



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2025-00003

March 19, 2025

OWNER(S): SALVATION ARMY SUDBURY, 634 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): BELANGER SALACH ARCHITECTURE, 255 Larch Street, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada P3B1M2

LOCATION: PIN(s) 022450356 and 022450357, Firstly: Lot 3, Plan 85-S and Part Lot 6, Plan 85-S, being Part 1, Plan 53R-16668; Secondly: Part Lot 17, Plan M-7B, being Part 2, Plan 53R-16668, and being Parts 5 & 6, Plan 53R-9714, Part Lots 4 and 5, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 634 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury P3C 5L2

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned C2(64) according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to reconstruct the existing building providing an increase in gross floor area within the required front yard and reduced parking spaces at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Sudbury Hydro, March 13, 2025

No Objections.

Building Services, March 12, 2025

Building Services has reviewed your documents and sketches for the requested minor variances and can advise that we have the following comments:

We have no concerns with the requested variances as listed.

Applicant to be advised that a Building Permit will be required for the re-construction of the building, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official. Building Services may have further comments at time

of fulsome plans examination.

Development Approvals, March 12, 2025

The purpose and effect of the application is to permit the reconstruction and enlargement of a building with an existing front yard setback of 5.46 m, whereas enlargement, reconstruction, repair and/or renovation shall not increase the gross floor area of a building or structure within the minimum front yard setback of 15 m. It is noted that there will be no changes to the front, side, or rear yard setbacks from the existing building to the reconstructed proposed building, however, the building will go from 1 storey in height to 2 stories in height. Staff have no concerns with maintaining the existing front yard setback with the proposed reconstruction and enlargement of the building.

The subject lands are designated 'Mixed Use Commercial' and 'Parks and Recreation' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, zoned 'C2(64)' General Commercial Special within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law, and regulated by the Nickel District Conservation Authority (NDCA).

The following site-specific standards came into effect as part of a rezoning application to establish medical offices/pharmacy use:

Notwithstanding any other provision hereof to the contrary, within any area designated C2(64) on the Zone Maps, all provisions of this Bylaw applicable to C2 Zones shall apply subject to the following modifications:

- (i) Restaurants, hotels and taverns shall not be permitted.
- (ii) 36 parking spaces shall be required for the existing building.
- (iii) Parts 1 and 2 on Plan 53R-16668 shall be used only for parking.

The lands are subject to a site plan agreement from 1991 and are in the process of revising the site plan to reflect the Salvation Army use. Given that the applicant is renovating the existing building, the 36 parking spaces is applicable even with the change of use. The applicant has requested relief to permit 26 parking spaces where 36 are required.

Although the 36 spaces apply, staff have evaluated the impact of the proposed amount of parking against the current parking standards for assembly use which requires 1 parking space per 6 persons capacity. Based on this standard and the amount of spaces provided, enough parking for 156 person capacity has been provided. It is noted that the capacity of the building has not yet been confirmed as building permits have not been submitted, however, in consultation with Building Services it is anticipated that sufficient parking has been provided for the proposed use. Additionally, it is noted that the lands abut a transit route, with the nearest stop being approximately 30 m north along Notre Dame Avenue. Staff are satisfied that the proposed 26 spaces will be adequate for the intended use.

Staff are of the opinion that the variances are considered to be minor in nature, are 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.

Linear Infrastructure Services, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Ministry of Transportation, March 12, 2025

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

Strategic and Environmental Planning, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Development Engineering, March 11, 2025

No Concerns

Site Plan, March 10, 2025

No Concerns

Conservation Sudbury, March 6, 2025

Conservation Sudbury has no objection to the requested minor variance. Subject property is completely within a floodplain of Junction Creek. However, design requirements as they relate to the floodplain are being addressed through the Site Plan Control Agreement process.

Meeting Minutes:

03/19/2025 The applicant's agent, Amber Salach of Belanger Salach Architecture, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she attended the site and had no issues with the Application. Committee Member Goswell requested the agent to explain design elements of the building and the agent explained what they were and their purpose. Committee Member Goswell expressed support for the Application. Committee Members Sawchuk and Murray and Committee Chair Dumont expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

SALVATION ARMY SUDBURY

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 022450356 and 022450357, Firstly: Lot 3, Plan 85-S and Part Lot 6, Plan 85-S, being Part 1, Plan 53R-16668; Secondly: Part Lot 17, Plan M-7B, being Part 2, Plan 53R-16668, and being Parts 5 & 6, Plan 53R-9714, Part Lots 4 and 5, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 634 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury P3C 5L2

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.25, subsection 4.25.1 b) and Part 11, Section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (III), clause (ii) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the reconstruction of the existing building providing, firstly, an increase in gross floor area within the required front yard, where enlargement, reconstruction, repair and/or renovation shall not increase the gross floor area of a building or structure located within the minimum required front yard, and secondly, 26 parking spaces, where 36 parking spaces are required, 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.

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	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2025-00008

March 19, 2025

OWNER(S): 2810373 ONTARIO INC., 162 Mackenzie Street, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3C4X8
AGENT(S): J.L. RICHARDS & ASSOCIATES LIMITED, 314 Countryside Dr, Sudbury, ON, Canada
LOCATION: PIN(s) 735860343, Lots 7-10, 17 and 18, Plan 8-SA, Parts 6-8, Plan SR-3338, Part Lot 7, Concession 3, Township of McKim, 40 Eyre Street, Sudbury P3C 4A5

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned C2(125) according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to permit the existing building to provide loading space setbacks and reduced planting strips at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Transportation, March 13, 2025

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

Sudbury Hydro, March 13, 2025

No Objections.

Development Approvals, March 12, 2025

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the change of use of an existing building to a light manufacturing use producing electronics, videos and 3D scanning solutions and related accessory uses with the following variances:

1. A loading space with a setback of 7.65 m to the front lot line, whereas a setback a 10 m is

required and a setback of 4.25 m to a residential zone boundary, whereas 10 m is required; and 2. A 0 m planting strip abutting the residential zone on the eastern property line, whereas a 3 m planting strip is required.

The subject lands are designated 'Institutional' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'C2(125)' General Commercial Special within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

The lands are subject to a Site Plan Control application which is in process.

Staff are of the understanding that the requested relief is being sought due to the location of the existing building and garage door in terms of maintaining accessibility into and around the building.

Staff are of the opinion that the variances are considered to be minor in nature, are 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.

Linear Infrastructure Services, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Building Services, March 11, 2025

For relief from Part 4, Section 4.15, subsection 4.15.4 a) i) and Part 5, Section 5.6.5 e) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit the existing building and site conditions on the subject property providing, firstly, no planting strips adjacent to 27 and 37 Regent Street as indicated on the Site Plan submitted with the Application, where a 3.0m wide planting strip adjacent to the full length of the lot line is required, and secondly, a loading space front yard setback of 7.65m and a minimum residential zone boundary setback of 4.25m, where a minimum 10.0m setback from any street line and residential zone boundary is required.

Previously subject to Consent Applications B0987/1970 (Aug 10/70) and B0988/1970 (Aug 10/70) and Minor Variance Application A0124/2009 (Nov 02/09)

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

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 change of use and any proposed construction.
- 2) Retaining walls measuring 1.0m or higher require a separate building permit application to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Development Engineering, March 11, 2025

No Concerns

Site Plan, March 10, 2025

No Concerns

Conservation Sudbury, March 5, 2025

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

03/19/2025 The applicant's authorized agent, James Henderson, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she attended the site and had no issues with the Application. She expressed satisfaction that the building was being repurposed.
Committee Member Goswell commended the Applicant for the work on the building and expressed support for the Application.
Committee Members Sawchuk and Murray and Committee Chair Dumont expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
2810373 ONTARIO INC.

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735860343, Lots 7-10, 17 and 18, Plan 8-SA, Parts 6-8, Plan SR-3338, Part Lot 7, Concession 3, Township of McKim, 40 Eyre Street, Sudbury P3C 4A5

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.15, subsection 4.15.4 a) i) and Part 5, Section 5.6.5 e) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit the existing building and site conditions on the subject property providing, firstly, no planting strips adjacent to 27 and 37 Regent Street as indicated on the Site Plan submitted with the Application, where a 3.0m wide planting strip adjacent to the full length of the lot line is required, and secondly, a loading space front yard setback of 7.65m and a minimum residential zone boundary setback of 4.25m, where a minimum 10.0m setback from any street line and residential zone boundary is required, 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.

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	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2025-00009

March 19, 2025

OWNER(S): SYLVIO VACHON, 4521 Whitewater Lake Road, Azilda, ON, Canada
COLETTE AUBIN, 4521 Whitewater Lake Road, Azilda, Ontario, Canada P0M 1B0

AGENT(S): 3RD LINE STUDIO, 289 Cedar St, 3rd Fl, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3B 1M8

LOCATION: PIN(s) 733460895, Parcel 27440 SEC SWS SRO, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Part 3, Plan 53R-9375, Township of Rayside, 390 Marier Street, Azilda P0M 1B0

SUMMARY

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

Application: To permit the construction of a detached accessory building containing an additional dwelling unit providing an increase in the total number of permitted additional dwelling units on the subject property at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Transportation, March 13, 2025

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

Sudbury Hydro, March 13, 2025

Outside of our territory.

Development Approvals, March 12, 2025

The purpose and effect of the application is to permit a single detached dwelling with two dwelling units (one in single detached, one in accessory building) for a total of three dwelling units, whereas

only a single detached dwelling with one additional unit (either in single detached OR accessory building) is permitted on a rural residential parcel of land. A rural residential parcel of land is defined as a partially or unserviced lot that is inside or outside of a settlement area on which a dwelling, other than an accessory dwelling unit, is permitted by by-law.

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

Its staff's understanding that the applicant was in the process of completing works to establish a 3rd dwelling unit on the subject lands, which was previously permitted under the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and Zoning By-law, however, did not submit a building permit. In response to Bill 23 changes (November 28 2022), staff completed an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment to bring the policies into conformity with the Planning Act which came into effect in November 2024. The applicant's proposal no longer conforms to the Official Plan or Zoning By-law and was advised that a planning application was required. The applicant opted to apply for a Minor Variance.

Is the variance minor in nature?

Staff are of the opinion that the proposed variance is considered to be minor in nature as it is not anticipated to impact surrounding land uses.

Is the variance an appropriate use of the land?

Staff are of the opinion that the variance is an appropriate use of the lands as the applicant has demonstrated sufficient services for 3 units, a shared driveway, and have met locational criteria for an additional dwelling unit in an accessory building.

Does the variance meet the intent of the Official Plan?

The Official Plan permits a total of two dwelling units on rural residential parcels of land. The permitted options are to have one single detached dwelling containing an additional dwelling unit in the single detached dwelling OR one single detached dwelling with an additional dwelling unit in an accessory building. The requested variance does not meet the intent of the additional dwelling unit provisions within the City's Official Plan, which does not permit three units on rural residential parcels of land.

Does the variance meet the intent of the Zoning By-law?

The Zoning By-law contains similar permissions on additional dwelling units found in the Official Plan. Staff are of the opinion that the 3rd proposed unit does not meet the intent of the zoning by-law which limits the number of dwelling units on rural residential parcels of land.

It is recommended that the application be denied as the application does not meet the intent of the Official Plan or Zoning By-law.

Linear Infrastructure Services, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Building Services, March 11, 2025

No Concerns

Conservation Sudbury, March 11, 2025

Conservation Sudbury has no objection to Minor Variance MV-2025-00009 to allow an additional dwelling unit.

Subject property contains regulated features including floodplain. Proposed development is located outside of these regulated areas.

Development Engineering, March 11, 2025

No Concerns

Site Plan, March 7, 2025

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

03/19/2025 The applicant's agent, Vanessa Vachon of 3rdLine Studio, appeared before Committee and at the request of Committee Chair Dumont provided a summary of the Application addressing the timing of the building permits and delays. Committee Chair Dumont asked staff when the new policies came into effect and staff provided the dates of when the policies were put into effect by the Province and the City. The agent advised Committee the steps that the applicant took in preparation of developing the third unit including the septic system and servicing. Committee Chair Dumont asked the agent why they were seeking a minor variance rather than a rezoning and the agent advised that staff recommended seeking a minor variance. Committee Member Castanza had no questions. Committee Member Goswell asked staff to explain how servicing affects the Application and staff explained the changes in the policies relating to definitions, urban and non-urban areas and how those effect the permitted uses for the subject property. Committee Member Goswell asked staff to explain the logic and staff explained how local policies must conform to Provincial legislation and policies, residential growth and efficiencies and prevention of urban sprawl. Committee Member Goswell commented on housing shortages, the applicant's investment in the dwelling, the change in by-laws and Committee's discretion on the Application.

03/19/2025 Committee Member Sawchuk asked staff for the definition of a dwelling unit, and Committee Chair Dumont asked staff to also provide the definition for additional dwelling unit. Staff read the definition of dwelling unit from the City's Zoning By-law and explained what the permitted uses were on the property. Committee Member Sawchuk asked staff to explain the definition relating to single detached and use, and staff explained what was permitted on the property and the Zoning By-law's limitations on criteria for appearance relating to semi-detached and single detached. Committee Member Sawchuk asked staff about converted granny suites to units. Staff provided an explanation on temporary use conversions to permanent use and the requirement of a main use and the permitted ancillary features.

Committee Chair Dumont asked Committee Member Sawchuk if his concerns related to the single detached appearing like a semi and Committee Member Sawchuk confirmed that was correct. Committee Chair Dumont asked staff what the servicing was on the property and staff advised that it was partially serviced. The agent confirmed that the property was on municipal water. Committee Chair Dumont asked staff if the servicing affected the permitted use due to built form. The agent advised Committee that a semi was not permitted, and that the additional dwelling unit was 10% smaller than the main dwelling unit. Committee Chair Dumont asked staff to explain the different dwelling unit types and staff explained what currently exists, what was permitted and what was being requested.

Committee Member Sawchuk asked staff why a semi was not allowed, and staff explained the permitted uses in the rural zoned areas and why. Staff also advised Committee that the single detached dwelling and additional dwelling unit already exists. Committee Member Sawchuk asked staff why a semi was not permitted but what exists was. Committee Chair Dumont provided Committee with a history of the legislated changes. Committee Member Sawchuk advised Committee that he was open to hearing their thoughts.

Committee Member Murray advised Committee that he was opposed to staff's recommendation.

Committee Chair Dumont advised Committee that he would support a motion to overturn staff's recommendation. He cautioned Committee about comments relating to a dwelling unit with an additional dwelling unit versus a semi in a rural setting. He explained his understanding of the legislated changes, servicing and why he was supportive of changing the recommendation.

Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she supported Committee Chair Dumont.

Committee Member Goswell advised Committee that would support overturning the denial as the applicant acted in good faith, invested money, obtained approval from the Sudbury and District Health Unit and installed septic and hydro to support the unit.

Committee Member Sawchuk requested procedure clarification, and the Chair outlined the process with confirmation from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Committee Member Murray acknowledged that the existing dwelling was not a semi-detached dwelling.

Committee Member Goswell put forth a motion to amend the resolution to grant the Application, which was seconded by Committee Member Murray. The motion was supported and carried.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

SYLVIO VACHON AND COLETTE AUBIN

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 733460895, Parcel 27440 SEC SWS SRO, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Part 3, Plan 53R-9375, Township of Rayside, 390 Marier Street, Azilda P0M 1B0

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.10.1 (v) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit the construction of a detached garage containing an additional dwelling unit, where the existing single detached dwelling currently contains an additional dwelling unit, and where no more than one dwelling unit is permitted in a building or structure accessory to a single detached dwelling on a parcel of rural residential land, if the single detached dwelling contains no more than one dwelling unit, 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	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2025-00011

March 19, 2025

OWNER(S): NICHOLAS FOLIGNO, 2106 South Shore Road, Greater Sudbury, ON, Canada
JANELLE FOLIGNO, 2106 South Shore Road, Greater Sudbury, Ontario, Canada
P3G M3

AGENT(S): TULLOCH, 131 Fielding Road, Greater Sudbury, ON, Canada

LOCATION: PIN(s) 734720263, Location CL12452, being Parts 3 and 4, Plan 53R-19666, Part Lot 11, Concession 2, Township of Broder, 2106 South Shore Road, Sudbury P3G 1M3

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R1-1 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:

Corridor Management, March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), March 13, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Transportation, March 13, 2025

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

Sudbury Hydro, March 13, 2025

Contact GSHI if disconnect or service upgrade is required.

Building Services, March 12, 2025

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 permit and building permit documents to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official, is required for the proposed accessory structure (detached garage).

2) A search of our records indicates there is a Building Permit which has not been completed. Owner shall contact Building Services to discuss outstanding items. Building Permit No. B11-2265

Development Approvals, March 12, 2025

The purpose and effect of the application is to permit an accessory building with a height of 9 m, whereas the maximum permitted is 5 m.

The subject lands contain a single detached dwelling and an accessory building. The subject lands are serviced by lake water and a septic system and have access from South Shore Road.

The subject lands are designated 'Rural' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, are zoned 'R1-1' Low Density Residential One within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law, and are regulated by the Nickel District Conservation Authority (NDCA).

Surrounding uses are rural and residential in nature.

Accessory is defined within the Zoning By-law as "a use, separate building or structure, which is usually incidental, subordinate, exclusively devoted to and located on the same lot as the principal use, building or structure and, in the case of a building or structure, may or may not be attached to the main building on the same lot."

The subject lands have an area of 15,861 m² which is larger than the minimum lot area requirement of 4,000 m² in the R1-1 Zone. The maximum lot coverage for all buildings and structures is 25% and the maximum lot coverage for all accessory buildings and structures is 10%. Given the size of the residential lot, the applicant will remain under the maximum lot coverage as a result of the proposed 454.2 m² accessory building in addition to the existing accessory building.

The main use of the subject lands is the single detached dwelling which as a ground floor area of 354 m² and a height of 11 m. Although the proposed accessory building will exceed the main dwelling in size, it will be subordinate in height. Staff are satisfied that the use will be accessory to the residential use as the applicants advised it would be used for personal storage purposes. The subject lands contain a natural vegetative buffer along the frontage of the property abutting South Shore Road and are maintaining the front yard setback. The proposed building will be located outside of the high water mark, closer to the road than the dwelling.

As an advisory note, commercial businesses, commercial storage, and contractor yards are not permitted.

Given the characteristics and location of the subject land, staff are of the opinion that the variance is considered to be minor in nature, is an appropriate use of the lands, and meets the intent of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is recommended that the application be granted.

Linear Infrastructure Services, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, March 12, 2025

No Concerns

Development Engineering, March 11, 2025

No Concerns

Conservation Sudbury, March 10, 2025

No objection to MV-2025-00011 with regards to the garage.

Subject property contains areas regulated by Conservation Sudbury. However, garage is located outside of these areas. Future development in regulated areas requires permission of Conservation Sudbury.

Site Plan, March 7, 2025

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

03/19/2025 The applicant's agent, Aaron Ariganello of Tulloch Engineering, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee had no questions or concerns and expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

NICHOLAS FOLIGNO AND JANELLE FOLIGNO

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 734720263, Location CL12452, being Parts 3 and 4, Plan 53R-19666, Part Lot 11, Concession 2, Township of Broder, 2106 South Shore Road, Sudbury P3G 1M3

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.4 a) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of detached garage providing a maximum height of 9.0m, where the maximum height of any accessory building on a residential lot shall be 5.0m, 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	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring