



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00002

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): GERRY PERFETTO, 3248 CKSO Road, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3G1B8
KRISTALEE PERFETTO, 3248 CKSO Road, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3G1B8

AGENT(S): GERRY PERFETTO, 3248 CKSO Road, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3G1B8

LOCATION: PIN(s) 734730324, Part Lot 9, Concession 3, Part 3, Plan 53R-19682, Township of Broder, 0 South Shore Road, Sudbury, Ontario P3G 1L3

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 the construction of a dwelling on the subject property providing setbacks to the high water mark at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, February 26, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a single detached dwelling providing a high water mark setback of 21.27 m, where no person shall erect any residential building closer than 30 m to the high water mark of a lake.

The subject lands are vacant of buildings and structures. The lands will be serviced by an individual well and septic system and will need to establish access from South Shore 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 and low density residential in nature.

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.

The applicant has demonstrated that sufficient lot depth is not available to locate the new proposed dwelling outside of the 30 m setback requirement while maintaining the front yard setback requirement of 10 m. The dwelling will be located outside of the shoreline buffer area and the septic system will be located closer to the road than the dwelling.

Conservation Sudbury advised that the building is located outside of the regulated area, a Section 28 permit will be required, and has no objections to the application.

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 shoreline protection policies found within the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is recommended that the application be granted.

Hydro One, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, February 25, 2026

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

For the applicants' information, a building permit application shall be required for the construction of the Single Family Dwelling, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Development Engineering, February 25, 2026

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, February 25, 2026

The staff in SEP have reviewed the proposed development. Policy 3 in section 8.4.1 in the City's Official Plan states that "A minimum 30-metre setback from the normal high water mark of a lake or river, or a minimum 12-metre setback from the normal high water mark of a permanently flowing stream, will be required for all new development, excluding shoreline structures. A lesser setback may be considered by way of a change to the zoning by-law 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 acknowledge that the proposed design appears to be setback as closely as allowed by the RU, Rural zone of Zoning By-law 2010-100Z and that the structure does not extend into the required 20 metre natural vegetated buffer along the shoreline. As such, staff are of the opinion that the proposed development complies with criteria a. above.

The applicant is advised that compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, the federal Fisheries Act, 1985, the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and the provincial Endangered Species Act, 2007, is their sole responsibility.

Ministry of Transportation, February 24, 2026

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

Conservation Sudbury, February 23, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, February 19, 2026

No objection.

Site Plan, February 18, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

03/04/2026 The applicants appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:  
GERRY PERFETTO AND KRISTALEE PERFETTO  
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 734730324, Part Lot 9, Concession 3, Part 3, Plan 53R-19682, Township of Broder, 0 South Shore Road, Sudbury, Ontario P3G 1L3

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.41, subsection 4.41.2 a) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of a single detached dwelling providing a high water mark setback of 21.27m, where no person shall erect any residential building closer than 30.0m to the high water mark of a lake, 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00007

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): JASON JALLET, 55 douglas street, sudbury, ON, Canada  
FLORENTYNA KALETA JALLET, 55 Douglas Street, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada P3E 1G7

AGENT(S): SHIELD EA LTD, 130 Paris Street, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3E3E1

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735850686, Parcel 9935 SEC SES, Lot 47, Plan M-41, Part Lot 6, Concession 3, Township of McKim, 55 Douglas Street, Sudbury P3E 1G7

---

**SUMMARY**

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-3 according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

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

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, February 27, 2026

No Comment Received

Hydro One, February 27, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), February 27, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, February 26, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a 33.2 m<sup>2</sup> accessory structure providing a maximum height of 8.0m, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure on a residential lot shall be 5.0m.

The subject lands contain a 150 m<sup>2</sup> dwelling with two dwelling units, that are serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection. The lands are accessed from Riverside Drive. The dwelling has a height of 7.5 m.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'R2-3' Low Density Residential Two within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Surrounding uses are predominantly low density residential in nature.

The applicant has advised that the 8 m height is being requested in order to accommodate a second storey for personal amenity space. Staff are satisfied that the proposed use for personal amenity space is considered to be accessory to the residential use of the lands.

Although the accessory building will exceed the height of the main dwelling by 0.5 m, it will be located in the rear yard, 31.29 m from the front lot line, which will visually remain accessory to the main residential use. The subject lands are the only property with vehicular access on this portion of the road allowance.

The subject lands contain mature vegetation which will act as a visual buffer from the front, rear, and east interior side lot lines. The property abutting the subject lands to the east has a higher elevation than the subject lands and as such is not anticipated to have visual impacts as a result of the addition height. The property abutting the subject lands to the west is pie shaped with the narrowest portion of the property being the rear lot line. The accessory building will maintain the required yard setbacks from all property lines.

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.

Building Services, February 25, 2026

For relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.4 a) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of a detached accessory structure providing a maximum height of 8.0m, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure on a residential lot shall be 5.0m.

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

For the applicants' information, a building permit shall be required for the construction of the Accessory Structure, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Development Engineering, February 25, 2026

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, February 25, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and the provincial Endangered Species Act, 2007 is their sole responsibility.

Ministry of Transportation, February 24, 2026

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

Conservation Sudbury, February 23, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, February 19, 2026

No objection.

Site Plan, February 18, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

03/04/2026 The applicant, Jason Jallet and his agent, Kristin Beites of Shield Engineering, appeared before Committee and provided comments on the Application. The Secretary-Treasurer confirmed Committee's receipt of the letter of support from MacGregor Sinclair of 322 Laura Avenue and the email of support from John and Jennifer Cawley Caruso of 52 Roxborough. Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:  
JASON JALLET AND FLORENTYNA KALETA JALLET  
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735850686, Parcel 9935 SEC SES, Lot 47, Plan M-41, Part Lot 6, Concession 3, Township of McKim, 55 Douglas Street, Sudbury P3E 1G7

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.4 a) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of a detached accessory structure providing a maximum height of 8.0m, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure 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.

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

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00010

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): DON LEHTO, gitrdon41@hotmail.ca, hanmer, ON, Canada P3P1C3

AGENT(S): DON LEHTO, gitrdon41@hotmail.ca, hanmer, ON, Canada P3P1C3

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735040119, Parcel 51600 SEC SES SRO, Part Lot 10, Plan M-507, being Part 2, Plan 53R-16178, Part Lot 4, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4528 Park Avenue, Hanmer P3P 1C3

---

**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 a detached garage on the subject property providing accessory lot coverage and height at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, March 3, 2026

**REVISED**

Now that the lot coverage has been confirmed, staff can advise that they are supportive of the application. Adequate spacing will be maintained around the building, rear yard amenity space will be maintained, and site functionality is not anticipated to be impacted as a result of the additional lot coverage.

Building Services, February 26, 2026

We have reviewed the above noted application for minor variance relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsections 4.2.3 and 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 a detached garage providing, firstly, an accessory lot coverage of 14%, where the total lot coverage of all accessory buildings and structures on a residential lot shall not exceed 10%, and secondly, a maximum height of 5.39m, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure on a residential lot shall be 5.0m.

Based on the information provided, Building Services has the following comments:

1) A review of the drawings provided indicates an area of the proposed detached garage of 12.0m x 9.6m (including covered patio area). Our calculations indicate the accessory lot coverage exceeds the relief requested of 14%. To ensure the required relief is requested, please review and adjust.

Applicant/Owner to be informed of the following information:

- 1) Building Services acknowledges the submission of building permit documents and building permit BP-NEW-2026-00090, to construct a detached garage.
- 2) With respect to additional considerations related to this development, Building Services reserves further comment until the time of Building Permit Application and Plans Examination.

Corridor Management, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, February 26, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a 104.05 m<sup>2</sup> detached garage with the following variances:

1. an accessory lot coverage of 14%, where the total lot coverage of all accessory buildings and structures on a residential lot shall not exceed 10%, and
2. a maximum height of 5.39m, where the maximum height of any accessory building or structure on a residential lot shall be 5.0m.

The subject lands contain an 89.93 m<sup>2</sup> single detached dwelling and an accessory building that has been identified by the applicant as being removed. The single detached dwelling has a height of 4 m. The lands are serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection and have existing access from Park Avenue.

