



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00042

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): Z&M FOOD LTD., 105 Eclipse Crescent, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada P3B 0E6

AGENT(S): BENSEN JOY, 305 Eyre Street, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3C4B3

LOCATION: PIN(s) 021310149, Part Lots 7-9, Plan 18-SB as in S68464, Part Lot 5, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 497 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury P3C 2W1, 499 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury, 501 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury, 507 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury

SUMMARY

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

Application: Approval to permit existing and proposed uncovered stairs and landing providing setbacks at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Building Services, May 7, 2026

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

For the applicants' information:

Building Services acknowledges building permit applications:

BP-PSP-2026-00014 (Wall Sign – Shawarma Daddy).

BP-NEW-2026-00209 (Interior and Exterior Alterations)

BP-BCO-2026-00026 and BP-BCO-2026-00027 (Building Code Orders) are still active/in progress. Please contact Building Services for more information at 705-674-4455 Ext. 4278.

Development Approvals, May 7, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to recognize an existing commercial building with the following variances:

1. to permit the existing uncovered steps located on the north east side of the building providing a 0.8m setback from the corner side lot line, where 15.0m is required;
2. to facilitate the construction of the uncovered steps proposed on the south east side of the building providing a 4.0m setback from the front lot line and a 0.8m setback from the corner side lot line, where a 6.0m

front yard setback is required and where a 15.0m corner side yard setback is required; and
3. to permit the existing uncovered steps and landing located on the north west side of the building providing a 0.6m setback from the interior side lot line, where 3.6m setback is required.

The subject lands are designated 'Mixed Use Commercial' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'C2', General Commercial Zone within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Staff have no concerns with the existing or proposed steps abutting Notre Dame as they appear to integrate with pedestrian connectivity with the sidewalk.

Staff have no concerns with recognizing the existing staircase with a deficient interior side yard setback.

Staff are 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, May 7, 2026

No Concerns

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Hydro One, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The owner’s authorized representative, Muhammad Afzal, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff’s recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
Z&M FOOD LTD.

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 021310149, Part Lots 7-9, Plan 18-SB as in S68464, Part Lot 5, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 497 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury P3C 2W1, 499 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury, 501 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury, 507 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury

for relief from Part 7, Section 7.3, Table 7.3 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, for the following: firstly, to permit the existing uncovered steps located on the north east side of the building providing a 1.8m setback from the corner side lot line, where 15.0m is required, secondly, to facilitate the construction of the uncovered steps proposed on the south east side of the building providing a 4.0m setback from the front lot line and a 0.8m setback from the corner side lot line, where a 6.0m front yard setback is required and where a 15.0m corner side yard setback is required, thirdly, to permit the existing uncovered steps and landing located on the north west side of the building providing a 0.6m setback from the interior side lot line, where 3.6m setback 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00043

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): SUDBURY APARTMENT RENTALS LIMITED, 219 O'Neil Dr E, Hanmer, ON, Canada

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 021350242, Lot 45, Block B, Plan 3-SA, Part Lot 6, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 101 Pine Street, Sudbury P3C 1W9

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned C2(89) according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Permission under Section 45(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, to expand the legal non-conforming use of the existing lot, including the building, to increase the number of dwelling units within the existing building, providing an increase in residential density and maintain current parking.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Building Services, May 7, 2026

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 and/or alterations associated with the addition of all additional dwelling units within the building, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Note: A minimum of 7 bicycle parking spaces shall be provided and clearly identified on the plot plan submitted as part of the building permit application.

Development Approvals, May 7, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to expand the legal non-conforming use of the existing building from 12 dwelling units to 13 dwelling units providing a maximum net residential density of 235 units per hectare, where a maximum net residential density of 216 units per hectare is permitted pursuant to Minor Variance Application PL-MV-2025-00138, and maintain 4 parking spaces for 13 dwelling units where 4 parking spaces for 12 dwelling units currently exist.

The subject lands contain a 12-unit multiple dwelling that is serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection with access from Pine Street.

The subject lands are designated 'Downtown' within the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and are zoned 'C2(89)', General Commercial Special Zone within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Surrounding uses are commercial in nature.

Residential development is a key priority for the Downtown as a means of stimulating increased investment and business activity, reinforcing the City's urban structure and achieving more efficient pattern of development. Compact, walkable and transit-supportive, the Downtown possesses a distinct built form that sets it apart from other urban areas, offering unique opportunities to protect, develop and sustain its role as the vibrant hub of a dynamic city.

Staff have no concerns with the proposed additional dwelling unit and maintaining current parking spaces given the location in the Downtown designation. Impacts are not anticipated to surrounding uses as the units will be located inside the existing building.

Staff are 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

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

Hydro One, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The owner's agent, Vanessa Smith of Tulloch Engineering, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
SUDBURY APARTMENT RENTALS LIMITED
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 021350242, Lot 45, Block B, Plan 3-SA, Part Lot 6, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 101 Pine Street, Sudbury P3C 1W9

for permission under Section 45(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13 to expand the legal non-conforming use of the existing building from 12 dwelling units to 13 dwelling units providing a maximum net residential density of 235 units per hectare, where a maximum net residential density of 216 units per hectare is permitted pursuant to Minor Variance Application PL-MV-2025-00138, and maintain 4 parking spaces for 13 dwelling units where 4 parking spaces for 12 dwelling units currently exist, be granted

Consideration was given to Section 45(2) of the *Planning Act*, the use that was made of the building or structure on the day the By-law was passed continued until the date of the Application to the Committee. The enlargement or extension of the building or structure is within the limits of the land owned and used in connection therewith on the day the By-law was passed. The request is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the property and the general intent and purpose of the By-Law and 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00045

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): DENISE ST. AMANT, 51 Bluejay Way, Garson, ON, Canada P3L0A8
MARTY GIGNAC, 51 Bluejay Way, Garson, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): A.L. PERMITS, 460 Boyce St, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3E2G7

LOCATION: PIN(s) 734941090, Lot 19, Plan 53M-1431, Part Lot 5, Concession 1, Township of Garson,
51 Bluejay Way, Garson P3L 0A8

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 second-storey addition on the existing dwelling providing setbacks and encroachments at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Building Services, May 7, 2026

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

For the applicant's information:

- Building Services acknowledges Building Permit Application BP-NEW-2026-00280 (addition and attached deck).

Development Approvals, May 7, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a second-storey addition on the existing dwelling providing an interior side yard setback of 1.32m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.46m into the 1.32m interior side yard setback, where a 1.8m interior side yard setback is required and where eaves may encroach 0.6m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line.

The subject lands contain a single detached dwelling with an attached garage and deck. The subject lands are serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection with access from Bluejay Way.

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 Zone within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Surrounding uses are residential in nature.

Staff have no concerns with the request to add a second storey to the existing single detached dwelling while maintaining the same interior side yard setback. Based on the elevation drawings, the proposed second storey appears to maintain the same height as the existing dwelling.

Staff are 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The owner’s agent, Angela Lanteigne of A.L. Permits, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Member Castanza clarified the number of storeys of the dwelling with the agent. The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff’s recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DENISE ST. AMANT AND MARTY GIGNAC
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 734941090, Lot 19, Plan 53M-1431, Part Lot 5, Concession 1, Township of Garson, 51 Bluejay Way, Garson P3L 0A8

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 second-storey addition on the existing dwelling providing an interior side yard setback of 1.32m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.46m into the 1.32m interior side yard setback, where a 1.8m interior side yard setback is required and where eaves may encroach 0.6m 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00046

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): NORMAND POITRAS, 795 Lavoie St, Sudbury, ON, Canada
KATHERINE HUCAL, 795 Lavoie, Sudbury, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): NORMAND POITRAS, 795 Lavoie St, Sudbury, ON, Canada

LOCATION: PIN(s) 021710245, Parcel 23684 SEC SES SRO, Lot 4, Plan M-397, Part Lot 3, Concession 6, Township of McKim, 795 Lavoie Street, Sudbury P3A 2B8

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 addition on the existing detached garage providing setbacks, encroachments, accessory lot coverage and height at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Building Services, May 8, 2026

Building Services has no objections to the proposed minor variances.

However, we would like to note a discrepancy in the setbacks provided for the garage. The current plot plan indicates that the garage is 0.48m from the lot line on the front corner where as Building Services has a survey from January 2001 that indicates that the same corner has a setback of 0.48 feet, converts to 0.15m. The proposed plot plan does not indicate a unit of measure for the 0.48 and that plot plan contains dimensions in both imperial and metric.

Owner to be aware that:

- 1) A demolition permit is required to remove the existing garage and shed, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.
- 2) A building permit is required to be submitted for the new garage, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official. The new structure appears to be a pre-engineered steel building. If this is the case, the building permit must include the engineered drawings from the company where it is being purchased and a Commitment Certificate from an engineer who will be performing the general review of the erection of the pre-engineered building.
 - a. Spatial separations to be addressed on the building permit drawings per OBC 2024 Clause 9.10.14.5.(4)

requiring not less than a 45min fire resistance rating where the limiting distance is less than 0.6m, as indicated by the setback of 0.48m to the west side lot line.

Sudbury Hydro, May 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, May 7, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of an addition on the existing detached garage with the following variances:

1. an interior side yard setback of 0.48m, where accessory buildings greater than 2.5m in height shall be no closer than 0.6m from the side lot line;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.82m into the interior side yard with a 0.22m setback from the interior side lot line, where eaves may encroach 0.6m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line;
3. an accessory lot coverage of 13%, where the total lot coverage of all accessory buildings and structures on a residential lot shall not exceed 10%, and;
4. a maximum height of 6.1m, where the maximum height of any accessory building on a residential lot shall be 5.0m.

The subject lands contain a single detached dwelling and two accessory buildings, one in which has been identified by the applicant as being removed. The subject lands are serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection with access from Lavoie Street.

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 Zone within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Surrounding uses are residential and commercial in nature.

The applicant has advised the request for the increased size of the garage is to accommodate storage and the increased height is to accommodate an automotive lift. The existing garage has an area of 38.9 m² and a height of 4 m. The proposed addition would result in a garage with a total area of 96.5 m² and at its highest peak 6.1 m in height. The single detached dwelling has an area of 97.5 m² and a height of 4.9 m. The proposed addition will be located to the rear of the single detached dwelling, 20.8 , from the front lot line. Sufficient rear yard amenity space appears to be maintained, and the lot layout remains functional as a result of the requested lot coverage increase. Staff are of the opinion that so long as the garage continues to be utilized for accessory residential use only the residential character of the property will be maintained.

Building Services has advised that based on their records the existing garage has a setback of 0.48 ft rather than 0.48 m. It is unclear based on the concept plan provided where the addition is being proposed.

It is recommended that the following variances be granted:

3. an accessory lot coverage of 13%, where the total lot coverage of all accessory buildings and structures on a residential lot shall not exceed 10%, and;
4. a maximum height of 6.1m, where the maximum height of any accessory building on a residential lot shall be 5.0m.

It is recommended that the following variances be deferred to allow the applicant an opportunity to clarify the requested interior side yard setback:

1. an interior side yard setback of 0.48m, where accessory buildings greater than 2.5m in height shall be no closer than 0.6m from the side lot line;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.82m into the interior side yard with a 0.22m setback from the interior side lot

line, where eaves may encroach 0.6m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line.

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The owner, Normand Poitras, appeared before Committee. The Chair confirmed with the owner that he received the comments and noted the recommendation for partial approval. The owner provided a summary of the Application.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised Committee that an email of support was received from Trevor Bosse of 798 Lavoie Street. The Secretary-Treasurer confirmed with Committee their receipt of the email and advised Committee that the email was provided to the owner prior to the hearing.

Committee Member Castanza referred to the comments regarding the setback discrepancy and requested the owner to clarify. The owner advised that he corrected the discrepancy.

Committee Chair Dumont requested staff to comment and staff advised that the correction to change the dimensions from feet to meters occurred as part of the submission of the Application however through comment circulation, Building Services identified through a survey that the garage was setback 0.48 feet, not meters and advised Committee that the variance applied for was incorrect. Committee Member Castanza explained the discrepancy to the owner and advised that she attended the site.

Committee Member Goswell requested staff to explain the variance and staff advised that a variance was required for the interior side yard setback, that the wrong dimension was requested and staff recommended that the variance be deferred to allow the owner the opportunity to correct the error. The Committee Member asked staff about the deferral fee to correct the error and staff confirmed that if the variance was deferred a deferral fee would be applicable. The Committee Member requested the owner to comment on the discussion. The owner advised Committee that staff contacted him, and he attended the City and submitted revised plans and questioned the need for the variance. The Chair provided the owner with an explanation of the process for a submission and the comments. The Chair asked staff if any discussion occurred after the comments were provided and staff advised that a revised plan was not received. The owner advised Committee that he provided a revised plan. Committee Member Goswell asked what the implications were if the correct version of the plan was provided and staff advised that they could only comment on what was provided. The Member asked staff what the implications were if the application was approved and staff advised that the variance granted may not be sufficient to obtain a building permit. The Member asked what the owner could do to address the concerns and the Chair suggested that the owner could speak with staff to ensure that the setbacks were correct. The Member requested staff to read the recommendation and staff read the recommendation to Committee and advised that the owner could apply for routine disclosure to obtain the necessary information.

Committee Member Murray asked the owner if he wanted a decision and the owner advised that the setback could be greater than what he applied for and that he corrected the plan to remove the eaves and only provide for an eaves trough. The Member confirmed with staff that if the owner's setback were incorrect that a new variance application would be required. The Member confirmed with the owner that he was seeking a decision on the Application.

Committee Chair Dumont commented on the requirement of the four tests of a minor variance and expressed support for staff's recommendation.

05/13/2026 Committee Member Murray requested clarification from the Chair on his comments and suggested that the Application should be accepted on its own merit. The Chair requested staff to comment, and staff advised that Building Services confirmed through their comments that there was a survey on record. Committee Member Castanza asked staff why the survey was not provided to the owner and staff advised that the owner was advised to obtain the survey through a routine disclosure request as staff is not permitted to release surveys. Committee Member Murray expressed support for the Application based on the submission by the owner. The Chair clarified staff's recommendation to defer to allow the owner the opportunity to obtain the correct information. Committee Member Goswell expressed support for the Application. Committee Member Murray commented on the owner's confidence that the submission was correct and expressed support for the Application and would support a motion to approve the Application. Committee Member Castanza commented that the survey should have been provided to the owner. Committee Chair Dumont expressed support for staff's recommendation. Staff's recommendation to partially defer the Application was defeated. Committee Member Murray put forward a motion to grant all the variances applied for in the Application and Committee Member Goswell seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
NORMAND POITRAS AND KATHERINE HUCAL
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 021710245, Parcel 23684 SEC SES SRO, Lot 4, Plan M-397, Part Lot 3, Concession 6, Township of McKim, 795 Lavoie Street, Sudbury P3A 2B8

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsections 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 a) and 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 an addition on the existing detached garage providing, firstly, an interior side yard setback of 0.48m, where accessory buildings greater than 2.5m in height shall be no closer than 0.6m from the side lot line, secondly, an eaves encroachment of 0.82m into the interior side yard with a 0.22m setback from the interior side lot line, where eaves may encroach 0.6m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line, thirdly, an accessory lot coverage of 13%, where the total lot coverage of all accessory buildings and structures on a residential lot shall not exceed 10%, and fourthly, a maximum height of 6.1m, 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 variances are minor in nature and are 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	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00047

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): KYLE KARCHIE, 110 Paul St, Azilda, ON, Canada P0M1B0
DANICA SERVANT, 110 Paul St, Azilda, ON, Canada P0M1B0

AGENT(S): KYLE KARCHIE, 110 Paul St, Azilda, ON, Canada P0M1B0

LOCATION: PIN(s) 733470240, Parcel 16568 SEC SWS SRO, Lot 68, Plan M-466, Part Lot 6, Concession 1, Township of Rayside, 110 Paul Street, Azilda P0M 1B0

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 providing a height at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a detached garage providing a maximum height of 5.9m, where the maximum height of any accessory building on a residential lot shall be 5.0m.

The subject lands contain a single detached dwelling and a gazebo. The subject lands are serviced by a municipal water and sanitary connection with access from Paul Street.

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 Zone within the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law.

Surrounding uses are residential in nature.

The applicant has advised the request for the increased height is to accommodate an automotive lift for personal use. The single detached dwelling has an area of 84 m2 and a height of 3.9 m. Although the proposed garage will exceed the size and height of the single detached dwelling, staff are satisfied that the use will remain accessory to the residential use of the lands. The garage will be located in the rear yard, 30.5 m from the front lot line. Staff are satisfied that residential character will be maintained as a result of the additional 0.9 m of height being requested for the proposed garage.

Staff are 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 2026

Building Services has no objections to the proposed minor variance.

Owner to be aware that a building permit is required to be submitted for the garage to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

Comments provided by A.Dittrich, Plans Examiner

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

No Concerns

Hydro One, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The applicants, Kyle Karchie and Danica Servant, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
KYLE KARCHIE AND DANICA SERVANT
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 733470240, Parcel 16568 SEC SWS SRO, Lot 68, Plan M-466, Part Lot 6, Concession 1, Township of Rayside, 110 Paul Street, Azilda P0M 1B0

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 a detached garage providing a maximum height of 5.9m, 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00049

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): JEFF HUNTER, 411 Kaireen St, Sudbury, ON, Canada
TANYA REILLY-HUNTER, 411 Kaireen St, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada P3E 5T3

AGENT(S): JEFF HUNTER, 411 Kaireen St, Sudbury, ON, Canada

LOCATION: PIN(s) 734790159; 734790148, Parcels 9521 and 10915 SEC SES, Part Lot 9, Concession 6, as in LT60372 and LT52121, except LT81264, Township of Dill, 2798 Richard Lake Road, Sudbury

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 dwelling providing a high water mark setback, shoreline structure, shoreline buffer, cleared area at high water mark and building facade at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Corridor Management, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, May 7, 2026

See attached PDF

Hydro One, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 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 demolition permit and documents will be required to be completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official for the demolition of the existing dwelling.
- 2) A building permit and documents will be required to be completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official for the construction of the proposed dwelling.

Conservation Sudbury, May 6, 2026

No Concerns

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 6, 2026

The proposed development is the reconstruction of a single detached dwelling and septic system on an existing lot with a lot depth of approximately 50 metres and width of 45 metres. The applicant is requesting a reduced highwater mark setback to permit the redevelopment. Staff rely on Policy 1, section 8.4.1 General Policies of the City's Official Plan. The policy requires a 30 metre highwater mark setback, but will allow for consideration of a lesser setback under 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.

The lot size and dimensions are such that meeting all of the required setbacks are challenging. More importantly, the proposed development has the septic system entirely outside of the 30 metres highwater mark setback, located to the rear of the proposed dwelling. While ideally the applicant locate the proposed dwelling as far back from the highwater mark setback as possible, staff acknowledge that the current design is a net improvement, in compliance with d. above.

With regards to the requested shoreline buffer clearance of 73%, staff note that the existing structures represent a lot shoreline buffer clearance of approximately 71 square metres, or 7.1% of the shoreline buffer area. The proposed development shows structures covering only 55 square metres, or 5.5% of the shoreline buffer area, while the balance of the shoreline buffer clearance is comprised of grass. Staff are of the opinion that the grass represents an existing condition. Permitting shoreline buffer clearance relief would allow a future landowner to replace 73% of the shoreline buffer area, or approximately 730 square metres, with impervious materials such as pavers, concrete, or asphalt, to the detriment of Richard Lake. Ideally the landowner would allow the shoreline buffer area to re-naturalize, but staff are of the opinion that the grass represents a pre-existing condition, pre-dating the shoreline buffer requirements of Zoning By-law 2010-100Z.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The owners, Jeff Hunter and Tanya Reilly-Hunter, and their agent, Tim James of Third Line Studio, appeared before Committee. The Chair requested the agent to comment on staff's recommendation to deny a portion of the Application and the agent advised that the owner's intent was to recognize the existing state of the property and are supportive of staff's recommendation.

Alex Cieslewicz appeared before Committee on behalf of the Richard Lake Stewardship Committee and summarized the Stewardship's position and concerns with the Application and requested information on the location of the proposed dwelling.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised Committee that a letter of concern was received from the Richard Lake Stewardship Committee and confirmed Committee's receipt of the letter. The Chair requested the agent to speak to the concerns outlined by the Stewardship Committee. The agent provided an explanation as to why the proposed location was chosen, commenting on the lake view, septic system, well and slope stability.

Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she attended the property and expressed support for the Application.

Committee Member Goswell acknowledged the Richard Lake Stewardship Committee's presentation and advised that the Committee was not able to require restoration of the buffer zone. The Committee Member expressed support for staff's recommendation.

Committee Member Murray expressed support for staff's recommendation.

Committee Chair Dumont clarified staff's recommendation to partially approve the Application and deny a portion of the Application. The Chair requested confirmation from staff that the owners would be able to obtain a building permit despite the denial and staff confirmed that the recommendation would not impact the owner's ability to obtain a building permit.

Committee Member Castanza requested clarification on the denial and staff provided an explanation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

JEFF HUNTER AND TANYA REILLY-HUNTER

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 734790159; 734790148, Parcels 9521 and 10915 SEC SES, Part Lot 9, Concession 6, as in LT60372 and LT52121, except LT81264, Township of Dill, 2798 Richard Lake Road, Sudbury

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.41, subsections 4.41.2 and 4.41.4 and Part 6, Section 6.2, Table 6.1, special provision #10 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 dwelling providing a high water mark setback of 17.0m, 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 secondly, a main building façade that does not have an entrance facing a public road,

where the main building façade shall have an entrance that faces public road, 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 are 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	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00050

May 13, 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) 735043251, SRO, Lot 109, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4202 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-2, R1-5 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 and subject of a future Consent Application, providing setbacks, encroachments and lot coverage at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 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 and subject of a future Consent application, with the following variances:

- 1. a rear yard setback of 6.5m, where 7.5m is required;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line; and
3. a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted.

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 Bonaventure Drive.

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

Staff have no concerns with the requested rear yard variances as sufficient rear yard amenity space will be maintained.

Staff have no concerns with the requested lot coverage as all other zone standards (with the exception of requested rear yard setback of 6.5 m) are being maintained. The proposed lot coverage does not appear to impact the functionality of the proposed lot.

Staff is 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 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 semi-detached dwelling.

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The Committee Members and the Chair unanimously agreed to hear Applications PL-MV-2026-00050 and PL-MV-2026-00051 together.
The owner's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735043251, SRO, Lot 109, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4202 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

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 and subject of a future Consent application, providing firstly, a rear yard setback of 6.5m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, 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, and secondly, a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted, 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00051

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP, 100 RADISSON, CHELMSFORD, ON, Canada P0M1L0

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735043251, SRO, Lot 109, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4206 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-2, R1-5 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 and subject of a future Consent Application, providing setbacks, encroachments and lot coverage at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 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 and subject of a future Consent application, with the following variances:

1. a rear yard setback of 6.5m, where 7.5m is required;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line; and
3. a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted.

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 Bonaventure Drive.

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

Staff have no concerns with the requested rear yard variances as sufficient rear yard amenity space will be maintained.

Staff have no concerns with the requested lot coverage as all other zone standards (with the exception of requested rear yard setback of 6.5 m) are being maintained. The proposed lot coverage does not appear to impact the functionality of the proposed lot.

Staff is 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 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 semi-detached dwelling.

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The Committee Members and the Chair unanimously agreed to hear Applications PL-MV-2026-00050 and PL-MV-2026-00051 together.
The owner's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735043251, SRO, Lot 109, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4206 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

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 and subject of a future Consent application, providing firstly, a rear yard setback of 6.5m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, 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, and secondly, a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted, 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00052

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP, 100 RADISSON, CHELMSFORD, ON, Canada P0M1L0

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735043251, SRO, Lot 110, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4210 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-2, R1-5 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 and subject of a future Consent Application, providing setbacks, encroachments and lot coverage at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 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 and subject of a future Consent application, with the following variances:

1. a rear yard setback of 6.5m, where 7.5m is required;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line; and
3. a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted.

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 Bonaventure Drive.

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 rear yard variances as sufficient rear yard amenity space will be maintained.

Staff have no concerns with the requested lot coverage as all other zone standards (with the exception of requested rear yard setback of 6.5 m) are being maintained. The proposed lot coverage does not appear to impact the functionality of the proposed lot.

Staff is 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 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 semi-detached dwelling.

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The Committee Members and the Chair unanimously agreed to hear Applications PL-MV-2026-00052 and PL-MV-2026-00053 together. The owner's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735043251, SRO, Lot 110, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4210 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

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 and subject of a future Consent application, providing firstly, a rear yard setback of 6.5m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, 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, and secondly, a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted, 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00053

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP, 100 RADISSON, CHELMSFORD, ON, Canada P0M1L0

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735043251, SRO, Lot 110, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4214 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R2-2, R1-5 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 and subject of a future Consent Application, providing setbacks, encroachments and lot coverage at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 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 and subject of a future Consent application, with the following variances:

1. a rear yard setback of 6.5m, where 7.5m is required;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line; and
3. a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted.

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 Bonaventure Drive.

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 rear yard variances as sufficient rear yard amenity space will be maintained.

Staff have no concerns with the requested lot coverage as all other zone standards (with the exception of requested rear yard setback of 6.5 m) are being maintained. The proposed lot coverage does not appear to impact the functionality of the proposed lot.

Staff is 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 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 semi-detached dwelling.

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The Committee Members and the Chair unanimously agreed to hear Applications PL-MV-2026-00052 and PL-MV-2026-00053 together.
The owner's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735043251, SRO, Lot 110, Plan M-1114, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 4214 Bonaventure Drive, Hanmer P3P 0E2

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 and subject of a future Consent application, providing firstly, a rear yard setback of 6.5m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, 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, and secondly, a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted, 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00054

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP, 100 RADISSON, CHELMSFORD, ON, Canada P0M1L0

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735043267, SRO, Lot 148, Plan M-1115, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3101 Manon Street, Hanmer, ON

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 construct a semi-detached dwelling on a proposed lot identified as Side B on the Plot Plan and subject of a future Consent Application, providing setbacks, encroachments, lot coverage, parking and driveway at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 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 and subject of a future Consent application, with the following variances:

- 1. a rear yard setback of 6.36m, where 7.5m is required;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.62m into the proposed 6.36m rear yard setback, where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line;
3. a corner side yard setback of 1.35m, where 4.5m is required;
4. an eaves encroachment of 0.62m into the proposed 1.35m, where eaves may encroach 0.6 m into the required yard or court but not closer than 0.6 m to the lot line;
5. a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted;
6. a parking area within the sight triangle, where outdoor parking areas shall not be located within a sight triangle in accordance with Section 4.35;
7. a parking area within the required corner side yard, where outdoor parking areas shall not be located within any required corner side yard in any Residential (R) Zone;
8. a driveway within a sight triangle and not furthest removed from the intersection, where driveways used for providing access for the parking of motor vehicles shall not be located within a sight triangle and where a lot is occupied by a semi-detached dwelling unit, the driveway shall be located along the front lot line or exterior side lot line, at the location furthest removed from the intersection;
9. a vehicle to be parked or stored within a sight triangle, where within any part of a sight triangle, no vehicle shall be parking or stored in such a manner as to impede or obstruct in any way the field of view across such a sight triangle for persons driving vehicles on an abutting road.

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 Drive.

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 rear yard variances as sufficient rear yard amenity space will be maintained.

Staff have no concerns with the requested lot coverage as the lot appears to be functional.

While the subject land is considered a corner lot it differs from a typical corner lot in that it abuts a cul de sac rather than another through road. Given the context of the site, staff have no concerns with the requested corner side yard setback.

Development Engineering stated that in this case, the proximity to the cul de sac does not appear to incur the normal concerns typically found for corner lots with parking or obstructions in the sight triangle. The applicant is recommended to revise the dwelling layout to place the driveway outside of the sight triangle, but at this time we have no concern with the current location. Based on this, staff are supportive of the requested variances associated with the location of the driveway.

Staff is 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 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 semi-detached dwelling.

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

In this case, the proximity to the cul de sac does not appear to incur the normal concerns typically found for corner lots with parking or obstructions in the sight triangle. The applicant is recommended to revise the dwelling layout to place the driveway outside of the sight triangle, but at this time we have no concern with the current location.

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The Committee Members and the Chair unanimously agreed to hear Applications PL-MV-2026-00054 and PL-MV-2026-00055 together.
The owner's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735043267, SRO, Lot 148, Plan M-1115, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3101 Manon Street, Hanmer, ON

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.35, subsection 4.35.2, Part 5, Section 5.2, subsection 5.2.4.3 a) and d) and subsection 5.4.3.2 a) i) and 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 and subject of a future Consent application, providing firstly, a rear yard setback of 6.36m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.62m into the proposed 6.36m rear yard setback, 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, secondly, a corner side yard setback of 1.35m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.62m into the proposed 1.35m, where 4.5m is required and where eaves may encroach 0.6 m into the required yard or court but not closer than 0.6 m to the lot line, thirdly, a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted, fourthly, a parking area within the sight triangle, where outdoor parking areas shall not be located within a sight triangle in accordance with Section 4.35, fifthly, a parking area within the required corner side yard, where outdoor parking areas shall not be located within any required corner side yard in any Residential (R) Zone, sixthly, a driveway within a sight triangle and not furthest removed from the intersection, where driveways used for providing access for the parking of motor vehicles shall not be located within a sight triangle and where a lot is occupied by a semi-detached dwelling unit, the driveway shall be located along the front lot line or exterior side lot line, at the location furthest removed from the intersection, seventhly, a vehicle to be parked or stored within a sight triangle, where within any part of a sight triangle, no vehicle shall be parking or stored in such a manner as to impede or obstruct in any way the field of view across such a sight triangle for persons driving vehicles on an abutting road, 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00055

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP, 100 RADISSON, CHELMSFORD, ON, Canada P0M1L0

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735041108, SRO, Lot 148, Plan M-1115, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3097 Manon Street, Hanmer P3P 0E3

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

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 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 and subject of a future Consent application, with the following variances:

1. a rear yard setback of 6.5m, where 7.5m is required;
2. an eaves encroachment of 0.62m into the proposed 6.5m rear yard setback, where eaves may encroach 1.2m into the required yard but not closer than 0.6m to the lot line; and
3. a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted.

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 rear yard variances as sufficient rear yard amenity space will be maintained.

Staff have no concerns with the requested lot coverage as all other zone standards (with the exception of requested rear yard setback of 6.5 m) are being maintained. The proposed lot coverage does not appear to impact the functionality of the proposed lot.

Staff is 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.

Sudbury Hydro, May 7, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, May 6, 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 semi-detached dwelling.

Corridor Management, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

In this case, the proximity to the cul de sac does not appear to incur the normal concerns typically found for corner lots with parking or obstructions in the sight triangle. The applicant is recommended to revise the dwelling layout to place the driveway outside of the sight triangle, but at this time we have no concern with the current location.

Eaves Encroachment:

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, May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), May 6, 2026

No Comment Received

Strategic and Environmental Planning, May 5, 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.

Ministry of Transportation, April 30, 2026

I can confirm that the subject lands are not within the MTO's Permit Control Area; therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Conservation Sudbury, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 29, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

05/13/2026 The Committee Members and the Chair unanimously agreed to hear Applications PL-MV-2026-00054 and PL-MV-2026-00055 together.
The owner's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.
The Committee Members and the Chair expressed support for the Application and staff's recommendation.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
DOMINION PARK DEVELOPMENTS CORP
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735041108, SRO, Lot 148, Plan M-1115, Part Lot 5, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer, 3097 Manon Street, Hanmer 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 and subject of a future Consent application, providing firstly, a rear yard setback of 6.36m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.62m into the proposed 6.36m rear yard setback, 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, and secondly, a maximum lot coverage of 51%, where 45% is permitted, 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 are 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	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00035

May 13, 2026

OWNER(S): PAUL CHARBONNEAU, 219 O'Neil Dr E, Garson, ON, Canada

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 021360046, Part Lots 141 - 142, as in S89056, Plan 1-SC, Part Lot 6, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 111 Bloor Street, Sudbury P3C 2K8

SUMMARY

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

Application: Permission under Section 45(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, to expand the legal non-conforming use of the existing lot, including the building, to increase the number of dwelling units within the existing building and maintain current parking.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, May 7, 2026

No changes from previous comments.

Development Engineering, May 6, 2026

We have some concerns regards to the reduction in the required number of parking spaces, it is important to note that on-street parking is not permitted on College Street, and/or only short term on-street parking (maximum of 4 hours) is available on Bloor Street, therefore any overflow parking that may occur from this site will affect the neighbouring property owners on Bloor Street or other area roadways.

Building Services, May 1, 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 permit and building permit documents to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official, is required for the proposed construction.
2. A search of our records indicates there are Building Permits which have not been completed. Owner shall contact Building Services to discuss outstanding items. Building Permit Number B14-1154

Development Approvals, April 10, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to expand the legal non-conforming use of the existing building from 10 dwelling units to 12 dwelling units and maintain 1 parking space for 12 dwelling units where 1 parking space for 10 dwelling units currently exists.

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 are of the opinion that increasing the number of residential units without adequate parking in the 'Living Area I' designation is not an appropriate use of the lands.

Development Engineering has advised of concerns regards to the reduction in the required number of parking spaces, and noted that on-street parking is not permitted on College Street, and/or only short term on-street parking (maximum of 4 hours) is available on Bloor Street, therefore any overflow parking that may occur from this site will impact the neighbouring property owners on Bloor Street or other area roadways.

Staff recognize that the nearest bus stop is located approximately 50 m north of the subject lands on College Street, and that there are institutional and park uses within walking distance, 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.

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 permit and building permit documents to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official, is required for the proposed construction.
2. A search of our records indicates there are Building Permits which have not been completed. Owner shall contact Building Services to discuss outstanding items. Building Permit Number B14-1154

Corridor Management, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, April 8, 2026

We have some concerns regards to the reduction in the required number of parking spaces, it is important to note that on-street parking is not permitted on College Street, and/or only short term on-street parking (maximum of 4 hours) is available on Bloor Street, therefore any overflow parking that may occur from this site will affect the neighbouring property owners on Bloor Street or other area roadways.

Hydro One, April 8, 2026

No Comment Received

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

No Comment Received

Sudbury Hydro, April 8, 2026

No Concerns

Conservation Sudbury, April 2, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, April 2, 2026

site plan control is not required for the proposed increase from 10 units to 12 units, as long as no increase in parking or paved areas is required.

Meeting Minutes:

04/15/2026 The Application was deferred before the meeting at the request of the applicant in order to address staff's comments.

05/13/2026 The applicant's agent, Vanessa Smith of Tulloch Engineering, appeared before Committee and provided information on the deferral, the changes that were made in response to staff's comments and a summary of the Application.
The Secretary-Treasurer advised Committee that a letter of concern was received from Brad Ferguson of 142 Bloor Street and confirmed Committee's receipt of the letter.
Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she attended the property and expressed opposition to staff's recommendation.
Committee Member Goswell expressed opposition to staff's recommendation. The Committee Member asked the agent to speak to the parking arrangements for the units that would not benefit from a parking space and the agent advised that the lease specifies whether a unit would have parking.
Committee Member Murray expressed opposition to staff's recommendation.
Committee Chair Dumont expressed opposition to staff's recommendation. The Chair commented on the property's proximity to other designations under the Official Plan, available transit and the agent's comments regarding the parking arrangements under a lease. The Chair expressed support for the agent's rationale provided as part of the Application.
Staff's recommendation to deny the Application was defeated. Committee Member Castanza put forward a motion to grant the Application and Committee Member Goswell seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
PAUL CHARBONNEAU
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 021360046, Part Lots 141 - 142, as in S89056, Plan 1-SC, Part Lot 6, Concession 4, Township of McKim, 111 Bloor Street, Sudbury P3C 2K8

for permission under Section 45(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13 to expand the legal non-conforming use of the existing building from 10 dwelling units to 11 dwelling units and maintain 1 parking space for 11 dwelling units where 1 parking space for 10 dwelling units currently exists, be granted.

Consideration was given to Section 45(2) of the *Planning Act*, the use that was made of the building or structure on the day the By-law was passed continued until the date of the Application to the Committee. The enlargement or extension of the building or structure is within the limits of the land owned and used in connection therewith on the day the By-law was passed. The request is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the property and the general intent and purpose of the By-Law and 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	Concurring
DAVID MURRAY	Concurring
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Absent
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring