

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. A0133/2021

November 10, 2021

OWNER(S): SHARPE FARM SUPPLIES LTD., C/O PAUL SHARPE, 7707 Mill Road Guelph ON N1H 6J1

AGENT(S): HFH INC. (C/O JOHN VANDERWEORD), 6006 HWY 6 Elora ON N0B 1S0

LOCATION: PIN 73347 0736, Parcel 30147, Survey Plan 53R-12839 Part(s) 1, Lot Pt 7, Concession 3, Township of

Rayside, 434 Montee Principale, Azilda

SUMMARY

Zoning:

The property is zoned RU(31) (Rural) according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-

100Z, as amended.

Application:

For approval to permit an existing storage building on the subject property providing a lot coverage at

variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

The Nickel District Conservation Authority, November 04, 2021

Conservation Sudbury does not oppose Minor Variance Application A0133/2021. It does not appear that a permit pursuant to Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act will be required as the subject property does not contain any obvious floodplains, watercourses, shorelines, wetlands, valley slopes or other environmental features.

Notes

Please be advised that Conservation Sudbury regulates the hazards associated with natural features and uses the attached mapping as a tool to identify those hazards for the public. Although Conservation Sudbury makes every effort to ensure accurate mapping, regulated natural hazards may exist on-site that have not yet been identified. Should a regulated natural hazard be discovered as the site is developed, the applicant must halt works immediately and contact Conservation Sudbury directly at 705.674.5249. Regulated natural hazards include floodplains, watercourses, shorelines, wetlands, valley slopes.

Conservation Sudbury respectfully requests a copy of any decision. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at bailey.chabot@conservationsudbury.ca.

CGS: Building Services Section, November 03, 2021

No Objection.

CGS: Site Plan Control, November 03, 2021

No objections.

Ministry of Transportation, November 03, 2021

No concerns.

Greater Sudbury Hydro Inc., November 02, 2021

No objection.

CGS: Development Approvals Section, November 01, 2021

The lot coverage variance being sought would recognize and permit an existing accessory building to remain on the lands which have frontage on Montee Principale in Azilda. The lands are designated Agricultural Reserve in the City's Official Plan and zoned "RU(31)", Rural Special under By-law 2010-100Z being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury. Staff notes that the "RU" Zone permits a maximum lot coverage for all buildings of 10% whereas the variance being sought would allow for 15.5% maximum lot coverage. Staff understands that the main building was recently reconstructed and the owner intended on demolishing the storage building once construction of the new main building was completed. The owner has since opted to retain the storage building and when combined with the recently constructed main building the lands are now exceeding the maximum lot coverage of 10% for all buildings on the lands. Staff notes that the lands form a legal existing undersized lot of record and upon review of the application is of the opinion that the additional 5.5% lot coverage is reasonable and would not result in the over-development of the lands. The location of the existing accessory building in relation to the main building also does not appear to negatively impact the lands from an operational perspective. Staff recommends that the variance be approved as it is minor, appropriate development for the area and the intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law are maintained.

CGS: Infrastructure Capital Planning Services, October 29, 2021

Roads No concerns.

Transportation & Innovation No concerns.

Active Transportation No concerns.

CGS: Development Engineering, October 28, 2021

No objection.

The applicant appeared before Committee and explained that they built a new feed store on the property. The applicant explained that there were originally four structures on the property, but they took down three of them and built the new feed store. The applicant explained that they originally wanted to build a bigger building, but they were going to be tight on space. The storage building is primarily used for hay and straw storage as it would be difficult to store those products outside and therefore, they would like to keep the building.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

SHARPE FARM SUPPLIES LTD.

the owner(s) of PIN 73347 0736, Parcel 30147, Survey Plan 53R-12839 Part(s) 1, Lot Pt 7, Concession 3, Township of Rayside, 434 Montee Principale, Azilda

for relief from Part 9, Section 9.3, Table 9.3 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit an existing accessory building, being a storage building, providing a maximum lot coverage of 15.5%, where 10% 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 variance is minor in nature and is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land and building. 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
Carol Ann Coupal	Concurring
Cathy Castanza	Concurring
Dan Laing	Concurring
Derrick Chartand	Concurring
Matt Dumont	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. A0134/2021

November 10, 2021

OWNER(S): JOHN MCCORMICK, 3 Marina Rd Onaping ON P0M 2R0

AGENT(S): TULLOCH ENGINEERING - VANESSA SMITH, 1942 REGENT STREET UNIT L SUDBURY ON P3E 5V5

LOCATION: PINs 73354 0796 & 73354 0138 & 73354 0260, Parcels 23767 & 9445 SEC SWS, Survey Plan 53R-4645

Part(s) 1, Lots Pt 10, Pt Broken 10, Concession 4, Township of Dowling, 3 Marina Road, Onaping

SUMMARY

Zoning:

The property is zoned RU (Rural), SLS (Seasonal Limited Service) according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application:

Approval of a severed lot, following a severance, having a lot frontage at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

CGS: Environmental Planning Initiatives, November 05, 2021

This correspondence is for informational purposes only. Shoreline property owners are encouraged to continue adopting lake-friendly practices.

The subject lands are immediately adjacent to Windy Lake, Township of Dowling, City of Greater Sudbury.

Phosphorus is an essential element for all life forms and is the most limiting major nutrient for aquatic plant growth in freshwater streams and lakes. Increasing levels of phosphorus in lakes, streams and rivers can lead to an increasing incidence of nuisance aquatic vegetation, green algae, and, in some cases, toxic cyanobacterial (blue-green algae) blooms. Public Health Sudbury & Districts have confirmed the presence of cyanobacterial blooms in Windy Lake in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2016 and 2019.

Existing vegetation on the subject lands acts as an important buffer, absorbing runoff sediments and holding soil in place. Vegetation removal on the subject lands should be kept to a minimum during any site preparation or construction activities or for purposes of converting existing natural vegetation to lawns. Lawns require higher maintenance and expense and generally require importing soil from outside of the lot. Imported soil can introduce considerable quantities of phosphorus.

Shoreline and stream bank residents can help reduce phosphorus levels or maintain them at low levels by following a few guidelines:

- 1. A natural vegetated buffer of at least 30 metres (the wider the better) from the high water mark should be retained and supplemented with additional shrubs where necessary. As per the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law, a maximum cleared area of 25% of the shoreline or stream bank or up to 23 metres, whichever is less, is allowable.
- 2. Residents should minimize the amount of lawn on their property. Lawns generally require removing existing vegetation that is currently preventing soil erosion.

Lawns may also require that soil be imported to the property, which can introduce significant phosphorus to the lake through erosion. Finally, lawns are expensive and time-consuming to maintain.

- 3. General use lawn fertilizers containing phosphorus should never be used. It is illegal to apply lawn fertilizers containing phosphorus in the City of Greater Sudbury unless establishing a new lawn. Before applying fertilizer of any kind on their lawns, owners should have the soil tested by a professional. The soil might only need crushed limestone to make it less acidic and allow soil nutrients to be more available for uptake by the turf grass.
- 4. Application of fertilizer containing phosphorus to flower or vegetable beds or shrubs should not be applied any closer than 30 metres from the water's edge the farther the better.
- 5. Any soil that is disturbed onsite or that is brought onto the subject lands should be covered with vegetation as quickly as possible to ensure that it doesn't erode into the lake. Soil particles can contain large amounts of phosphorus. Tarps should be used to cover the soil piles if rain is in the forecast.
- 6. Detergents (soaps and shampoos) should never be used in a lake or river. Only phosphorus-free detergents should be used for washing vehicles on the subject lands and washing should be done as far from the lake as possible.
- 7. Private sewage systems should be inspected and pumped at least every three years.

Property owners are encouraged to contact the City's Lake Water Quality Program at (705) 674-4455 ext. 4604 to book a free, confidential and non-regulatory shoreline home visit. During the visit, qualified staff will provide ideas and advice on shoreline management techniques to maintain and improve lake water quality.

The applicant or owner must contact Conservation Sudbury at (705) 674-5249 before starting any work in water or on the shoreline or stream bank (retaining walls, etc).

The Nickel District Conservation Authority, November 05, 2021

Conservation Sudbury does not oppose Minor Variance Application A0134/2021 as lot frontage is not germane to the concerns of Conservation Sudbury.

However, the proponent is advised that development, as defined by the Conservation Authorities Act, will not be permitted within the floodplain or wetland and therefore any structures, lot grading, septic systems and other servicing and infrastructure will not be allowed within the floodplain nor the wetland. It is recommended that the proponent clearly communicate these restrictions to any prospective purchasers. The proponent is advised that Conservation Sudbury will review the proposed severances under separate cover.

Notes

The proponent is advised that development within an area regulated by Ontario Regulation 156/06 may require a permit pursuant to Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act. 'Development' is defined by the Conservation Authorities Act and includes, but is not limited to, the alteration of a watercourse, grading, placement or removal of fill (even if it originated from the same site), site preparation for construction, and the erection of a building or structure. Scientific studies and/or technical reports may be required to support the permit application, the cost of which will be borne by the applicant. Any permit issued may include conditions of development and permits are not guaranteed. For more information and to discuss the requirements, please contact our office at ndca@conservationsudbury.ca.

Please be advised that Conservation Sudbury regulates the hazards associated with natural features and uses the attached mapping as a tool to identify those hazards for the public. Although Conservation Sudbury makes every effort to ensure accurate mapping, regulated natural hazards may exist on-site that have not yet been identified. Should a regulated natural hazard be discovered as the site is developed, the applicant must halt works immediately and contact Conservation Sudbury directly at 705.674.5249. Regulated natural hazards include floodplains, watercourses, shorelines, wetlands, valley slopes.

Conservation Sudbury respectfully requests a copy of any decision. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at bailey.chabot@conservationsudbury.ca.

CGS: Building Services Section, November 03, 2021

No Objection.

CGS: Site Plan Control, November 03, 2021

No objections.

Ministry of Transportation, November 03, 2021

No concerns.

Greater Sudbury Hydro Inc., November 02, 2021

No objection.

CGS: Development Approvals Section, November 01, 2021

The variance being sought would facilitate the creation of a rural waterfront lot having frontage on Marina Road in Dowling. The lands also have water access on Windy Lake. The lands are designated Rural in the City's Official Plan and zoned "SLS", Seasonal Limited Service under By-law 2010-100Z being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury. Staff would note that the development proposal represents rural waterfront lot creation and as such the policies contained under Section 5.2.2 (4) of the City's Official Plan are applicable. In particular, Section 5.2.2(4) of the City's Official Plan requires both the severed and retained lands to have a minimum lot area of 0.8 ha (2 acres) along with a minimum water lot frontage of 45 m (148 ft). Staff is generally supportive of the development proposal and notes that the proposed rural waterfront lots are in conformity with the above noted policies in the City's Official Plan and therefore the variances are largely technical in nature. Staff notes that the proposed new lot would maintain 45 m (148 ft) of water frontage on Windy Lake and 25 m (82.02 ft) of frontage on Marina Road. Staff is of the opinion that the variance being sought is largely technical in nature due to the proposed lot having public road frontage on Marina Road that would not be altered as a result of the development proposal proceeding. Staff recommends that the variance be approved as it is minor, appropriate development for the area and the intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw are maintained.

CGS: Infrastructure Capital Planning Services, October 29, 2021

Roads No concerns.

Transportation & Innovation No concerns.

Active Transportation No concerns.

CGS: Development Engineering, October 28, 2021

No objection.

The agent, Vanessa Smith of Tulloch Engineering, appeared before Committee and explained that the application is to permit a lot frontage of 25.0m, where 45.0m is required due to a proposed severance where the lot frontage does not meet the Seasonal Limited Service zoning standards. The agent explained that the overall lot is proposed to be severed

into three lots with two severed and one retained. The agent explained that proposed lot 1 is the lot that requires this variance due to it having frontage at the end of Marina Road as well a water frontage along Windy Lake. The agent explained that this variance is technical in nature given the water frontage. The agent explained that the variance is minor and appropriate because it is technical in nature as the property has both road frontage on Marina Road and water frontage on Windy Lake, the variance would facilitate the creation of one new lot which meets the requirements in the Official Plan lot creation policies, and because the application proposes a reduction in frontage requirements to permit 25.0m of road frontage, where 45.0m is required and will have the required 45.0m of frontage along the water. The agent further explained that the original proposal for proposed lot 1 was to provide no road frontage, however after discussions with staff it was decided that this is the preferred option and therefore the variance is required. The agent explained that if they had not provided road frontage a variance would not have been needed. The agent further explained that in terms of this variance in keeping with the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law, the subject property and all surrounding properties in the area are zoned SLS, Seasonal Limited Service and the only permitted uses in this zone are seasonal dwellings and private cabins. The agent also explained that the SLS zone require that all lots have a minimum area of 0.8 hectares and 45.0m of frontage and it is her opinion that the application is in keeping with the general intent of the Zoning By-law as all of the proposed lots are greater than 0.8 hectares in area and all provide a minimum of 45.0m of water frontage. The agent advised that the only uses proposed are those that are permitted, being the seasonal dwellings and private cabins. The agent explained that in terms of this variance in keeping with the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan, the lands are designated Rural in the Official Plan and waterfront lot creation is permitted in Rural areas subject to policies in section 5.2.2, 4 and all of these lots will conform. The agent acknowledged the concerns expressed by area residents around the use of the property and explained that the variance does not pertain to the use of the lands as it is a technical variance for development which is consistent with Official Plan policies. The agent further explained that any non-compliance with the use of the property is a by-law enforcement matter and should be dealt with through by-law enforcement. Stephanie McIntyre of 41 Marina Road addressed Committee and advised that she sent an email with questions about the application. Committee Chair Chartrand advised the resident that she had five minutes to express support or opposition to the hearing however with regards to the questions, as the owner was not at the hearing to provide answers, Committee could direct questions after the fact. The resident wanted to know what the applicant's plans are for the property. She also explained to Committee that she understands that the zoning is SLS but most residents in the area reside on their properties as their primary residence as opposed to seasonal recreational and with Covid, people are working from home and seasonal recreational would be disruptive. Committee Chair Chartrand explained to the resident that this application is not a rezoning and what Committee is deciding on is strictly the frontage going to 25.0m, where 45.0m is required and asked the resident if she had any comments relating to that. The resident advised that she had emailed her questions and it was her understanding that someone would answer them and so far, they haven't been. The resident requested that the Committee answer the questions or email her the answers. Committee Chair Chartrand asked the Secretary-Treasurer what the City received for correspondence. The Secretary-Treasurer advised that the City received three emails of concern, the first from Terry Shinton and Steven Shinton of 37 Marina Road and their concerns relate to the plans for the property, the zoning changes, camping trailer park, people living in mobile homes, deterioration of buildings, complaints to by-law enforcement, outhouses and lack of washing facilities, security of their own home and they are not in support of the application. The Secretary-Treasurer advised that the second email that was received was from Stephanie McIntyre of 41 Marina Road who Committee just heard from and the Secretary-Treasurer advised that the email was forwarded to Committee for their consideration. The Secretary-Treasurer advised that there were several questions relating to the application and requested Committee to acknowledge receipt of the email. Committee Chair Chartrand advised that he did not receive the email and requested the Secretary-Treasurer to read the email to Committee, the Secretary-Treasurer read the email from Stephanie McIntyre dated November 5, 2021 in its entirety. The Secretary-Treasurer advised that the third email of concern received by the City was from Shannon LePage of 79 Marina Road and her concerns relate to the plans for the severed properties, maintenance of the road, use of the severed properties, trespassing, the environment, use the garbage and recycling, and access to her property. The agent acknowledged the comments and concerns but explained that they relate to the use of the property and are being dealt with through By-law and the application before Committee is a Minor Variance application for a reduced lot frontage from 45.0m to 25.0m, and in terms of access to the property to the east, as shown on the sketch, access would still be maintained as those easements are registered. The agent further explained that the applications are within Official Plan policies and had they decided to give all the road lot frontage to proposed lot 2 the application would not be before Committee. Committee Member Coupal advised that she attended the property and saw one trailer and a shed and that she was unsure about where the AirBNB was located, and it was her understanding that the Health Unit attended the property, and the outhouses are not illegal but the grey water from the shower needs to be done. Committee Member Coupal further advised that she saw young children in the area but was not sure where the bus drops them off and that it was her understanding that the road was maintained to the end of the pavement. Stephanie McIntyre explained that the other trailers were removed from the property mid-September. Committee

Member Coupal explained that the previous owner had the boat launch at the location with boats and trailers on the site and asked the resident what the difference was now. Stephanie McIntyre explained that it was advertised as a trailer park and the turnover of trailers was often. She also explained that the applicant was using it as an illegal trailer park without the proper accommodations for sewer, septic, and garbage. Committee Member Coupal explained that that would be a by-law issue and not what is in front of Committee. Stephanie McIntyre explained that there was more than one trailer in the summer. Committee Member Coupal asked the resident where the other property was that the applicant was renting as she did not see another house. Stephanie McIntyre explained that the shed was being made into a second AirBNB and another building at the boat launch, and that both are on either side of the boat launch, but the second one was not finished. Committee Member Coupal advised that she only saw one trailer, about four boats and the shed and any issues around use was a by-law problem and there have been no issues beyond the grey water from the sauna by the lake. Committee Chair Chartrand asked Committee Member Coupal if she had any comments relating to the lot frontage and Committee Member Coupal advised that she did not, and that Committee was only dealing with the lot frontage and not with everything else. Committee Member Dumont advised that he was supportive of staff's recommendation to support this variance for lot frontage. Committee Member Dumont explained that when Committee is dealing with variance applications, it is strictly regarding the four tests through the Planning Act, that is the focus and that is on what he bases his decision and ultimately that is based on staff's information that is brought to Committee prior to the meetings. Committee Member Dumont explained that staff's information is with respect to the Official Plan as well as the Zoning By-law and it concerns him to hear comments requesting personal information, if residents have concerns, they should be reaching out to appropriate City staff. Committee Member Dumont explained that residents have the right to do what they want on their property so long as they meet the regulations in the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law and Committee is there to hear Planning related matter. Committee Member Castanza advised that she is of the same opinion as Committee Member Dumont and supports staff recommendation. Committee Chair Chartrand advised that the issues surrounding the plans for the property, potential zoning changes, illegal campgrounds, etc., Committee is there specifically to deal with the minimum lot frontage that will be part of a severance and Committee has no jurisdiction or authority over what anyone's plans may or may not be in the future, future owners, or By-law Enforcement, if there is a safety issue or a by-law issue then residents should contact the proper authorities. Committee Chair Chartrand further explained that Committee's jurisdiction is to deal with the minor variance request for the minimum lot frontage and the objections do not relate to the variance in question and have more to do with issues and matters between neighbours and he supports staff's recommendation. Staff advised that they reviewed the emails containing the comments and Committee should be in possession of the comments dated November 5 which contained all the correspondence received on this application. Staff also advised that they do forward all the correspondence to Committee for their consideration and the Notices that go out do invite comments, remarks or to phone City staff if there are questions and staff does forward all of that to Committee. Committee Chair Chartrand confirmed that he did in fact receive the correspondence.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by: JOHN MCCORMICK

the owner(s) of PINs 73354 0796 & 73354 0138 & 73354 0260, Parcels 23767 & 9445 SEC SWS, Survey Plan 53R-4645 Part(s) 1, Lots Pt 10, Pt Broken 10, Concession 4, Township of Dowling, 3 Marina Road, Onaping

for relief from Part 9, Section 9.3, Table 9.3 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to approve a severed lot following a severance, which is subject of a proposed Consent Application, providing a minimum lot frontage of 25.0m where 45.0m 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.

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
Carol Ann Coupal	Concurring

Cathy Castanza Concurring

Dan Laing Concurring

Derrick Chartand Concurring

Matt Dumont Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. A0137/2021

November 10, 2021

OWNER(S): SHAUN MCGLADE, 2855 Valleyview Road Val Caron ON P3N 1R2 MAZIE MCGLADE. 2855 Valleyview Road Val Caron ON P3N 1R2

AGENT(S):

LOCATION: PIN 73519 0088, Parcel 53M1229-22 SEC SES SRO, Lot(s) 22, Subdivision 53M-1229, Township of Rathburn, 1931 Bushy Bay Road, Sudbury

SUMMARY

Zoning:

The property is zoned SLS (8) (Seasonal Limited Service) according to the City of Greater Sudbury

Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application:

For approval to construct an addition to the seasonal dwelling on the subject property providing a front yard setback at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

CGS: Environmental Planning Initiatives, November 05, 2021

This correspondence is for informational purposes only. Shoreline property owners are encouraged to continue adopting lake-friendly practices.

Phosphorus is an essential element for all life forms and is the most limiting major nutrient for aquatic plant growth in freshwater streams and lakes. Increasing levels of phosphorus in lakes, streams and rivers can lead to an increasing incidence of nuisance aquatic vegetation, green algae, and, in some cases, toxic cyanobacterial (blue-green algae) blooms. Public Health Sudbury & Districts have confirmed presence of cyanobacterial blooms in Wanapitei Lake in 2016 and 2017.

Existing vegetation on the subject lands acts as an important buffer, absorbing runoff sediments and holding soil in place. Vegetation removal on the subject lands should be kept to a minimum during any site preparation or construction activities or for purposes of converting existing natural vegetation to lawns. Lawns require higher maintenance and expense and generally require importing soil from outside of the lot. Imported soil can introduce considerable quantities of phosphorus.

Shoreline and stream bank residents can help reduce phosphorus levels or maintain them at low levels by following a few guidelines:

- 1. A natural vegetated buffer of at least 20 metres (the wider the better) from the high water mark should be retained and supplemented with additional shrubs where necessary. As per the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law, a maximum cleared area of 25% of the shoreline or stream bank or up to 23 metres, whichever is less, is allowable.
- 2. Residents should minimize the amount of lawn on their property. Lawns generally require removing existing vegetation that is currently preventing soil erosion. Lawns may also require that soil be imported to the property, which can introduce significant phosphorus to the lake through erosion. Finally, lawns are expensive and time-consuming to maintain.
- 3. General use lawn fertilizers containing phosphorus should never be used. It is illegal to apply lawn fertilizers containing phosphorus in the City of Greater Sudbury unless establishing a new lawn. Before

applying fertilizer of any kind on their lawns, owners should have the soil tested by a professional. The soil might only need crushed limestone to make it less acidic and allow soil nutrients to be more available for uptake by the turf grass.

- 4. Application of fertilizer containing phosphorus to flower or vegetable beds or shrubs should not be applied any closer than 30 metres from the water's edge the farther the better.
- 5. Any soil that is disturbed onsite or that is brought onto the subject lands should be covered with vegetation as quickly as possible to ensure that it doesn't erode into the lake. Soil particles can contain large amounts of phosphorus. Tarps should be used to cover the soil piles if rain is in the forecast.
- 6. Detergents (soaps and shampoos) should never be used in a lake or river. Only phosphorus-free detergents should be used for washing vehicles on the subject lands and washing should be done as far from the lake as possible.
- 7. Private sewage systems should be inspected and pumped at least every three years.

Property owners are encouraged to contact the City's Lake Water Quality Program at (705) 674-4455 ext. 4604 to book a free, confidential and non-regulatory shoreline home visit. During the visit, qualified staff will provide ideas and advice on shoreline management techniques to maintain and improve lake water quality.

The applicant or owner must contact Conservation Sudbury at (705) 674-5249 before starting any work in water or on the shoreline or stream bank (retaining walls, etc)

The Nickel District Conservation Authority, November 04, 2021

Conservation Sudbury does not oppose Minor Variance Application as the proposed addition is outside of the natural hazards associated with Boland's Bay, Lake Wahnapitae.

However, proponent is reminded that future development within an area regulated by Ontario Regulation 156/06 may require a permit pursuant to Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act. Conservation Sudbury regulates to the hazard elevation of 269.5 metres (CGVD28 datum) on Lake Wahnapitae, plus an additional 15 metres horizontally inland.

Notes

Please be advised that Conservation Sudbury regulates the hazards associated with natural features and uses the attached mapping as a tool to identify those hazards for the public. Although Conservation Sudbury makes every effort to ensure accurate mapping, regulated natural hazards may exist on-site that have not yet been identified. Should a regulated natural hazard be discovered as the site is developed, the applicant must halt works immediately and contact Conservation Sudbury directly at 705.674.5249. Regulated natural hazards include floodplains, watercourses, shorelines, wetlands, valley slopes.

Conservation Sudbury respectfully requests a copy of any decision. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at bailey.chabot@conservationsudbury.ca.

CGS: Building Services Section, November 03, 2021

No objection.

CGS: Site Plan Control, November 03, 2021

No objections.

Ministry of Transportation, November 03, 2021

No concerns.

Greater Sudbury Hydro Inc., November 02, 2021

No objection.

CGS: Development Approvals Section, November 01, 2021

The variance being sought would facilitate the construction of an addition to an existing seasonal dwelling on the subject lands that have frontage on Bushy Bay Road in Sudbury. The lands also have water frontage on Boland's Lake. The lands are designated Rural in the City's Official Plan and zoned "SLS(8)", Seasonal Limited Service Special under By-law 2010-100Z being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury. Staff notes that the shoreline is irregular and the proposed addition at its closest point would be setback from 18.3 m (60.04 ft) from the highwater mark of Boland's Lake whereas the maximum setback to the proposed addition as depicted on the submitted sketch would be 25 m (82.02 ft). Staff further notes that the existing seasonal dwelling appears to maintain a 21.4 m (70.21 ft) setback to the highwater mark of the lake at its closest point. Staff is satisfied in this regard that the proposed addition is reasonable and not excessive in nature and the portion of the addition that is within the shoreline buffer is minimal. Staff recommends that the variance be approved as it is minor, appropriate development for the area and the intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law are maintained.

CGS: Infrastructure Capital Planning Services, October 29, 2021

Roads No concerns.

Transportation & Innovation No concerns.

Active Transportation No concerns.

CGS: Development Engineering, October 28, 2021

No objection.

The applicant appeared before Committee and explained that he is adding on to his 20-year-old camp and one small portion of the addition is less than the required 20.0m setback. Staff advised that Development Approvals did correct comments that were distributed which referenced 14.1m being the variance, however that was an error, the variance is for 18.3m at its closes point to the high water mark and the 14.1m is the setback to the interior side lot line.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

SHAUN MCGLADE AND MAZIE MCGLADE

the owner(s) of PIN 73519 0088, Parcel 53M1229-22 SEC SES SRO, Lot(s) 22, Subdivision 53M-1229, Township of Rathburn, 1931 Bushy Bay Road, Sudbury

for relief from Part 11, Section 4, subsection 4, paragraph (h) 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 to the seasonal dwelling providing a minimum front yard setback of 18.3m, where 20.0m 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 and building. 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
Carol Ann Coupal	Concurring
Cathy Castanza	Concurring
Dan Laing	Concurring
Derrick Chartand	Concurring
Matt Dumont	Concurring