



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2025-00133

April 15, 2026

OWNER(S): DANIEL BLANCHETTE, 1700 Charles Court, Val Caron, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): CLAUDIA BRISSON, 1700 Charles Court, Val Caron, ON, Canada

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735050706, Parcel 23380 SEC SES SRO, Lot 166, Plan M-462, Part Lot 7, Concession 1, Township of Hanmer, 1700 Charles Court, Val Caron P3N 1H2

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R1-5 according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to permit a circular driveway on the subject property at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, April 10, 2026

- The purpose and effect of the application is to permit a circular driveway with the following variances:
1. a setback of 9.0m for the main building to the street line, where the main building shall be setback at least 15.0m from the street line, and
 2. for each driveway to provide a maximum width of 5.0m at the street line, where the maximum width of each driveway at the street line shall be 4.0m.

The subject lands contain a single detached dwelling and an accessory building. The lands are serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection and have access from Charles Court. Based on google maps, a drainage culvert appears to have be installed on the subject lands between 2009 and 2012, which the applicants refer to and utilize as a second driveway.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'R1-5' Low Density Residential One within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Surrounding uses are low density residential.

The Zoning By-law contains the following provisions on circular driveways:

"5.4.3.3 Provisions for Circular Driveways

a) Circular driveways that include two connected accesses from a lot onto a public road shall not be permitted on lots in a Residential (R) Zone, except where:

i) The lot has a minimum 30.0 metres of lot frontage;

- ii) The main building is setback at least 15.0 metres from the street line;
- iii) The driveways are at least 7.0 metres apart, at the street line;
- iv) The second driveway connects the public road to the other driveway that provides direct access from the public road;
- v) No more than 50% of the area of the front yard is used for driveway purposes;
- vi) The maximum width of each driveway at the street line shall be 4.0 metres;
- vii) The second driveway is not onto an arterial road; and
- viii) The necessary permits have been obtained from the City for the driveway entrance.”

With the exception of the two variances being sought, the applicant meets the remaining criteria for establishing a circular driveway.

Staff have no concerns with recognizing the existing distance of the dwelling from the road. The applicant has demonstrated that no more than 50% of the front yard will be driveway and that more than 50% of the front yard will remain landscaped open space. Staff are satisfied that residential character would be maintained on the subject lands. Due to the lots in the area having 30 m frontages, circular driveways are common, for example, the abutting lands to the east and west of the subject lands have circular driveways. Staff are satisfied that the request would align with the character of the area.

Given the 30 m + of frontage, and the proposed 18 m distance between driveways, staff have no concerns with the request to establish 5 m driveway widths. Sufficient space will remain in between driveways for any short term on street parking. The R1-5 Zone requires a minimum lot frontage of 15 m and one driveway with a maximum width of 6 m. The two proposed driveways with 5 m width each is not anticipated to be more impactful operationally than two 15 m wide parcels each with a 6 m wide driveway.

Staff is of the opinion that the variances are considered to be minor in nature, are an appropriate use of the land, and meet the intent of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is recommended that the application be granted.

Development Engineering, April 10, 2026

Development Engineering does not support the additional driveway width for the circular driveway. A Circular driveway is meant to act as a one way entrance and the width must be limited to 4m to ensure this. Driveway widths within the road allowance must be kept to a minimum to maximize snow storage and temporary on street parking, and reduce the impact on drainage and the road.

Ministry of Transportation, April 9, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's permit control area (PCA); therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Strategic and Environmental Planning, April 9, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997 and Species Conservation Act, 2025, and the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994 and Species At Risk Act, 2002, is their sole responsibility.

Building Services, April 8, 2026

Building Services has no objections to the proposed minor variances. However, based on the information submitted on the plot plan we were unable to verify the following aspects of the Zoning By-law 2010-100Z:

- 1) 4.15.2 - A minimum of 50% of all required front and corner side yards shall be maintained as landscaped open space in Low Density Residential One (R1) or Low Density Residential Two (R2) Zones.
- 2) 5.4.3.3 v) - No more than 50% of the area of the front yard is used for driveway purposes;

Comments provided by A.Dittrich, Plans Examiner
Corridor Management, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Hydro One, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Site Plan, April 8, 2026

No Concerns

Conservation Sudbury, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, April 2, 2026

no concerns - outside our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

04/15/2026 The applicant's agent, Claudia Brisson, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Members and the Chair had no questions and expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DANIEL BLANCHETTE
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735050706, Parcel 23380 SEC SES SRO, Lot 166, Plan M-462, Part Lot 7, Concession 1, Township of Hanmer, 1700 Charles Court, Val Caron P3N 1H2

for relief from Part 5, Section 5.4, subsection 5.4.3.3 ii) and vi) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit a circular driveway on the subject providing, firstly, a setback of 9.0m for the main building to the street line, where the main building shall be setback at least 15.0m from the

street line, and secondly, for each driveway to provide a maximum width of 5.0m at the street line, where the maximum width of each driveway at the street line shall be 4.0m, be approved.

Consideration was given to Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O.1990, c. P.13, as amended, including written and oral submissions related to the Application, it is our opinion the variances are minor in nature and is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land and Buildings. The general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan are maintained.

As no public comment, written or oral, has been received, there was no effect on the Committee of Adjustment's decision.

Member	Status
CATHY CASTANZA	Absent
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00030

April 15, 2026

OWNER(S): MIKE BOUILLON, 37 Sleepy Hollow Rd, Whitefish, ON, Canada P0M3E0

AGENT(S): MIKE BOUILLON, 37 Sleepy Hollow Rd, Whitefish, ON, Canada P0M3E0

LOCATION: PIN(s) 733950301, Parcel 26326 SEC SWS, Part Lot 1, Concession 6, as in LT441327, Township of Lorne, 37 Sleepy Hollow Road, Whitefish P0M 3H0

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned RU according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to permit two mobile homes dwelling units on the subject property at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Building Services, April 9, 2026

Building Services has no objections to the proposed minor variances.

Owner to note that Building Services acknowledges receipt of the building permit, BP-NEW-2025-01745, for both of these mobile home dwellings.

Comments provided by A.Dittrich, Plans Examiner

Development Approvals, April 9, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to permit two mobile home dwelling units, where a maximum of one mobile dwelling unit is permitted.

The subject lands contain three accessory buildings and are otherwise vacant of buildings or structures. The lands will be serviced by an individual well and septic system, and have existing access from Sleepy Hollow Road.

The subject lands are designated 'Rural' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, are zoned 'RU', Rural within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law, and are regulated by Conservation Sudbury (NDCA).

Surrounding uses are rural in nature.

The 'RU' Zone permits one mobile home dwelling as a main use or one mobile home dwelling as an

accessory dwelling unit. The definition of mobile home park is “A lot containing two or more mobile home dwellings on separate mobile home sites, with or without buildings, structures or uses accessory thereto including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, a mobile home dealership”. Staff are satisfied that the request to establish two mobile homes is not intended to be a mobile home park and the requested variance would limit the number of mobile home dwellings to two. The applicant has advised that the mobile homes would be for himself and his aging parents.

The applicant has advised that the mobile home dwellings would be placed on permanent concrete foundations. Staff are satisfied that the request is appropriate and would not be out of character with the rural area, which does permit two stand alone residential dwellings. As an advisory comment, MTO permits are required for the development proposal.

Staff is of the opinion that the variance is considered to be minor in nature, is an appropriate use of the land, and meets the intent of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is recommended that the application be granted.

Ministry of Transportation, April 9, 2026

I can confirm that the subject property is located within the MTO's permit control area (PCA); and therefore, is subject for review under the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement act R.S.O. 1990 and will require proper MTO permits. I am prepared to offer the following comments:

An MTO Building/Land Use Permit is required for the placement of any new buildings/structures as well as any site grading/paving taking place on the subject property.

Please direct any permit inquiries to Michelle Lavallee, Corridor Management Officer, at Michelle.Lavallee@ontario.ca.

Strategic and Environmental Planning, April 9, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997 and Species Conservation Act, 2025, and the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994 and Species At Risk Act, 2002, is their sole responsibility.

Corridor Management, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, April 8, 2026

No Concerns

Hydro One, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Conservation Sudbury, April 7, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, April 2, 2026

no concerns - outside our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

04/15/2026 The applicant, Mike Bouillon, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Members and the Chair had no questions and expressed support for the Application and staff recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
MIKE BOUILLON
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 733950301, Parcel 26326 SEC SWS, Part Lot 1, Concession 6, as in LT441327, Township of Lorne, 37 Sleepy Hollow Road, Whitefish P0M 3H0

for relief from Part 9, Section 9.2, Table 9.2, Special Provision #1 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit two mobile home dwelling units, where a maximum of one mobile dwelling unit is permitted, be approved.

Consideration was given to Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O.1990, c. P.13, as amended, including written and oral submissions related to the application, it is our opinion the variance is minor in nature and is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land. The general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan are maintained.

As no public comment, written or oral, has been received, there was no effect on the Committee of Adjustment's decision.

Member	Status
CATHY CASTANZA	Absent
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00034

April 15, 2026

OWNER(S): MARC ARSENEAULT, 1195 Wilfred Street, Hanmer, ON, Canada P2B3C8
 ROXANNE LEGAULT-ARSENEAULT, 1195 Wilfred Street, Hanmer, Ontario, Canada P3P 1S2

AGENT(S): MARC ARSENEAULT, 1195 Wilfred Street, Hanmer, ON, Canada P2B3C8

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735043247, Lot 199, Plan M-1115, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 1195 Wilfred Street, Hanmer P3P 1S2

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R1-5 according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to construct an attached porch with eaves on the existing dwelling providing yard encroachments and setbacks at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, April 10, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a 20.3 m2 attached porch at the rear of the existing dwelling providing a 3.0m setback from the rear lot line with eaves encroaching an additional 0.6m into the proposed 3.0m setback, where porches may encroach 2.4 m into the required 7.5m rear yard and where eaves may encroach 1.2 m into the required 7.5m rear yard but not closer than 0.6 m to the lot line.

The subject lands contain a single detached dwelling. The lands will be serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection and have an access from Wilfred Street.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, are zoned 'R1-5', Low Density Residential One within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law, and are regulated by Conservation Sudbury (NDCA).

Surrounding uses are low density residential in nature.

The lands are irregular in shape with frontage along Schreyer Street to the west and frontage along Wilfred Street to the north. The subject lands contain an easement along the eastern lot line. Staff have no concerns with the proposed location of the covered porch as adequate space will be maintained for access and maintenance purposes and sufficient rear yard amenity space will remain.

Staff is of the opinion that the variance is considered to be minor in nature, is an appropriate use of the land, and meets the intent of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is recommended that the application be granted.

Ministry of Transportation, April 9, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's permit control area (PCA); therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Strategic and Environmental Planning, April 9, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997 and Species Conservation Act, 2025, and the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994 and Species At Risk Act, 2002, is their sole responsibility.

Building Services, April 8, 2026

Based on the information provided, Building Services has no concerns with this application.

For the Owner's information Building Services has the following comments,

1. Building Services acknowledges an associated building permit application (BP-NEW-2026-00265) for the proposed construction.

Corridor Management, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, April 8, 2026

The roof must be complete with eaves troughs and the variance would permit both the structure and its eaves troughs to be 0.6m from the lot line. Downspouts must be discharged towards the interior of the property and not towards the adjacent property.

Hydro One, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Conservation Sudbury, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, April 2, 2026

no concerns - outside our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

04/15/2026 The applicant, Marc Arseneault, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Members and the Chair had no questions and expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
MARC ARSENEAULT AND ROXANNE LEGAULT-ARSENEAULT
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735043247, Lot 199, Plan M-1115, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 1195 Wilfred Street, Hanmer P3P 1S2

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.5, Table 4.1 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of a 20.3 sq. m attached porch at the rear of the existing dwelling providing a 3.0m setback from the rear lot line with eaves encroaching an additional 0.6m into the proposed 3.0m setback, where porches may encroach 2.4 m into the required 7.5m rear yard and where eaves may encroach 1.2 m into the required 7.5m rear yard but not closer than 0.6 m to the lot line, be granted.

Consideration was given to Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O.1990, c. P.13, as amended, including written and oral submissions related to the application, it is our opinion the variance is minor in nature and is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land. The general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan are maintained.

As no public comment, written or oral, has been received, there was no effect on the Committee of Adjustment's decision.

Member	Status
CATHY CASTANZA	Absent
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00033

April 15, 2026

OWNER(S): APRIL DAHMER, 14 Randolph Road, Whitefish, ON, Canada P0M3E0
JORDAN DAHMER, 14 Randolph Road, Whitefish, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): APRIL DAHMER, 14 Randolph Road, Whitefish, ON, Canada P0M3E0

LOCATION: PIN(s) 733960256, Parcel 29943 SEC SWS SRO, Part Lot 1, Concession 6, Part 1, Plan 53R-13097, Township of Louise, 0 Island Road, Whitefish, ON

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned RU according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to construct a detached accessory building providing a height at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, April 9, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a detached garage providing a maximum height of 7.4m, where the height of any building or structure accessory to a residential dwelling shall be 6.5m.

The subject lands are vacant of buildings and structures. The lands will be serviced by an individual well and septic system, and will be accessed from Island Road.

The subject lands are designated 'Rural' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'RU', Rural within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Surrounding uses are rural in nature.

The applicant has not provided a rational for the requested additional height.

The accessory building is proposed to be located in the front yard, approximately 42 m from the front lot line. The accessory building is proposed to exceed the height of the single detached dwelling by 1 m, however, will be 2 m² smaller in ground floor area. The subject lands appear to contain vegetation which would act as a visual buffer from the road. Staff are satisfied that the building will appear to be accessory to the single detached dwelling and maintain the residential character of the subject lands.

Staff is of the opinion that the variance is considered to be minor in nature, is an appropriate use of the land, and meets the intent of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is recommended that the application be granted.

Ministry of Transportation, April 9, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's permit control area (PCA); therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Strategic and Environmental Planning, April 9, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997 and Species Conservation Act, 2025, and the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994 and Species At Risk Act, 2002, is their sole responsibility.

Building Services, April 8, 2026

Based on the information provided, Building Services has no concerns with this application. Applicant/Owner to be advised of the following comments:

1) We acknowledge the receipt of associated building permit (BP-NEW-2026-00191) for the construction of a single family dwelling & (BP-NEW-2026-00192) for the construction of the proposed detached garage.

Corridor Management, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, April 8, 2026

No Concerns

Hydro One, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Conservation Sudbury, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, April 2, 2026

no concerns - outside our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

04/15/2026 The applicant, April Dahmer, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
Committee Members and the Chair had no questions and expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
APRIL DAHMER AND JORDAN DAHMER
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 733960256, Parcel 29943 SEC SWS SRO, Part Lot 1, Concession 6, Part 1, Plan 53R-13097, Township of Louise, 0 Island Road, Whitefish, ON

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.4 b) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of a detached garage providing a maximum height of 7.4m, where the height of any building or structure accessory to a residential dwelling shall be 6.5m, be granted.

Consideration was given to Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O.1990, c. P.13, as amended, including written and oral submissions related to the application, it is our opinion the variance is minor in nature and is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land. The general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan are maintained.

As no public comment, written or oral, has been received, there was no effect on the Committee of Adjustment's decision.

Member	Status
CATHY CASTANZA	Absent
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00032

April 15, 2026

OWNER(S): TJ HEREAULT, 1349 Lasalle Blvd, Sudbury, ON, Canada
AGENT(S): CR DESIGN, 2200 - 3609 Lakeshore Blvd West, Toronto, ON, Canada M8V1A4
LOCATION: PIN(s) 733700017, Parcel 53M1204-9 SEC SWS SRO, Lot 9, Plan 53M-1204, Part Lot 4, Concession 6, Township of Snider, 1926 Fire Route O, Azilda P0M 1B0

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned SLS(2) according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to construct a detached garage providing a height at variance to the By-law, and permit an existing shed providing a high water mark setback, shoreline structure and shoreline buffer at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, April 9, 2026

- The purpose and effect of the application is to permit accessory buildings with the following variances:
1. a maximum height of 7.32m for a proposed detached garage, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure on a residential lot shall be 5.0m;
2. a high water mark setback of 10.97m for the existing shed, where no person shall erect any residential building or other accessory building or structure closer than 30.0m;
3. to permit a shed within the shoreline buffer area, whereas only gazebos, boathouses, docks, decks, stairs, water pumps, saunas, boat launches, marine railways, waterlines and heat pump loops are permitted within the shoreline buffer area; and
4. the shoreline buffer to be cleared to a maximum of 344.0 sq. m (25%), where on any residential lot the shoreline buffer area is permitted to be cleared of natural vegetation to a maximum of 25%, but in no case shall exceed a maximum of 276.0 sq. m.

The subject lands contain a seasonal dwelling, deck, sauna, and shed. The lands will be serviced by an individual well and septic system, and have access onto Fire Route O, being a private road.

The subject lands are designated 'Rural' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, are zoned 'SLS(2)', Seasonal Limited Service Special within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law, and are regulated by Conservation Sudbury (NDCA).

Surrounding uses are seasonal and rural in nature.

Staff have no concerns with the requested height for the proposed garage in order to accommodate RV and boat storage accessory to the seasonal dwelling use. The garage is proposed to be setback 57 m from the front lot line being the shoreline and 92 m from the travelled portion of the private road.

Staff recognize the existing clearance of 344 m² and that the proposal is not seeking to further reduce the clearance levels.

The intent of the shoreline buffer and setback policies is to protect waterbody quality and waterbody ecosystems.

The Official Plan includes policies that identify criteria for when relief to shoreline zoning standards are justified being:

- a) sufficient lot depth is not available;
- b) terrain or soil conditions exist which make other locations on the lot less suitable;
- c) the proposal is for an addition to an existing building or replacement of a leaching bed where the setback is not further reduced; or.
- d) redevelopment is proposed on an existing lot and a net improvement is achieved.

Staff are of the opinion that the applicant has not demonstrated meeting one of the above criteria for the existing shed and that there appears to be alternative locations outside of the 30 m high water mark to place the shed.

It is recommended that the following variances be denied as they do not meet the intent of the Official Plan:

2. a high water mark setback of 10.97m for the existing shed, where no person shall erect any residential building or other accessory building or structure closer than 30.0m; and
3. to permit a shed within the shoreline buffer area, whereas only gazebos, boathouses, docks, decks, stairs, water pumps, saunas, boat launches, marine railways, waterlines and heat pump loops are permitted within the shoreline buffer area.

It is recommended that the following variances be granted as they are considered to be minor in nature, an appropriate use of the land, and meet the intent of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law:

1. a maximum height of 7.32m for a proposed detached garage, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure on a residential lot shall be 5.0m; and
4. the shoreline buffer to be cleared to a maximum of 344.0 sq. m (25%), where on any residential lot the shoreline buffer area is permitted to be cleared of natural vegetation to a maximum of 25%, but in no case shall exceed a maximum of 276.0 sq. m.

Ministry of Transportation, April 9, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's permit control area (PCA); therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Strategic and Environmental Planning, April 9, 2026

Staff in SEP have reviewed the proposed minor variance application. The proposed garage is outside of the 30.0 metres highwater mark setback and not within a natural heritage feature. As such, staff do not object to the variance related to the proposed garage.

With regards to the existing shed, the City's Official Plan allows for reductions to the highwater setback in the following circumstances:

- a. sufficient lot depth is not available;
- b. terrain or soil conditions exist which make other locations on the lot less suitable;
- c. the proposal is for an addition to an existing building or replacement of a leaching bed where the setback is

not further reduced; or
d. redevelopment is proposed on an existing lot and a net improvement is achieved.

Staff in SEP note that the proposed shed, although existing, does not meet any of the above noted criteria.

The applicant is advised that compliance with the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997 and Species Conservation Act, 2025, and the federal Fisheries Act, 1985; Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994; and, Species At Risk Act, 2002 is their sole responsibility.

Building Services, April 8, 2026

Based on the information provided, Applicant/Owner to be advised of the following comments:

1) A building permit and documents will be required to be completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official for the proposed detached garage.

2) Our research indicates that a sauna was constructed after 2017 without benefit of a building permit. A building permit and documents will be required to be completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Corridor Management, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, April 8, 2026

No Concerns

Hydro One, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Conservation Sudbury, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, April 2, 2026

no concerns - outside our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

04/15/2026 The applicant's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and at the request of the Chair commented on the partial approval and requested a decision for the shed. Area resident, Kim Campbell of 1938 Fire Route O, appeared before Committee and expressed concern about the garage's proximity to the shared lot line. The agent advised that the owner would make best efforts to move the garage further from the lot line. Committee Member Goswell requested staff to explain the resolution, and the Secretary Treasurer provided an explanation on the partial approval and the resolution that would be presented to Committee. He requested clarification on the motion process, and the Secretary Treasurer clarified the procedure that Committee could follow if a motion was put forward. Committee Member Sawchuk referred to staff's comments, commented on the shed and expressed support for staff's recommendation. He addressed the neighbour's comments, suggested that buffering could be provided and expressed support for a deferral. Committee Member Murray expressed pleasure that the owner was willing to work with the neighbour and asked the agent why the shed could not be moved. The agent clarified which variances were supported in response to Committee Member Sawchuk's comments, suggested that the shed should remain as the existing sauna was permitted and requested a decision from Committee. Committee Member Murray requested the agent to speak to the four tests in relation to the shed. The agent advised Committee that the shed was used to house recreation equipment, was small in size, does not affect neighbours and that the Conservation Authority was not opposed to its location. Committee Member Murray expressed support for staff's recommendation. Committee Chair Dumont expressed support for the Application, clarified the size of the shed and Building Services' comments with the agent. He commented on the shed's use, the Conservation Authority and Strategic and Environmental Planning's comments and suggested that the impact was minor. Committee Member Sawchuk expressed support for a motion to approve the shed. Committee Chair Dumont put forward a motion to approve the variances associated with the shed and Committee Member Goswell seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
TJ HEREAULT

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 733700017, Parcel 53M1204-9 SEC SWS SRO, Lot 9, Plan 53M-1204, Part Lot 4, Concession 6, Township of Snider, 1926 Fire Route O, Azilda P0M 1B0

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.4 a) and Section 4.41, subsections 4.41.2, 4.41.3 and 4.41.4 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury as amended, for the following, firstly, the construction of a detached garage providing a maximum height of 7.32m, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure on a residential lot shall be 5.0m, secondly, permit an existing shed providing a high water mark setback of 10.97m, where no person shall erect any residential building or other accessory building or structure closer than 30.0m to the high water mark of a lake and where the only permitted structures within 20.0m of the high water mark of a lake are the permitted accessory structures set out in 4.41.2 of the Zoning By-law, boat launches, marine railways, waterlines and heat pump loops, and thirdly, the shoreline buffer to be cleared to a maximum of 344.0 sq. m (25%), where on any residential lot the shoreline buffer area is permitted to be cleared of natural vegetation to a maximum of 25%, but in no case shall exceed a maximum of 276.0 sq. m, be granted.

Consideration was given to Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O.1990, c. P.13, as amended, including written and oral submissions related to the Application, it is our opinion the variances are minor in nature and is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land and Buildings. The general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan are maintained.

Public comment has been received and considered and had no effect on Committee of Adjustment's decision as the application represents good planning.

Member	Status
CATHY CASTANZA	Absent
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring