey Meadows subdivision in Puslinch should be designated as part of a settlement area and applicable settlement areas policies should apply to these lands. The lands surrounding, not included in a settlement area, should retain the secondary agricultural designation and the Greenland features should be refined based on ground truthing. Section 10.4.4 consent policies should be revised to reflect the current date. |

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|---|
| 014 | <p data-bbox="261 212 930 243">Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <p data-bbox="261 260 716 291">Comments raised concerns related to:</p> <ul data-bbox="261 312 1463 1470" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="261 312 1463 489">• The timing of the County’s phase 1 report release in relation to its June 23, 2021 Public Information Centre and June 29th, 2021 Special Meeting of Council. Comments indicate that there was inadequate time to review and comment on the Phase 1 report prior to these meetings being held. Comments indicate that the process failed to meet the legal requirements under section 26 of the Planning Act and request further public consultation. <li data-bbox="261 510 1463 646">• The County’s approach to mapping and identifying rural settlements in the proposed urban structure. Comments provided preliminary feedback that suggest the County’s approach was not in conformity with the existing Official Plan, is selective and not comprehensive. Comments request that Audrey Meadows be included in mapping identifying Rural Settlements. <li data-bbox="261 667 1463 911">• The growth that is contemplated for Puslinch is extremely limited and to be facilitated primarily through rural severances. Comments suggest that the County should consider infilling/ rounding out opportunities in existing rural settlement areas as an alternative to severance growth. Comments highlight that the that landowner’s property represents a perfect opportunity for accommodating new growth which would have limited impacts on agricultural and the natural environment. Comments concludes by urging the County to not undermine the growth opportunity that is present on these lands. <li data-bbox="261 932 1463 1113">• The proposed urban structure and re-classification of Morriston and Aberfoyle to Secondary Urban Centres; and the re-classification of Rural Settlement areas to only include existing hamlets. These changes would leave Puslinch with limited opportunities for future growth. The comments indicate that the growth management component of the report for Puslinch is lacking. <li data-bbox="261 1134 1463 1314">• The County’s approach to rural growth opportunities in Puslinch. The County has not evaluated neighbouring municipal approaches to growth in the rural area that would permit the type of development being proposed by their client. These policy approaches recognize the character of the rural landscape and provide a policy framework to allow for limited, appropriate growth. Comments encouraged County staff to review these other approaches. <li data-bbox="261 1335 1463 1470">• The primary means of future growth in Puslinch being consents. These opportunities will be less than historical numbers due to the Provincial Agricultural and Natural Heritage System being implemented. Comments outline how an expansion to the Audrey Meadows subdivision is superior to single rural consents, in terms of servicing and impacts to the community. <p data-bbox="261 1491 1435 1591">Comments concluded with an overview of the merits of the Audrey meadows subdivision proposal and a request to allow rural settlements to include areas like Audrey Meadows; and to allow for minor infill and rounding out options to continue to be allowed.</p> |
| 015 | <ul data-bbox="261 1619 1463 1724" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="261 1619 1463 1724">• Comments submitted were related to the Secondary Agricultural residential severance policy. Particularly, if the Official Plan Review will result in a change to the March 1st, 2005 date to allow an additional residential severances off properties that have been severed past this date. |

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|--|
| 024 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments submitted on behalf of the landowner, regarding refinements of the Provincial Agricultural System and its impact on several aggregate properties in the Township of Puslinch. Comments provided an overview of the properties and an analysis of the topography and soil composition of the site. A recommendation was provided that the secondary agricultural designation apply to these lands as they do not reflect prime agricultural lands. |
| 031 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand Morriston urban centre. |
| 037 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments submitted were related to the Secondary Agricultural residential severance policy. Particularly, if the Official Plan Review will result in a change to the March 1st, 2005 date to allow an additional residential severances off properties that have been severed past this date. |
| 038 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowner interested in having their rural lands “rezoned” to another land use that would allow the best use of the lands possible for the County and Township. Comments suggested residential, employment or aggregate as possible long term uses of the lands. |
| 039 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to expand Aberfoyle urban centre. Comments provide an overview of the Provincial initiative to expand the Greenbelt and its impacts on Puslinch. Comments provided a rationale why the proposed expansion of Aberfoyle makes sense for the County. |
| 064 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments submitted were related to the Secondary Agricultural residential severance policy. Particularly, if the Official Plan Review will result in a change to the March 1st, 2005 date to allow an additional residential severance off properties that have been severed past this date. |

Table 4 WELLINGTON NORTH Public Comments

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|---|
| 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to convert Industrially designated lands to Residential in the settlement area of Mount Forest. |
| 034 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to have property in Arthur considered for a severance through the Municipal Comprehensive Review Process. The lands are currently designated Future Development in the County of Wellington Official Plan. Comments provide a brief overview of the property and rationale for severance. |
| 073 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to have lands in Arthur re-designated from a Future Development to a Highway Commercial Official Plan designation. |
| 040 | <p>Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments submitted on behalf of the Landowner requesting to have their lands included within the Settlement Area of Arthur. Comments provide an overview of the property including agricultural capabilities, proximity to existing services and limited natural constraints on site. Comments also reviewed the added flexibility added in the new land needs assessment methodology for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the impacts Covid-19 have had on growth in the area. Comments conclude with an opinion that there is ample justification to include the subject lands in the Settlement area of Arthur. |
| 066 | <p>Comments on June 16, 2021 Draft Phase 1 MCR Report</p> <p>Comments submitted, on behalf of the landowners, raised questions about certain conclusions reached in the phase 1 report and approaches taken in certain parts of the analysis. The comments provided were detailed and fall within the following topic areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> market analysis – short-term vs long-term outlook potential addition of the Greenbelt lands within southern Wellington County may limit growth in southern Wellington County allocation of growth to urban centres versus rural areas differences in housing forecast versus purely demand-based forecast allocation by urban centre within Wellington North needs to reflect servicing plans and proximity to large urban areas shortfall in supply relative to demand from County’s proposed OP review <p>Contained with the comments were specific questions seeking further clarification regarding aspects of the County’s analysis. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to understand the nature of the adjustments (made to the housing propensity analysis), and whether these actually fulfil the requirements in the Land Needs Assessment Methodology to account for market demand to the extent possible. We would ask the County and their consultants for data and supporting documentation to help us understand the quantitative nature of the adjustments made for ‘planning policy’, ‘housing affordability’ and ‘development pipeline’. (Related to adjustments made to the housing propensity analysis) |

| ID# | Comment Summary |
|-----|---|
| 066 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="261 178 1356 247">• Can the County provide information for why the allocation to Mount Forest in the Phase 1 report is significantly larger than in the Township’s Community Growth Plan?<li data-bbox="261 262 1356 331">• We would like to request that the Phase 2 report provides as much detail as possible on available supply in the County and its lower-tier municipalities. |

Appendix B

Summary of Virtual Special Meeting of County Council Meeting (June 29th, 2021)

Wellington County Official Plan Review Virtual Special Meeting of Council - Meeting Summary

Background

The County of Wellington is currently reviewing its Official Plan (OP) to complete a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) and a 5-year review of its Official Plan as specified under Section 26 of the *Planning Act*. An MCR is part of the OP review process. It establishes a long-term vision and planning framework for a municipality that fosters a sustainable approach to future residential growth and economic development. The County is doing this to prepare for additional population and employment growth and ensure that the updated OP supports healthy, compact and complete communities in Wellington as directed through A Place to Growth: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

On June 29, 2021, County Council and Staff engaged with community members at a Special Meeting of Council, to learn and discuss areas of community interest that should be reviewed through the Official Plan Review. This meeting is required under Section 26(3)(b) of the *Planning Act*.

Meeting Promotion

Public notice regarding the Virtual Special Meeting of Council was published two times through the Wellington Advertiser in accordance with Section 26(4) of the *Planning Act*. Notice was given once in the May 6, 2021 issue and a final time in the May 13, 2021 issue. The meeting was also promoted through the County's social media platforms to raise awareness.

Members of the public who wished to join the Virtual Special Meeting of Council were required to register in advance with the County Clerk's Department. Individuals could also join the meeting by calling in by phone.

Meeting Overview

The virtual Special Meeting of Council was held on June 29, 2021, with a purpose to:

- Provide information on the Official Plan review process; and
- Offer an early opportunity for the public to provide input on topics that should be considered through the Official Plan Review.

The meeting presentation was publicly posted in advance on the County of Wellington's Official Plan Review website Plan Well to allow participants the opportunity to review beforehand or follow along if they joined the meeting by phone. In total, 14 members of the public registered for the meeting.

The Chair started the meeting with an introduction and overview of the agenda and process for asking questions. Aldo Salis (Director of Planning at the County of

Wellington County Official Plan Review
Virtual Special Meeting of Council Summary – June 29, 2021

Wellington) provided introductory remarks and a brief context to the County's Official Plan Review process. Sarah Wilhelm (Manger of Policy Planning at the County of Wellington) delivered a presentation on the following topics of the Official Plan Review:

Live Well

- Complete and Healthy Communities
- Housing
- Consultation and Coordination

Grow Well

- Growth Management
- Transportation

Sustain Well

- Agricultural and Rural Areas
- Climate Change
- Natural Heritage, Flooding and Water

Following the presentation, the meeting Chair opened the meeting to the public and members of Council to receive feedback and comments. A summary of the discussion is provided in the following section.

What We Heard

The following key themes were identified in submissions received from members of the public who deputed during the Special Meeting:

- A deputant identified that Centre Wellington has already accommodated much of the County's growth and that community resources and facilities (such as water supply, community centres, seniors housing, etc...) are becoming increasingly stressed.
- A deputant identified they had submitted a letter on behalf of multiple landowners in support of expanding urban settlement boundaries.

The following key themes were identified through the Special Meeting of Council during general discussion between Councillors and staff:

- Allocation of growth should be mindful of local capacity for services to accommodate it
 - Broadly there were concerns about the speed of growth and the impact this is having on community services across the County.
 - One Councillor identified the desire to see more growth allocated to Mapleton in response to planned infrastructure improvements to support water supply and wastewater servicing.

Wellington County Official Plan Review
Virtual Special Meeting of Council Summary – June 29, 2021

- Desire to see a greater diversity of housing mix, including fully accessible housing types. A concern was identified regarding the size of new residential units.
- Concerns were raised regarding the Secondary Settlement Area designation of Aberfoyle and Morriston, and the Agricultural System and Candidate Areas in Puslinch – concerns focused on limited control the County has over these areas.

Staff also responded to questions raised during the meeting. Questions are marked by a 'Q', and answers are marked with an 'A'.

Questions from Members of the Public

Q: I understand that the County has completed a request for submissions related to Employment Area conversions. Will the County be requesting a settlement area expansion as well?

A: The County's consultants are currently working on the land need assessment. This will provide an overview of land needs in the County. Submissions will be requested later for proposed urban boundary expansion where a process will be developed to review and evaluate those requests.

Questions from Councillors

Q: Can you clarify the introductory comments on the Official Plan's local conditions and needs?

A: The County Official Plan provides policies which respond to unique local circumstances (e.g Mennonite transportation). All decisions made through the Official Plan Review will comply with Provincial policy. Provincial approval is required for these local conditions and needs policies.

Q: There is an existing Town of Erin OP policy related to commercial water bottling facilities. Will the County be developing any specific policies related to commercial water takings as part of the MCR?

A: If Council has an interest in staff developing policies related to commercial water takings we can investigate that further. This may be a challenge give case law on the subject.

Q: What are the implications of water and wastewater limitation on the growth the County will be allocating to municipalities?

A: County staff are currently working with an engineering firm to assess the capacity of municipal infrastructure and identify any critical issues.

Q: The Ministry of Seniors and Accessibility indicates that a mix and variety of housing includes accessible housing. How do we require this type of housing?

Wellington County Official Plan Review
Virtual Special Meeting of Council Summary – June 29, 2021

A: Accessibility legislation is generally applicable to public sector developments. The Provincial Policy Statement provides an enabling framework to municipalities to facilitate the mix of housing options. County staff can review this matter further to determine what our options are.

Q: What is a candidate area?

A: Candidate areas exist where we have Secondary Agricultural designations already. This includes Puslinch, Erin and Minto. The areas identified as Prime Agricultural in our Official Plan will remain as Prime Agricultural.

Q: What is the County's Plan for addressing deficiencies identified through municipal master plans that don't align with the growth allocations produced by the County?

A: County staff have been working closely with Centre Wellington and the Risk Management Official regarding growth and services in Centre Wellington. The servicing issues that have been identified in Centre Wellington are related to water infrastructure as opposed to a lack of water supply.

Q: The Haudenosaunee declared a moratorium on development in the Haldimand Tract. What is the County's Plan to respond to this moratorium?

A: We plan to prepare an Indigenous engagement guide to outline our approach to Indigenous engagement as part of the Official Plan review process. Broadly, the moratorium on development is a legal question.

Appendix C

Summary of Virtual Public Information Centre (June 23rd, 2021)

Wellington County Official Plan Review Virtual Public Information Centre (PIC) Meeting Summary

Prepared by LURA Consulting

Background

The County of Wellington is currently reviewing its Official Plan (OP) to complete a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) and a 5-year review of its Official Plan as specified under Section 26 of the [Planning Act](#). An MCR is part of the OP review process. It establishes a long-term vision and planning framework for a municipality that fosters a sustainable approach to future residential growth and economic development. The County is doing this to prepare for additional population and employment growth and ensure that the updated OP supports healthy, compact and complete communities in Wellington as directed through [A Place to Growth: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe](#).

In June 2021, the County engaged community members to gather public input on the Draft Phase 1 MCR Report. The draft Phase 1 Report focuses on a proposed Urban Structure and Growth Analysis for the County of Wellington and is the topic of this consultation. A draft Phase 2 Report focusing on Urban Land Needs and Policy Recommendations will be released in Fall 2021 for further consultation.

Phase 1 consultations included:

- A Virtual Public Information Centre (PIC) on June 23, 2021
- A Special Meeting of the County of Wellington Council on June 29, 2021
- A project email planwell@wellington.ca to accept written feedback from June 23 to July 16. Written feedback was also accepted by mail.

Meeting Promotion

Members of the public who wished to join the Virtual (PIC) were required to register in advance. Individuals could also join the meeting by calling in by phone.

A public notice regarding the Virtual PIC was published through the Wellington Advertiser two weeks before the meeting. The meeting was also promoted through the County's social media platforms to raise awareness.

Meeting Overview

The Virtual PIC was held on June 23, 2021, with a purpose to:

- Introduce the OP review process
- Present preliminary findings of the Phase 1 MCR
- Gather and answer any questions participants may have about the Phase 1 MCR.

The meeting presentation was publicly posted in advance on [the County of Wellington's Official Plan Review website Plan Well](#) to allow participants the opportunity to review beforehand or follow along if they joined the meeting by phone. **In total, 43 participants joined the meeting.**

Jim Faught (Facilitator from LURA Consulting) started the meeting with an introduction and overview of the meeting agenda. Sarah Wilhelm (Manager of Policy Planning at the County of Wellington) provided introductory remarks and a brief context to the County's Official Plan review process. Jamie Cook (Partner at Watson & Associates) delivered a presentation on the following topics of the OP Review:

- Policy Context and Growth
- Urban and Rural Systems
- County wide Population and Growth Forecasts
- Municipal Population and Housing Growth Forecasts
- Employment Forecasts

Jim Faught facilitated a discussion to receive feedback and comments from members of the public. A summary of the facilitated discussion is provided below.

What We Heard

Residential Growth Forecast

Participants were asked the following questions to prompt discussion:

- What are your thoughts on the population growth allocation shares by location?
- What types of housing should the County focus on promoting to achieve its population targets?
- Which settlement and built-up areas should the County focus on encouraging higher density housing (e.g. apartments), and how can they be integrated into existing and new communities?

Generally, participants did not respond directly to the prompting questions, instead they asked questions to the project team. The questions and answers related to the Residential Growth Forecasts are included as follows. Questions are marked by a 'Q', and answers are marked with an 'A'.

Q: Does the forecast include only new residents moving in? Or does it also include the approximate projected population growth from birth rates?

A: Growth from birth rates is being taken into consideration. The County estimates growth using the Cohort Survival Projection Method, which primarily looks at the net migration plus natural increase (or sometimes decrease). Since the County's population is aging and the birth rate has only rebounded to some extent, the natural increase is still relatively low. The County would need to rely more on net migration from surrounding areas as a source for population growth.

Q: There is currently an overall concern about housing affordability, and many local residents have commented that certain areas of Centre Wellington are built "for the rich". How will housing issues be mitigated to ensure there is sufficient mixed housing at affordable rates? With lower-paying jobs becoming more prevalent, how can we expect people to work and live in the County if it is not affordable to do so?

A: The Provincial Policy Statement requires the County to set targets through the OP related to affordable housing. The County aims to ensure a broader selection of housing types among all levels of housing density options. However, this focus has created a shift in demand towards higher-density housing options. More work needs to be done to examine how housing is broken down by tenure, such as the demand for rental housing versus ownership housing.

It is also important to explore various tools and incentives to achieve a greater supply of affordable housing. Although the County has a significant role and responsibility in housing affordability, affordability is complex. Some issues may be beyond the County's control when it comes to delivering affordable housing and controlling housing prices. The County has completed an attainable housing study with a task force looking at implementing some of the recommendations of that work. Overall, the County recognizes this as an important issue.

Employment Growth Forecast

Participants were asked the following questions to prompt discussion:

- What are your thoughts on the employment growth allocation shares by location?
- What policy enhancements are required to strengthen the County's ability to accommodate employment uses/sectors associated with structural changes in an evolving economy?
- Are the County's employment and economic Official Plan policies favourable when compared to competing municipalities in the surrounding area? If not, what would make the County's policies more competitive?

Generally, participants did not respond directly to the prompting questions, instead they asked questions to the project team. The questions and answers related to the Employment Growth Forecasts are included as follows. Questions are marked by a 'Q', and answers are marked with an 'A'.

Q: As professionals are leaving the GTA and looking for housing outside of the City, why are we not targeting some business professionals or types of employment? For example: technology/software/engineering/etc.

A: The County is looking to accommodate a shift towards a more knowledge-based sector. Several sub-sectors have been identified under the employment land category to support that shift. Apart from industrial-type jobs, employment areas would also include office-type development, which can accommodate knowledge-based sectors. This would likely take the form of multi-tenant small-scale offices, which may increase over time as the market dictates.

Q: We moved here during the pandemic to a smaller community and greener spaces. How will the County refactor employment estimations due to the pandemic's acceleration of distributed workforce workers in the community? Especially for those who work from home?

A: The County is expecting to see a strong rate of growth post-pandemic. There will likely be continued opportunities to work from home and for remote learning. Many industries are pivoting towards a hybrid model of work; however, the County still expects to see on-site office setting employment.

Although the trends for work from home may increase, it can be complicated to track how many people work from home. Even if someone works from home a few days a week under the hybrid mode, they would still be counted as working full time in their office by the census. The County acknowledges that the hybrid model may become more common post-pandemic.

Q: Is there a breakdown of the type of employment that we're targeting?

A: The County classifies employment by sector (industrial, commercial, and institutional) then breaks these down into sub-sectors such as manufacturing, constructing, retail, etc.

The focus of employment allocation is to take a high-level look at these sectors and subsectors and allocate them into more detailed categories related to the land use requirements they need. These employment categories are usually population-related, such as urban employment lands employment and rural employment. The County follows a series of requirements prescribed in the land use assessment methodology to determine these categories.

Q: Mapleton employment is expected to grow at a faster rate than other areas. Why is there not a larger population growth target allocated to Mapleton? Are historical growth rates the primary driver in determining future growth targets? It seems like many built-up areas have had servicing constraints, which halted growth in some of the smaller built-up areas.

A: Urban settlement areas usually have a boundary that can constrain growth due to the surrounding environment, such as being around agricultural land. Land supply was assessed to determine the growth target. There is a lot of mixed employment in Mapleton, including the agricultural sector, rural-based employment, and employment within the urban settlement areas.

General MCR process

Participants raised other questions and comments related to the OP Review and MCR process.

Q: The Township of Centre Wellington's water is identified by The Centre Wellington Tier 3 Water Budget Study as being at significant risk. This presents a limited growth situation due to the uncertainty of the water source. Centre Wellington cannot estimate its capacity for future growth in the next few years. How can growth be targeted to the County of Wellington when water needed to support that growth is uncertain and unsustainable?

A: In terms of long-term projections, growth is broadly driven by many macroeconomic factors. From a servicing standpoint, it is important to identify potential issues that could constrain growth in the long term and address them accordingly. The County is looking into servicing issues as they work through the MCR; however, the County currently has not identified a constraint on growth due to water or wastewater servicing. There will be more opportunities to monitor this 30-year growth process since the Official Plan will be updated in the next 10 years. The County has been actively working with the Township of Centre Wellington, and they have been part of the County's technical team on this matter.

Q: How accurate had previous Official Plan projections been for the current 2020/21 years?

A: It has been quite accurate so far, with 2016 being slightly lower than projected. There was an economic downturn during 2008/9, which affected growth. Now the County is seeing growth accelerating and catching up to the expected growth target set for 2021. Employment is a more difficult factor to track, but it should also be relatively close to current projects.

Q: Does the County have incentives for tech companies to come to Wellington County? Especially when competing with areas like Waterloo and Kitchener?

A: This question would be taken back to the County to inquire with economic development staff. The project team is currently unaware of specific strategic plans and will bring this topic back for further discussions.

Q: Are there any plans to expand the Guelph/Eramosa urban boundary?

A: It is premature to discuss expansion as the current focus is on the Phase 1 report, which focuses on County-wide population, employment and housing. The report does

Wellington County Official Plan Review
Virtual Public Information Centre #1 Summary – June 23, 2021

not go into the specifics of urban land needs. The project team has some preliminary understandings but still needs to wait for a later process when more information is available to provide an accurate answer.

Q: Does the County have any intention to support the Wastewater Treatment Plan in Erin? If so, how much?

A: Currently, the County has no intention to support the Wastewater Treatment Plant, as it is a local municipal responsibility.

Q: How is community water, wastewater, hydro, natural gas and broadband capacity, or ability to service being considered into population growth allocation by location?

A: The County has retained a consultant to conduct high-level municipal servicing analysis. There are no results to share on that analysis yet. The County's current main focus is on water and wastewater service. The Phase 1 Report has also been circulated to hydro, natural gas and other service providers to provide input and feedback.

Q: Are there any plans for the County to take over water or wastewater services? Could cost be reduced if the County took over these services? This is one of the major concerns for Erin residents as the cost is very high.

A: Counties are structured differently than regional government, as in they are not involved with water and wastewater servicing. Reducing cost is currently not under consideration, but the County understands that it is a concern for Erin residents.

The Association of Ontario Municipalities provides a helpful guide to understanding the differences between County and Regional government structures and their associated responsibilities. Learn more at <https://www.amo.on.ca/about-us/municipal-101/ontario-municipalities>

Written Feedback

Following the meeting, the County of Wellington received **20 submissions by email**. The following key points were raised through written feedback:

- Concerns regarding sufficient housing to support a growing population, particularly as the County continues to see regional migration from the core of the Greater Golden Horseshoe to the edges.
- Concerns regarding sufficient water infrastructure and sustainable water supply to service the projected population growth (including considering the risks outlined in the Tier 3 water Budget Study).
 - Concerns were also noted regarding the importance of conducting the OP review considering the impact of growth on watershed and sub-watersheds, natural heritage systems, hazardous lands, and climate change.

Wellington County Official Plan Review
Virtual Public Information Centre #1 Summary – June 23, 2021

- Agricultural systems and agricultural impact assessment should be prioritized in the OP review since future population growth and developments may negatively impact and pose risks to agricultural land loss.
- Suggestion that there could be more considerations and emphasis in the MCR on the Growth Plan policies concerning servicing rural settlements.
- Interest in the County's plans regarding whether urban boundaries will be expanded or not.
- Concerns about lower growth targets and few existing or future Settlement Areas to accommodate growth, and how this will impact the future of these municipalities. Specifically, concerns were raised about targets for Puslinch, Morriston, and Mapleton.
- Suggestion to allow limited growth in rural settlements and clusters that are mapped as part of the Agricultural Area to create opportunities to round out these settlements and allow some limited infilling. Precedents from the Town of Halton Hills (Rural Cluster Areas), the Township of Woolwich (Rural Residential Settlements and Service Settlements), and the Town of Caledon were identified.
- Significant hazard lands were identified for areas within the County presenting lost intensification opportunities that would need to be accommodated elsewhere.

The County of Wellington has documented details included within each of the written submissions for consideration as the Official Plan review progresses.

Additionally the following questions were identified in the written feedback for clarification:

Q: Will archaeological studies or fieldwork will be conducted for the OP review?

A: At this time the County is not intending to conduct a archeologic study as part of the Official Plan Review process. These studies, were deemed necessary, would be carried out at a more site specific level (i.e. through a secondary planning process or site specific development application).

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Jim Faught of LURA Consulting provided participants with the project team's contact information for any additional feedback and wrapped up the meeting. Members of the public can contact the project team by email or by phone at:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Contact | Sarah Wilhelm, Manager Policy Planning |
| Phone | 519-837-2600 ex 2130 |
| Email | planwell@wellington.ca |
| Mailing Address | ATTN Planning Department 74 Woolwich Street Guelph, ON N1H 3T9 |