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 predominantly low density residential in nature.

The applicant has advised that the size and height of the garage is being requested in order to accommodate additional storage space. Staff are satisfied that the proposed use of personal storage is considered to be accessory to the residential use of the lands.

Although the accessory building will exceed the height of the main dwelling by 1.39 m and exceed the ground floor area of the main dwelling by 14.92 m<sup>2</sup>, it will be located in the rear yard, 29.1 m from the front lot line, which will visually remain accessory to the main residential use. Additionally, it is noted that the accessory building is proposed to have a sloped roofline with only a portion of the building having a height above the required 5 m. The accessory building will maintain the required yard setbacks from all property lines.

Building Services has identified that the lot coverage is greater than the requested 14%, as such it is recommended that the application be deferred to address Building Services comments.

Hydro One, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, February 25, 2026

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, February 25, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and the provincial Endangered Species Act, 2007 is their sole responsibility.

Ministry of Transportation, February 24, 2026

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

Source Water Protection, February 24, 2026

Parcel located within the non-critical WHPA-D area. No prohibitions or restrictions within SPP. No significant drinking water threat identified at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, February 23, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, February 19, 2026

no concerns - outside of our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

03/04/2026 The applicant appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application and commented on the reason for the change in lot coverage. Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she attended the property and asked the applicant if the sheds would be removed and the applicant confirmed that they would be. Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

DON LEHTO

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735040119, Parcel 51600 SEC SES SRO, Part Lot 10, Plan M-507, being Part 2, Plan 53R-16178, Part Lot 4, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4528 Park Avenue, Hanmer P3P 1C3

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsections 4.2.3 and 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 a detached garage providing, firstly, an accessory lot coverage of 15%, where the total lot coverage of all accessory buildings and structures on a residential lot shall not exceed 10%, and secondly, a maximum height of 5.39m, where the maximum height of

any accessory building or structure 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 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00012

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): GREATER SUDBURY HOUSING CORPORATION, 10 Elm St, Sudbury, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): GREATER SUDBURY HOUSING CORPORATION, 10 Elm St, Sudbury, ON, Canada

LOCATION: PIN(s) 733491001, Parcel 19522 SEC SWS, Lot 41 and Part Lot 36, Plan M-91, Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Township of Balfour, 368 /370 Charette Avenue, Chelmsford, Ontario P0M 1L0, 370 Charette Avenue, Chelmsford, Ontario P0M 1L0

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-2 according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to permit two existing driveways on a proposed lot, subject of Consent Application PL-CON-2026-00003, at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, February 27, 2026

No Comment Received

Hydro One, February 27, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), February 27, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, February 26, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to permit two existing driveways on a proposed lot subject of Consent Application PL-CON-2026-00003, where only one driveway is permitted per lot.

The Greater Sudbury Housing Corporation own Lots 28, 33, 36 & 41 (4 lots) on plan of subdivision M91 which was approved in 1927. The semi-detached buildings were not constructed to be wholly contained to each of the four lots on the plan of subdivision. In order to convey each semi-detached building, new property boundaries are required to be established which would result in one semi-detached building being wholly contained on a newly adjusted lot.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, are zoned 'R2-2', within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law, and are regulated by Conservation Sudbury (NDCA).

The lands are subject to Consent Application PL-CON-2025-00003, which is scheduled for the March 2nd Consent Agenda.

Staff have no concerns with the requested variances as there will not be any visual changes that would impact residential character or surrounding uses as a result of the severance and associated variance.

Staff is of the opinion that the variance is considered to be minor in nature, 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.

Building Services, February 25, 2026

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

Development Engineering, February 25, 2026

For a semi-detached dwelling, the max driveway width(6.3m) may be split into two driveways, one for each portion. At this time it appears that each portion of these semi-detached buildings has an approximate 3m wide driveway entrance. Development Engineer does not support additional driveways as per the Private Entrance Bylaw.

Strategic and Environmental Planning, February 25, 2026

No Concerns

Ministry of Transportation, February 24, 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.

Conservation Sudbury, February 23, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, February 19, 2026

no concerns - outside of our service territory.

Site Plan, February 18, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

03/04/2026 The applicant's authorized representative, Kim Zarichney, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Member Murray asked staff, referring to Development Engineering's comments, if the two driveways were existing and staff confirmed that they were. Staff advised that Development Engineering's comments seemed to be advisory in nature. Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:  
GREATER SUDBURY HOUSING CORPORATION  
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 733491001, Parcel 19522 SEC SWS, Lot 41 and Part Lot 36, Plan M-91, Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Township of Balfour, 368 /370 Charette Avenue, Chelmsford, Ontario P0M 1L0, 370 Charette Avenue, Chelmsford, Ontario P0M 1L0

for relief from Part 5, Section 5.4, subsection 5.4.2 c) of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit two existing driveways on a proposed lot subject of Consent Application PL-CON-2026-00003, where only one driveway is permitted per lot, 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00014

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): JESSE ALKHOURY, 132 Jeanine Street, Sudbury, ON, Canada  
LEEN AZAR, 132 Jeanine Street, Sudbury, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): CR DESIGN, 2200 - 3609 Lakeshore Blvd West, Toronto, ON, Canada M8V1A4

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735081442, Part Lot 12, Concession 2, Parts 1-2, Plan 53R-21146, subject to easements as in LT13824 & LT13825, Township of Capreol, 4376 Notre Dame Avenue, Valley East P3P 1X5

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 a dwelling containing 4-dwelling units and attached uncovered deck on the subject property providing encroachments, setbacks, parking area, landscaped area and landscaped open space at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, February 26, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a dwelling containing 4-dwelling units and an attached uncovered deck with the following variances:

1. the rear attached uncovered deck to provide a rear yard setback of 1.22m, where uncovered decks greater than 1.2m in height may encroach 3.6m into the required rear yard but not closer than 3.0m to the rear lot line,
2. a 1.83m-wide landscaped area adjacent to the full length of the lot line abutting Notre Dame Avenue, where a 3.0m-wide landscaped area adjacent to the full length of the lot line shall be required abutting all public roads having a width greater than 10.m in all Zones,
3. a minimum of 26% of the required front yard to be maintained as landscaped open space, where 50% is required,
4. a parking area width of 13.17m in the required front yard, where the outdoor parking area for the subject property is permitted in the required front yard to a maximum width of 7.5m, and
5. a minimum required rear yard setback of 3.05m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.51m, where 7.5m is required and where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line.

The subject lands are currently vacant of buildings or structures. The lands will be serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection and will be accessed from Notre Dame Avenue.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, are zoned 'R1-5', within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law, and are located within the Pharand (F) wellhead protection area within the Source Water Protection Plan.

Based on the concept plan provided, staff are of the opinion that the proposal for four dwelling units on the subject property is considered to be over development.

Staff do not support the proposed parking area width or landscaping reductions as they will not maintain the residential character of the neighbourhood. The applicant is to be advised that tandem parking spaces are permitted and would increase landscaped area.

Staff acknowledge that the applicant is proposing an attached deck to be utilized for private amenity space, however, staff is of the opinion that the rear yard deck greater than 1.2 m in height being located 1.22 m from the rear lot line inappropriate from a privacy perspective. The applicant is encouraged to reconsider the rear yard amenity space for this proposal.

While four units are permitted as of right, not every parcel is suitable to accommodate four dwelling units.

Staff recommend that the application be deferred to allow the applicant to revise their proposal and address staff comments.

Hydro One, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, February 25, 2026

Based on the information provided, Building Services has no concerns with this application. 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 4-unit dwelling.

Development Engineering, February 25, 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.

Strategic and Environmental Planning, February 25, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and the provincial Endangered Species Act, 2007 is their sole responsibility.

Ministry of Transportation, February 24, 2026

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

Source Water Protection, February 24, 2026

Parcel located within Pharand(F) Well's WHPA-C. No significant drinking water threat identified at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, February 23, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, February 19, 2026

no concerns - outside of our service territory.

Site Plan, February 18, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

03/04/2026 The applicant's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application, commenting on tandem parking, landscaping, lot coverage, the deck encroachments and requested Committee to consider a partial approval of the location of the building.

Derrick Kring and Nicole Rivet of 4390 Notre Dame Avenue appeared before Committee and expressed concern over the current maintenance of the abutting tri-plex, snow storage and drainage and requested that the snow be removed rather than stored. Nicole Rivet commented on the driveway access of the abutting tri-plex and Derrick Kring expressed concern about snow storage impacting sight lines on the road.

Committee Chair Dumont requested the agent to comment on the resident's concerns and the agent advised that he would provide comments in response to Committee.

Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she attended the site and verified with the residents that the tri-plex was impacting 4390 Notre Dame rather than the subject property. Committee Member Castanza expressed support for the Application subject to the parking being safe in relation to snow.

Committee Member Goswell expressed support for staff's recommendation and suggested that discussions be had between staff, the applicant and the objectors before a decision is made.

Committee Member Murray expressed confusion over how the snow of the abutting property, and the neighbour was impacting the subject property. The agent confirmed the address of the subject property. Committee Member Murray confirmed that parking and snow would not be located in the rear and the agent confirmed that the setback would not permit snow storage. The agent advised that the owner typically removes snow. Committee Member Murray requested staff to comment on the rear yard setback and staff provided an explanation and advised that they consider it overdevelopment as no amenity space was being provided and that it was too close to the property line.

Committee Chair Dumont clarified the agent's remarks on the partial approval and the agent advised that if Committee was supportive of the location of the building, then the applicant would forgo the parking, landscaping and deck encroachment. Committee Chair Dumont confirmed with the agent that he was seeking approval for the rear yard setback. The agent asked if the resolution would include all the variances and the Secretary-Treasurer confirmed that the resolution was for all five variances.

Committee Member Murray asked the agent if the landscaping would be resolved with tandem parking and the agent confirmed that it would be. Committee Member Murray asked staff if the building location was only impacted by the 5th variance (as identified in the agenda) and staff confirmed that was correct. Committee Member Murray commented that staff's comments didn't express concern with the building's location. Committee Member Murray expressed support for the rear yard setback variance.

Committee Member Goswell expressed support for the rear yard setback.

Committee Member Murray put forward a motion to approve the variance for the rear yard setback and defer the remaining variances and Committee Member Castanza seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:  
JESSE ALKHOURY AND LEEN AZAR  
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735081442, Part Lot 12, Concession 2, Parts 1-2, Plan 53R-21146, subject to easements as in LT13824 & LT13825, Township of Capreol, 4376 Notre Dame Avenue, Valley East P3P 1X5

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, Table 4.1 and Part 6, Section 6.3, Table 6.2 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of a dwelling containing 4 -dwelling units on the subject property providing a minimum required rear yard setback of 3.05m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.51m, where 7.5m is required and where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m 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 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00015

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP, 100 RADISSON, CHELMSFORD, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): CR DESIGN, 2200 - 3609 Lakeshore Blvd West, Toronto, ON, Canada M8V1A4

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735041108, Parcel M1114-124-1 SES SRO, Lot 130, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3062 Manon Street, Hanmer, Ontario P3P 0E3

---

**SUMMARY**

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-2, FD according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to construct a semi-detached dwelling on a proposed lot identified as Side A on the Plot Plan, subject of a future Consent Application, providing a setback at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, February 26, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a semi-detached dwelling on a proposed lot identified as Side A on the Plot Plan submitted with the application, subject of a future Consent application, providing a rear yard setback of 6.8m, where 7.5m is required.

The lands are currently vacant of any buildings or structures. The lands will be serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection and will be accessed from Manon Street.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'R2-2', Low Density Residential Two within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Staff have no concerns with the requested variance as sufficient rear yard amenity space will be maintained. It is also recognized that the rear lot line is not parallel to the front lot line resulting in the closest portion of the dwelling being setback closer to the rear lot line on the west side and gradually increasing rear yard setback moving to the east.

Staff is of the opinion that the variance is considered to be minor in nature, 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.

Hydro One, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, February 25, 2026

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

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

1) Future construction will require building permit and building permit documents to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Development Engineering, February 25, 2026

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, February 25, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and the provincial Endangered Species Act, 2007 is their sole responsibility.

Ministry of Transportation, February 24, 2026

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

Source Water Protection, February 24, 2026

Parcel located within the non-critical Vermilion IPZ-3 area. No prohibitions or restrictions within SPP. No significant drinking water threat identified at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, February 23, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, February 19, 2026

no concerns - outside of our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

03/04/2026 Prior to the hearing, Committee unanimously agreed to hear both PL-MV-2026-00015 and PL-MV-2026-00016 together.  
The applicant's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.  
Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:  
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP  
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735041108, Parcel M1114-124-1 SES SRO, Lot 130, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3062 Manon Street, Hanmer, Ontario P3P 0E3

for relief from Part 6, Section 6.3, Table 6.3 of By-law 2010-100Z, as amended, for approval to construct a semi-detached dwelling on a proposed lot identified as Side A on the Plot Plan submitted with the application, subject of a future Consent application, providing a rear yard setback of 6.8m, where 7.5m 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 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00016

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENT, 100 RADISSON, CHELMSFORD, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): CR DESIGN, 2200 - 3609 Lakeshore Blvd West, Toronto, ON, Canada M8V1A4

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735041108, Parcel M1114-124-1 SES SRO, Lot 130, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3058 Manon Street, Hanmer, Ontario P3P 0E3

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-2, FD according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to construct a semi-detached dwelling on a proposed lot identified as Side B on the Plot Plan, subject of a future Consent Application, providing a setback at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, February 26, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a semi-detached dwelling on a proposed lot identified as Side B on the Plot Plan submitted with the application, subject of a future Consent application, providing a front yard setback of 4.72m, where 6.0m is required.

The lands are currently vacant of any buildings or structures. The lands will be serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection and will be accessed from Manon Street.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'R2-2', Low Density Residential Two within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Staff recognized that the east portion of the front lot line is angled due to the road configuration, resulting in a reduced front yard setback for the east corner of the building. Staff have no concerns with the requested variance as residential character will not be impacted and majority of the dwelling will be in compliance to the front yard setback.

Staff is of the opinion that the variance is considered to be minor in nature, 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.

Hydro One, February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), February 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, February 25, 2026

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

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

1) Future construction will require building permit and building permit documents to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Development Engineering, February 25, 2026

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, February 25, 2026

The applicant is advised that compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and the provincial Endangered Species Act, 2007 is their sole responsibility.

Ministry of Transportation, February 24, 2026

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

Source Water Protection, February 24, 2026

Parcel located within the non-critical Vermilion IPZ-3 area. No prohibitions or restrictions within SPP. No significant drinking water threat identified at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, February 23, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, February 19, 2026

no concerns - outside of our service territory.

Meeting Minutes:

03/04/2026 Prior to the hearing, Committee unanimously agreed to hear both PL-MV-2026-00015 and PL-MV-2026-00016 together.  
The applicant's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.  
Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

**DECISION:**

THAT the application by:  
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENT  
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735041108, Parcel M1114-124-1 SES SRO, Lot 130, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3058 Manon Street, Hanmer, Ontario P3P 0E3

for relief from Part 6, Section 6.3, Table 6.3 of By-law 2010-100Z, as amended, for approval to construct a semi-detached dwelling on a proposed lot identified as Side B on the Plot Plan submitted with the application, subject of a future Consent application, providing a front yard setback of 4.72m, where 6.0m 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 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2025-00106

March 4, 2026

OWNER(S): JEAN-FRANCOIS DEMORE, 105 Forestdale Drive, Sudbury, ON, Canada
CHANTAL ROMAIN, 105 Forestdale Drive, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada P3A 5X3
AGENT(S): GEOFF MCCAUSLAND, 120 Larch Street, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada P3E1C2
LOCATION: PIN(s) 021330268, Lot 29, Plan 85-S, Part Lot 5, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 375 Laforest Avenue, Sudbury P3C 5H9

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-3 according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.
Application: Approval to increase the number of dwelling units within the existing multiple dwelling on the subject property providing the number of parking spaces, accessible parking spaces and lot area per unit at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, February 27, 2026

REVISED:

The purpose and effect of the application is to legally recognize 13 dwelling units in an existing legal non-conforming 12-unit multiple dwelling with the following variances:

- 1. a minimum lot areas of 57.171 m2 per dwelling unit, where 140 m2 is required;
2. 0 parking spaces, where 13 are required; and
3. 0 accessible parking spaces, where 1 is required.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'R2-3', Low Density Residential Two Zone within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Subsequent to the previous hearing the applicant has completed a survey of the subject lands and has relocated refuse storage from the right of way of the road to in the basement of the building.

Staff acknowledge that Building Services provided a letter of legal non-conforming status for a 12-unit multiple dwelling and that the 13th unit appears to have been established around 1990 without benefit of a building permit. Its understood that the current owner wishes to legalize the 13th unit through the building permit process, however, in doing so triggers zoning by-law relief for minimum lot area per dwelling unit and parking requirements.

The subject lands do not abut a GOVA route, however, are located approximately 95 m from the nearest bus

stop being west of the property along Kathleen Street. Staff recognize that the lands are in walking distance to schools, churches, and commercial uses on Notre Dame Street, however, maintain the position that no less than 1 parking space per unit is considered to be appropriate in the Living Area I designation.

It is recommended that the application be denied.

Building Services, February 26, 2026

Building Services has reviewed your documents and sketches for the requested minor variances and can advise that we have no concerns.

Applicant to be advised that a Building Permit application will be required to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official to legalize the additional unit. Building Services reserves any opinion on compliance with Ontario Building Code for the time of building permit application.

Development Engineering, February 25, 2026

We have some concerns regards to the reduction in the required number of parking spaces, it is important to note that only short term on-street parking (maximum of 4 hours) is available on Laforest Street and Garnier Street, therefore any overflow parking that may occur from this site will affect the neighbouring property owners on Laforest Street, Garnier Street or other area roadways.

Site Plan, February 18, 2026

No Concerns

Development Approvals, August 15, 2025

The purpose and effect of the application is to legally recognize 13 dwelling units in an existing legal non-conforming 12-unit multiple dwelling with the following variances:

1. a minimum lot areas of 57.171 m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling unit, where 140 m<sup>2</sup> is required;
2. 0 parking spaces, where 13 are required; and
3. 0 accessible parking spaces, where 1 is required.

The subject lands are designated 'Living Area I' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'R2-3', Low Density Residential Two Zone within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Staff acknowledge that Building Services provided a letter of legal non-conforming status for a 12-unit multiple dwelling and that the 13th unit appears to have been established around 1990 without benefit of a building permit. Its understood that the current owner wishes to legalize the 13th unit through the building permit process, however, in doing so triggers zoning by-law relief for minimum lot area per dwelling unit and parking requirements.

Site Plan Control comments stated that parking and garbage storage currently occurs within the municipal boulevard, blocking pedestrian traffic and snow plowing operations including snow storage. The proposed variance cannot be supported unless the municipal boulevard and curbing is revegetated and restored to eliminate parking, and alternative garbage storage/collection arrangements are made.

The subject lands do not abut a GOVA route, however, are located approximately 95 m from the nearest bus stop being west of the property along Kathleen Street. Staff recognize that the lands are in walking distance to schools, churches, and commercial uses on Notre Dame Street, however, maintain the position that no less

than 1 parking space per unit is considered to be appropriate in the Living Area I designation.

It is recommended that the application be denied.

Traffic and Transportation, August 15, 2025

We have some concerns regards to the reduction in the required number of parking spaces, it is important to note that only short term on-street parking (maximum of 4 hours) is available on Laforest Street and Garnier Street, therefore any overflow parking that may occur from this site will affect the neighbouring property owners on Laforest Street, Garnier Street or other area roadways.

Corridor Management, August 14, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), August 14, 2025

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, August 14, 2025

The applicant is advised that compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, the provincial Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and the provincial Endangered Species Act, 2007 is their sole responsibility.

Building Services, August 13, 2025

Building Services has reviewed your documents and sketches for the requested minor variances and can advise that we have no concerns.

Applicant to be advised that a Building Permit application to the satisfaction of the Chief Building official will be required to legalize the additional unit. Building Services reserves any opinion on Ontario Building Code compliance to time of permit review.

Development Engineering, August 13, 2025

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, August 12, 2025

No Objections.

Hydro One, August 8, 2025

This property is not in Hydro One's service territory, therefore Hydro One does not have any concerns.

Ministry of Transportation, August 7, 2025

We have determined that the subject lands are not located within the MTO's permit control area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Site Plan, August 7, 2025

Parking and garbage storage currently occurs within the municipal boulevard, blocking pedestrian traffic and snow plowing operations including snow storage.

The proposed variance cannot be supported unless the municipal boulevard and curbing is revegetated and restored to eliminate parking, and alternative garbage storage/collection arrangements are made.

Conservation Sudbury, August 6, 2025

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

08/20/2025 The applicant's agent, Geoff McCausland, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application and addressed Site Plan Control's comments at the request of Committee Chair Dumont. Committee Member Castanza advised the agent that each Application was viewed on its own merits and advised Committee that she was undecided and wanted to hear the other Member's thoughts. Committee Member Goswell expressed support for staff's recommendation. Committee Member Murray requested staff to explain the recommendation and staff advised that one for one parking in the Living Areas should be maintained as the standard. Committee Member Murray asked staff if the parking standards were being reviewed, and staff advised that they were being reviewed in relation to additional dwelling units. Committee Member Murray expressed support for a motion to approve the Application. Committee Chair Dumont asked the agent when the property was purchased and if legal non-conforming status was required and the agent advised that the property was purchased a few years ago and the legal non-conformity status was not sought at that time. The agent advised Committee that the 13th unit existed in the 1950s, but was changed to a commercial unit, then reverted to a residential unit in the 1990s. Committee Chair Dumont requested the agent to explain why the variances were being sought now and the agent referred to Committee's decision on 20 Cypress. Committee Chair Dumont confirmed the existing parking situation with staff and the agent confirmed that there was no parking existing on the property. Committee Chair Dumont requested staff to explain legal non-conformity as it relates to parking and staff provided an explanation. Committee Chair Dumont shared his thoughts on the Application and staff's comments and expressed support for a deferral of the Application. The agent advised Committee that the applicant may be open to obtaining a survey to confirm lot lines and advised Committee that parking could not be accommodated on the property. Committee Member Castanza questioned why the unit was not considered legal non-complying when it previously existing. Committee Chair Dumont requested the agent to ensure that a future submission would include information to support his comments. Committee Member Goswell and Murray expressed support for a deferral. Staff provided Committee with information on the Official Plan designation of the property and 20 Cypress and cautioned Committee that a clean-up of the site would not address staff's concerns regarding the parking. Committee Member Murray put forward a motion to defer the Application and Committee Chair Dumont seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

03/04/2026 The applicant, Jean-Francois Demore and his agent, Geoff McCausland, appeared before Committee and both provided information and history on the Application. Committee Member Castanza expressed support for the Application and commented on walkability to conveniences and rental rate. Committee Member Goswell commented on the Flour Mill BIA and expressed support for the Application. Committee Member Murray expressed support for the Application. Committee Chair Dumont expressed support for staff's recommendation and commented on the zoning, legal non-conforming status and lack of parking. Committee Member Murray put forward a motion to approve the Application and Committee Member Castanza seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

The following decision was reached:

**DECISION:**

THAT the application by:  
JEAN-FRANCOIS DEMORE AND CHANTAL ROMAIN  
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 021330268, Lot 29, Plan 85-S, Part Lot 5, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 375 Laforest Avenue, Sudbury P3C 5H9

for relief from Part 5, Section 5.2, subsection 5.2.3.5, Table 5.2 and Section 5.5, subsection 5.5.3 and Part 6, Section 6.3, Table 6.4 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit the conversion of the existing legal non-conforming 12-unit multiple dwelling to 13-units providing, firstly, 0 required parking spaces, where 13 are required, secondly, no accessible parking spaces, where 1 is required, and thirdly, a minimum lot are of 57.171 sq. m per unit, where 140.0 sq. m per unit 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Status</b>
CATHY CASTANZA	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Non-Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring