



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00114

September 2, 2026

OWNER(S): ANDREW BRYANTON, 79 Notre Dame St East, Azilda, ON, Canada

AGENT(S): ANDREW BRYANTON, 79 Notre Dame St East, Azilda, ON, Canada

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735040027, Parcel 53542 SEC SES SRO, Part Lot 6, Concession 1, Part 2, Plan 53R-16820, Township of Hanmer, 1547 Dominion Drive, Val Caron P3P 1A7

SUMMARY

Zoning: The property is zoned R3.D5 according to the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, as amended.

Application: Approval to increase the net residential density to permit an increase in the number of dwelling units within the existing multiple dwelling at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, August 27, 2026

Comments are uploaded as attached PDF. Development Approvals staff is supportive of the proposed application.

Development Engineering, August 27, 2026

No Concerns

Building Services, August 26, 2026

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

1) A review of our records indicates that there are several active permits and Orders to Comply associated with the property. Please contact Building Services to arrange the required inspections and ensure that all permit requirements are satisfied and the permits are closed.

Our records reflect the following active Permits and Orders:

a) B11-0747 (Decks – Issued)

b) 08-0050 (Convert School to 4 plex with attached garage – Issued)

i. BP-BCO-2026-00051 – As per associated building code order, construction is not according to plans provided under building permit B08-0050. A fifth unit has been constructed in the South East corner of the

building without the benefit of a building permit.

ii. BP-BCO-2025-00174 – As per associated building code order, exterior alterations have been constructed without the benefit of a building permit. Owner is required to obtain a building permit for exterior alterations and deck or remove the deck and restore original window.

2) A building permit application, together with all required supporting documentation, shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official for the proposed addition of four (4) units to the existing four (4) unit multiple residential dwelling, resulting in an eight (8) unit multiple dwelling.

The Applicant/Owner is advised that in lieu of Site Plan Control, the proposal is subject to the Comprehensive Plot Plan Process. As part of the building permit submission, the following shall be provided:

- Comprehensive plot plan
- Site statistics table
- Lot grading plan
- Site servicing plan

Once the required Comprehensive Plot Plan is received, additional minor variances may be identified at the time of building permit application.

Plumbing calculations shall be provided at the time of building permit submission to confirm the sizing of the water distribution system and required pipe sizes based on the total number of fixture units served.

Provide fixture unit calculations in accordance with Table 7.6.3.2.-A (Sizing of Water Distribution Systems) for the proposed eight unit multiple dwelling. Based on the calculated fixture units, identify and confirm the required pipe sizing in accordance with Table A-7.6.3.1 (Pipe Size Based on Number of Fixture Units Served).

3) We acknowledge the 28m² portable garage and 18m² portable garage identified on the site plan provided.

Applicant/Owner to be aware that sheds greater than 15m² require a building permit in accordance with the Ontario Building Code Article 1.3.1.1. of Division C. Applicant/Owner to also be aware that with the exception of sheds, accessory buildings and structures greater than 10 m² (108 ft²) would also be subject to the Ontario Building Code and would require a building permit.

Corridor Management, August 26, 2026

No Comment Received

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

No Comment Received

Sudbury Hydro, August 24, 2026

This application falls outside of our service territory; therefore, we have no concerns.

Conservation Sudbury, August 22, 2026

No Concerns

Site Plan, August 21, 2026

No Concerns

Ministry of Transportation, August 20, 2026

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

Strategic and Environmental Planning, August 19, 2026

SEP staff have reviewed the application and have no concerns.

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.

Meeting Minutes:

09/02/2026 The owner appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. Committee Chair Dumont asked the owner when they purchased the property and the owner advised that they purchased the property on July 28, 2026.

Jocelyne Landry of 1571 Dominion Drive appeared before Committee asked what was happening with the green space behind their home.

Kim McKay of 1559 Dominion Drive appeared before Committee and expressed concerns with the increased density, traffic on Dominion Drive, and the type of potential tenants.

Scott Grimard of 1565 Dominion Drive appeared before Committee and expressed agreement with Kim McKay's comments and expressed concerns with the intensification of the building and the increase in traffic on Dominion Drive.

Richard Landry of 1571 Dominion Drive appeared before Committee and expressed concerns about the increase in traffic and would like traffic calming measures installed and asked if any development was proposed behind their homes.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised that a letter of concern was received from area resident, Vincent Murphy of 1539 Dominion Drive, expressing concerns about increased traffic, increased noise and garbage. The Secretary-Treasurer confirmed Committee's receipt of the letter.

The owner advised Committee that he didn't want to lose the existing tenants and intends to development the building to have additional units for family members.

Committee Member Goswell advised the residents in attendance that the application met the four tests and expressed support for staff's recommendation.

Committee Member Sawchuk acknowledged the resident's comments, advised that it was inappropriate to discriminate against the type of tenant and asked staff when a traffic impact study would be required. Staff advised that Development Engineering did not identify any issues and that a traffic impact study would be triggered for much larger developments. Staff explained that there are formal processes that the residents can go through to have the City investigate their traffic concerns. The Committee Member expressed support for staff's recommendation.

Committee Chair Dumont provided the residents with an explanation on the four tests of a minor variance, advised that staff were supportive of the Application and expressed support for staff's recommendation. The Chair advised that any future development would require another public process and that by-law enforcement is available to address any concerns relating to by-law infractions.

Staff advised that residents could contact the City by calling 311 and having a conversation about their traffic concerns and explained that there were other by-laws in place to address their other concerns.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

ANDREW BRYANTON

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735040027, Parcel 53542 SEC SES SRO, Part Lot 6, Concession 1, Part 2, Plan 53R-16820, Township of Hanmer, 1547 Dominion Drive, Val Caron P3P 1A7

for relief from Part 2, Section 2.2 (ii) and Part 6, Section 6.3, Table 6.5 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the legalization of 1 existing dwelling unit and the construction of 3 dwelling units within the existing 4-dwelling unit multiple building for a total of 8 dwelling units providing a maximum net residential density of 9 units per hectare, where a maximum net residential density of 4 units per hectare 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. The general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan are maintained.

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

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



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00116

September 2, 2026

OWNER(S): LUC MESSIER, 5780 old hwy 69, hanmer, ON, Canada P3L1N6

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

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735031747, Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Part Lot 4, Plan M-566, being Parts 10-14, Plan 53R-22312, Township of Hanmer, 5782 Municipal Road 80, Hanmer P3P1E9

SUMMARY

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

Application: Approval to construct a dwelling containing three dwelling units on the subject property providing a setback, encroachment and access driveway width at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, August 27, 2026

Comments uploaded as PDF attachment. Development Approvals Staff is supportive of the proposed application.

Building Services, August 26, 2026

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

1. Building Services acknowledges receipt of an associated building permit application (BP-NEW-2026-01497) for the proposed construction. Owner to be aware that an issued building permit is required prior to construction to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.
2. Owner/Applicant to submit a copy of the updated plot plan that aligns with the minor variance application to the building permit application (BP-NEW-2026-01497). For the building permit, please ensure the plot plan is updated to clearly identify the location of all services. Owner/Applicant to ensure the building dimensions shown on the plot plan are coordinated with the associated building permit drawings.

Corridor Management, August 26, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Engineering, August 26, 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 13.8m from the lot line. Downspouts must be discharged towards the interior of the property and not towards the adjacent property.

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

No Comment Received

Sudbury Hydro, August 24, 2026

This application falls outside of our service territory; therefore, we have no concerns.

Conservation Sudbury, August 22, 2026

No Concerns

Ministry of Transportation, August 20, 2026

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

Site Plan, August 19, 2026

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, August 19, 2026

SEP staff have reviewed the application and have no concerns.

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.

Meeting Minutes:

09/02/2026 The owner's agent, Rohit Walia, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application.

Alain Paquette of 405 Martha Street appeared before Committee and expressed concern with the driveway abutting his property, snow removal and parking space in close proximity to his lot. The Secretary Treasurer advised Committee that Alain Paquette also submitted a letter expressing concerns with property damage, removal of trees being a sound barrier from the traffic on Municipal Road 80, loss of privacy, noise and snow removal. The Secretary-Treasurer confirmed Committee's receipt of the letter.

The agent explained that grading for the lot would be done pursuant to the lot grading plan and suggested that a fence or shrub could be installed to prevent encroachment onto the neighbour's lands.

Committee Member Goswell expressed support for the Application.

Committee Member Sawchuk asked staff if there were setback requirements for parking spaces and staff advised that there were not. The Member asked if there were any requirements for snow removal and staff advised that the development was not subject to site plan control so there were no snow removal requirements. The Member expressed support for staff's recommendation.

Committee Chair Dumont asked the agent what the easement at the rear of the lot was for. The agent answered Committee Member Sawchuk's question and advised that the parking space was setback 1.07m (3.6') from the rear lot line and advised the Chair that the easement was a sanitary sewer easement running east and west. The agent also explained that parking spaces 4 and 5 on the plan were not required parking spaces. The Chair acknowledged the agents' comments that the lot grading would be dealt with through the building permit process and suggested that the agent speak with his client about installing a fence between the subject property and 405 Martha Street to prevent future conflict.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:

LUC MESSIER

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735031747, Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Part Lot 4, Plan M-566, being Parts 10-14, Plan 53R-22312, Township of Hanmer, 5782 Municipal Road 80, Hanmer P3P1E9

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, Table 4.1, Part 5, Section 5.2, subsection 5.2.9.3 and Part 6, Section 6.3, Table 6.2 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of a dwelling containing three dwelling units providing, firstly, a front yard setback of 10.5m with eaves encroaching an additional 0.6m into the proposed 10.5m setback, where a 15.0m front yard setback 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 driveway accessing a parking area to be a minimum width of 5.0m, where driveways accessing a parking area shall be a minimum width of 6.0m for two-way traffic, 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	Absent
DAVID MURRAY	Absent
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2025-00152

September 2, 2026

OWNER(S): SONYA ARCAND, 4015 Dupuis Dr, Hanmer, ON, Canada P3B0B3

AGENT(S): SONYA ARCAND, 4015 Dupuis Drive, Hanmer, ON, Canada P3B0B3

LOCATION: PIN(s) 735090332, Part Lot 7, Concession 2, being Part 2, Plan 53R-19256, Township of Capreol, 4015 Dupuis Drive, Hanmer P3P 0B3

SUMMARY

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

Application: Approval to permit an accessory building containing an additional dwelling unit providing a setback from the main building and location at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, August 27, 2026

Comments attached as PDF. Development Approvals staff is supportive of the proposed application.

Building Services, August 26, 2026

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

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

1. Building permit and building permit documents to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official, is required for the proposed construction.

2. Applicant/Owner to be aware that sheds greater than 15m² require a building permit in accordance with the Ontario Building Code Article 1.3.1.1. of Division C. Applicant/Owner to also be aware that with the exception of sheds, accessory buildings and structures greater than 10 m² (108 ft²) would also be subject to the Ontario Building Code and would require a building permit. Based on the information provided with this application, it appears that the accessory structures located on the property are below the size thresholds requiring a building permit.

Conservation Sudbury, August 24, 2026

Property is located within a floodplain regulated by Conservation Sudbury. Landowner has been in

consultation with Conservation Sudbury and we are in acceptance of the proposed cut and fill shown on the plan from Tulloch Engineering. This would create a safe building envelope outside of the floodplain for the additional dwelling unit. A permit will be required from Conservation Sudbury at the building permit stage.

Conservation Sudbury has no objection to MV-2025-00152.

Development Approvals, November 21, 2025

The purpose and effect of the application is to facilitate the construction of a two storey 98 m² accessory building containing an additional dwelling unit with the following variances:

1. to permit the additional dwelling unit in an accessory building to be located in the front yard, where an accessory building containing an additional dwelling unit is only permitted in the rear and/or interior side yards, and
2. a maximum setback from the main building of 51.82m, where an additional dwelling unit located in a building accessory to a main building in an "RU", Rural zone shall be located no more than 30.0m from the main building.

The subject lands contain a one storey 72 m² single detached dwelling and nine accessory buildings. The lands are serviced by a private septic system and individual well. The lands are accessed by an existing driveway from Dupuis Drive.

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

Surrounding uses are rural and agricultural in nature.

The applicant has identified that the lands to the south contain a hobby farm. For the applicant's information, as part of the building permit application the proposed additional dwelling unit will need to meet the Minimum Distance Separation I setback for a new dwelling in proximity to livestock. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide a copy of the MDS I calculations as part of the building permit process. If the building is unable to meet the required setback, additional relief from the Zoning By-law will be required through a subsequent Planning Act Application.

The intent of requiring additional dwelling units in the rear or interior side yard is to maintain the character of the principal use of the lands and surrounding area. Given the proposed additional dwelling unit will be larger in ground floor area and height in comparison to the single detached dwelling, it will appear as the principal dwelling. That being said, the additional dwelling unit is proposed to be setback 21 m from the front lot line and appears to contain a natural vegetative buffer between the proposed building and the road.

The intent of requiring a maximum distance between additional dwelling units and the main building is to prevent the ability to sever lands and encourage shared driveways and services. The subject land is approximately 2 ha in size with frontage of approximately 123 m along Dupuis Drive. The additional dwelling unit is proposed to be accessed from the existing driveway. The applicant did not include private servicing information on the concept plan. Given the size of the subject lands, staff are satisfied that the subject lands cannot be further subdivided without an Official Plan Amendment. Staff would not be able to support the request for a future severance.

Conservation Sudbury has advised that the additional dwelling unit is proposed to be located in a floodplain area and is not in a position to support the application.

It is recommended that the application be deferred to allow the applicant an opportunity to work with Conservation Sudbury to identify a safe building envelope in accordance with the Provincial Planning Statement.

Corridor Management, November 20, 2025

No Comment Received

Hydro One, November 20, 2025

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), November 20, 2025

No Comment Received

Sudbury Hydro, November 20, 2025

No objections - outside of our territory.

Building Services, November 19, 2025

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

- 1) A Building Permit and documents will be required to be completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official for the proposed additional dwelling unit.
- 2) A search of our records indicates an incomplete building permit for the subject property for the single-family dwelling & attached shed (B20-0163). Please contact Building Services to proceed in closing this project.
- 3) Please be advised that the housing of livestock (e.g., goats and chickens) on this property may trigger Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) requirements under provincial guidelines. The applicability of MDS will depend on the number and type of livestock units housed on the property. Applicants are encouraged to confirm compliance with MDS requirements to ensure appropriate separation from surrounding uses.
- 4) Owner to be aware that sheds greater than 15m² require a building permit in accordance with the Ontario Building Code Article 1.3.1.1. of Division C. Applicant/Owner to also be aware that with the exception of sheds, accessory buildings and structures greater than 10 m² (108 ft²) are also subject to the Ontario Building Code and would require a building permit.??

Conservation Sudbury, November 19, 2025

Conservation Sudbury has reviewed subject property for application PL-MV-2025-00152, proposing variance to distance from main building and location in front yard location of an additional dwelling unit (ADU).

The subject property contains a flood hazard, which is regulated by Conservation Sudbury and is also contemplated in the Provincial Planning Statement. The flood elevation at this location is 294.25 metres (CGVD28). Based on newly available topographic information, the flood hazard extends over most of the parcel. An ADU would only be permitted on this property if it is (1) located a minimum of 2 metres outside of the flood hazard, (2) there is safe access-egress to the ADU and (3) any development required to support the ADU, including grading and septic upgrades, will not aggravate the flood hazard.

Based on a cursory review of available topographic data, the highest point of land on the property (which is most likely to be out of the flood hazard), is not where the ADU is proposed. Conservation Sudbury cannot

support the proposed in application PL-MV-2025-00152 as currently presented as it is not consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement or requirements under the Conservation Authorities Act.

A topographic survey of the property, completed by a qualified professional (OLS or qualified engineer) is required to determine whether there is a safe building envelope for the proposed ADU. We recommend that the plot plan be updated as a result of this survey, and at that point the requirement for a Minor Variance should be re-assessed and if still required, the scope of the Minor Variance should be modified to reflect the new plot plan.

Please note that a permit for development by Conservation Sudbury (Section 28 permit) will be required prior to building permit approval of the ADU.

A pre-consultation with Conservation Sudbury is recommended for development of the ADU at the subject property. More information regarding development in regulated areas, as well as a link to the pre-consultation application form, can be found on the Conservation Sudbury website here:

<https://www.conservationsudbury.ca/permits-planning/>

Development Engineering, November 19, 2025

No Concerns

Strategic and Environmental Planning, November 18, 2025

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

Ministry of Transportation, November 13, 2025

I can confirm that the subject lands for the above applications are located outside the MTO's permit control area (PCA); therefore, we have no comments to provide at this time.

Site Plan, November 13, 2025

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 11/26/2025 | This Application has been deferred at the request of the applicant prior to the hearing in order to address Conservation Sudbury and staff comments. |
| 09/02/2026 | The owner appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application. The Members and the Chair had no questions and expressed support for staff's recommendation. |

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
SONYA ARCAND

the owner(s) of PIN(s) 735090332, Part Lot 7, Concession 2, being Part 2, Plan 53R-19256, Township of Capreol, 4015 Dupuis Drive, Hanmer P3P 0B3

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.2, subsection 4.2.10 c) and Part 9, Section 9.2, Table 9.1, special provision 11 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to facilitate the construction of an accessory building containing an additional dwelling unit providing, firstly, for the dwelling unit located in building accessory to the main building to be located in the front yard, where a dwelling unit located in a building accessory to a main building shall only be permitted within the rear and/or interior side yards, and secondly, for the dwelling unit located in the building accessory to the main building to provide a setback of 55.0m from the main building, where additional dwelling units shall be located no further than 30.0m from the main building, 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	Absent
DAVID MURRAY	Absent
JUSTIN SAWCHUK	Concurring
MATTHEW DUMONT	Concurring
RON GOSWELL	Concurring



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

SUBMISSION NO. PL-MV-2026-00040

September 2, 2026

OWNER(S): STEPHANIE MEILLEUR, 245 Bodson Dr E, Hanmer, Ontario, Canada P3P 1X2

AGENT(S): STEPHANIE MEILLEUR, 245 Bodson Dr E, Hanmer, Ontario, Canada P3P 1X2

LOCATION: PIN(s) 734920212, Parcel 26791 SEC SES SRO, Part Lot 12, Concession 6, as in LT170746, subject to LT117527, Township of Garson, 245 Bodson Drive, Hanmer

SUMMARY

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

Application: Approval to permit a kennel providing a setback from residential buildings at variance to the By-law.

Comments concerning this application were submitted as follows:

Development Approvals, August 27, 2026

Comments are attached as PDF document. Development Approvals staff is not supportive of the proposed application.

Building Services, August 24, 2026

Building Services has reviewed the resubmission, and there are no additional comments beyond those provided in the first submission review.

FIRST SUBMISSION COMMENTS:

Building Services has no concerns with this application; however, reserves further comment until the time of Building Permit Application and Plans Examination.

For the applicant's information:

1) A building permit shall be required for the construction of the proposed Kennel, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

2) Parking space and outdoor parking area requirements:

a. The minimum parking space size shall be 2.75m x 6m. (9 spaces total required)

b. Outdoor parking areas shall be permitted in any part of any yard, except that no part of any parking area shall be located in any required front yard in any Rural (RU) zoned lands.

Please ensure that the parking space dimensions are revised accordingly and that all outdoor parking areas are located outside of the required front yard at the time of Building Permit Application.

3) On a Rural (RU) zoned property, buildings shall have a minimum separation of 3m. The shed identified on the plot plan shall be located a minimum of 3m from the detached garage.

4) That a search of our records indicates that there is an issued permit for:

a. B22-1404 – Inter and Exterior Alterations (Full Permit Issued)

Please contact Building Services at 705-674-4455 x 4278 to close this project.

Conservation Sudbury, August 24, 2026

Conservation Sudbury has no objection to MV-2026-00040 as per location of kennel along the western property boundary as shown in "Circulation and comment package - second submission" pages 20 and 21. Landowner has applied for a permit from Conservation Sudbury and been in active consultation with us. Final approval of the permit will be required at the building permit stage.

Corridor Management, June 18, 2026

No Comment Received

Development Approvals, June 18, 2026

The purpose and effect of the application is to permit a kennel on the subject property, providing a 124.0 m setback from residential buildings, where no non-residential building or structure directly associated with a kennel shall be established or erected closer than 300.0 m to a residential building or Residential Zone.

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

The property is currently developed with a single detached dwelling, a detached garage and storage shed. The property is serviced via private services (well and septic) and is accessed from Bodson Drive East, which is a municipally maintained road.

While the use of a kennel is permitted on properties zoned Rural, special provision #6 of Table 9.2 of Zoning By-law 2010-100Z requires minimum setbacks of 300 m from residential zones or residential buildings. As shown in the concept plan provided, the proposed dog kennel on the subject property would range distances ranging between 124 m and 260 m from existing residential dwellings in the area.

As part of the proposed application, the applicant has provided the following details regarding mitigating noise associated with the proposed use:

1. Proposed kennel building (approx. 40ft by 60ft) would be located as far south as possible on the property +implementing sound proofing materials for new build.
2. Exterior time for the dogs would be limited to 7 am to 7 pm to mitigate anticipated sound.
3. Tree line and fencing to aid with noise attenuation.

While Planning Staff appreciate that the applicant has provided details regarding noise mitigation strategies, it is not clear to staff that these proposed mitigation measures would be sufficient for the proposed use. While rural zoned lands permit a wide range of uses, certain uses, including a kennel require additional distances to prevent incompatibility uses with nearby residential land uses.

Conservation Sudbury (NDCA) advised that the property contains floodplain regulated by NDCA and that in general, all development must be directed outside of the flood hazard. While the applicant has corresponded with the NDCA regarding a garage structure within the floodplain, the guidance provided specific to a garage structure does not apply to the currently proposed Kennel structure and use. The NDCA is not in support of the proposed application and would require a pre-consultation application to facilitate further review of flood extents and development opportunities on the property.

Staff is of the opinion that the variance is not considered to be minor in nature, is not appropriate use of the land, and does not meet the intent of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. It is recommended that the application be denied.

Development Engineering, June 18, 2026

No Concerns

Hydro One, June 18, 2026

No Comment Received

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), June 18, 2026

No Comment Received

Building Services, June 17, 2026

Building Services has no concerns with this application; however, reserves further comment until the time of Building Permit Application and Plans Examination.

For the applicant's information:

1) A building permit shall be required for the construction of the proposed Kennel, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.

2) Parking space and outdoor parking area requirements:

a. The minimum parking space size shall be 2.75m x 6m. (9 spaces total required)

b. Outdoor parking areas shall be permitted in any part of any yard, except that no part of any parking area shall be located in any required front yard in any Rural (RU) zoned lands.

Please ensure that the parking space dimensions are revised accordingly and that all outdoor parking areas are located outside of the required front yard at the time of Building Permit Application.

3) On a Rural (RU) zoned property, buildings shall have a minimum separation of 3m. The shed identified on the plot plan shall be located a minimum of 3m from the detached garage.

4) That a search of our records indicates that there is an issued permit for:

a. B22-1404 – Inter and Exterior Alterations (Full Permit Issued)

Please contact Building Services at 705-674-4455 x 4278 to close this project.

Conservation Sudbury, June 17, 2026

Subject property contains floodplain regulated by Conservation Sudbury. The regulatory flood elevation is 288.10m CGVD28. Generally, all development must be directed outside of the flood hazard.

Previously the applicant corresponded with Conservation Sudbury regarding a garage structure within the floodplain. However, the guidance provided specific to a parking garage does not apply to the currently proposed Kennel structure and use.

Conservation Sudbury cannot support the minor variance at this point in time. A pre-consultation application will be required in order to facilitate further review of flood extents and development opportunities on the property.

Application forms for pre-consultation can be found here: <https://www.conservationsudbury.ca/permits-planning/>

Strategic and Environmental Planning, June 17, 2026

The subject lands contain floodplain as per schedule 6a of the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and wildland fire hazard as per schedule 6b of the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan. The evaluation of floodplain and erosion hazards are under the jurisdiction of Conservation Sudbury. SEP staff have no objections to the application.

The applicant is advised that wildland fire mitigation best practices can be found in provincial standards such as FireSmart.

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

Sudbury Hydro, June 16, 2026

The following applications, are outside of our service territory – therefore we have no comments.

Ministry of Transportation, June 12, 2026

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

Site Plan, June 10, 2026

No Concerns

Meeting Minutes:

06/24/2026 The owners, Stephanie Meilleur and Kevin Joly, appeared before Committee and provided a summary of the Application addressing the changes that were made to the Application in response to staff's comments. The Chair asked if the information regarding the sound regulation was provided by a professional and the owner advised that it was not.

Committee Member Castanza advised Committee that she attended the property to perform a site visit and expressed concern about future expansion.

Committee Member Goswell asked staff if there were regulations or limitations regarding expansion. Staff advised that the use was permitted but that the property was too small and the existing neighbours are too close. Staff also advised that the Zoning By-law does not regulate the number of dogs. The Member expressed support for staff's recommendation.

Committee Member Sawchuk requested staff to comment on the floodplain and staff advised that the access was identified as an issue, not the structure. The Member requested staff to clarify the reasons for the recommendation to deny, and staff advised that the distance was the primary reason for the recommendation. The Member expressed support for a deferral.

Committee Member Murray expressed support for a deferral. The Member asked staff if they had an opportunity to review the revised information submitted by the owner and staff advised that they reviewed however there was a lot of technical information provided and not a lot of time to ensure accuracy. The Member expressed support for a deferral.

Committee Chair Dumont provided the owner with information to address Conversation Sudbury's comments. The Chair referred to the comments provided by Development Approvals, commented on the four tests of a minor variance and the size of the lot. The Chair expressed support for a deferral.

Committee Member Castanza asked the owner if they could purchase land to increase the size of their property and the owner advised that the cost to survey the lands was very high.

Committee Member Castanza, Goswell and Sawchuk expressed support for a deferral.

Committee Member Murray asked staff if the new information provided by the applicant addressing the noise would be reviewed by staff and staff advised that if a third-party professional report was submitted, staff would review. Committee Member Murray expressed support for a deferral.

Staff advised Committee that a third-party report could indicate that noise could adequately be mitigated but cautioned that the minor variance would be tied to the property, not the building.

Committee Chair Dumont suggested that the owner could review the location of the building and try to increase the distance.

Committee Member Castanza asked staff to expand on their comments regarding the building and staff advised that the minor variance would run with the property, not the building. Staff cautioned that if a decision was being made based on the building and the proposed noise mitigation measures, Committee should be aware that future reconstruction could occur without noise mitigation measures in place as the minor variance would run with the property. The Chair asked if there was anything that could be put in place to ensure what was being proposed was constructed and staff advised that the property was not subject to site plan control.

Committee Member Castanza clarified staff's comments.

Committee Member Murray put forward a motion to defer the Application and Committee Member Goswell seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

09/02/2026 The owner, Stephanie Meilleur, and Kevin Joly appeared before Committee. The owner advised Committee that she consulted with a Planner. The Chair asked the owner who they consulted with and the owner advised that they consulted with Urban Planning Consulting. The Chair asked if there were any discussions about noise mitigation with the planner and the owner advised that they feel that the noise mitigation measures are to assist in the planning of the building and to help the process but not that the noise requires mitigation measures. The owner summarized the Application and addressed the four tests of a minor variance. Committee Member Goswell, referencing the owner's comments regarding a dog park and its distance to residences, asked staff how close the dog park was to the nearest residence. Staff advised that a dog park was defined differently than a kennel under the Zoning By-law and different rules apply. The Member asked how the City aligned with other municipalities regarding distances for kennels and staff advised that they did not have that information. The Member commented on the percentage of the relief that was being sought, the City's requirements and staff's comments. The Chair clarified with staff that the sequence of the comments regarding the four tests wasn't significant and that all tests are weighed equally. The Member expressed support for staff's recommendation. The Chair asked the owner why the planner didn't provide a planning justification report and the owner advised that they consulted with the planner only. The owner advised that the planner suggested that her rationale was sufficient for this Application. The owner advised Committee that Appendix A in the submission contained the distances referred to in the earlier discussion. Committee Member Sawchuk commented on staff's recommendation being solely based on noise mitigation and expressed support for the Application. The Member referred to the owner's logarithmic graph of the noise attenuation curve and advised Committee that the Application was minor in relation to decibels, although not in distance. The Member provided Committee with a breakdown on the logarithmic graph and expressed support for a motion to approve the Application. Committee Chair Dumont confirmed with the Secretary-Treasurer that the City did not receive any concerns from the abutting landowners. The Chair expressed support for Committee Member Sawchuk's motion. Committee Member Goswell advised Committee that he performed an AI search and found a City report comparing kennel distance requirements of other municipalities and found that the City's setback was much greater than other municipalities. The Member expressed support for the Application. Committee Member Sawchuk acknowledged Committee Member Goswell's comments and suggested that the scrap yard two houses down would provide more noise than dogs and expressed support for the Application as it met the four tests. Committee Chair Dumont put forward a motion to grant the Application, Committee Member Sawchuk seconded the motion. The motion was supported and carried.

The following decision was reached:

DECISION:

THAT the application by:
STEPHANIE MEILLEUR
the owner(s) of PIN(s) 734920212, Parcel 26791 SEC SES SRO, Part Lot 12, Concession 6, as in LT170746,

subject to LT117527, Township of Garson, 245 Bodson Drive, Hanmer

for relief from Part 4, Section 4.37, subsection 4.37.3 and Part 9, Section 9.2, Table 9.2, special provision 6 of By-law 2010-100Z, being the Zoning By-law for the City of Greater Sudbury, as amended, to permit a kennel to provide a 132.0m setback from residential buildings, where no non-residential building or structure directly associated with a kennel shall be established or erected closer than 300.0m to a residential building or Residential Zone, be granted.

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

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

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