PM 6
Ward 1
Signarelli

Sudbury

Planning Committee Resolutions

Moved By

Seconded By

No. PL2016- 190

Date Monday, November 21, 2016

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by Oldenburg Inc. to amend Zoning By-law 2010-100Z to change the zoning classification from "M1-1", Business Industrial and "R2-3", Low Density Residential Two to "HR3-1(S)", Medium Density Residential Special – Holding on those lands described as PINs 73585-0909 & 73585 1128 & Part of PIN 73585-1085, Lots 88 & 89, Plan M-31S, Part of Alder Street Located South of Victoria Street & North of Willow Street, Lot 6, Concession 3, Township of McKim subject to the following conditions:

A) That prior to the enactment of the amending zoning by-law the owner shall submit to the Planning Services Division a registered survey of the lands to be rezoned in order to allow for the preparation of the amending zoning by-law;

B) That a holding provision be applied to the lands and that the holding provision not be removed from the lands until such time as:

i. The owner has entered into an agreement to acquire or has acquired the portion of Alder Street to be closed to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor;

ii. The owner has completed a Transportation Demand Management report addressing the approved reduction in parking space requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning Services;

iii. The owner has completed and submitted noise and vibration studies relating to the development of the lands to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning Services; and,

iv. City of Greater Sudbury Council declares the lands a Class IV area under the Ministry of the Environment's NPC -300 – Environmental Noise Guideline for Stationary and Transportation Sources.

C) That the amending zoning by-law contain the following site-specific provisions:

i.That the only permitted uses on the subject lands be a multiple dwelling with a maximum of 50 residential dwelling units and non-residential uses be limited to an art gallery, assembly hall, audio/visual studio, automotive sales establishment (electric vehicle), bake shop, banquet hall, business office, custom print or copy shop, financial institution, food processing plant in the form of a brewery, light industrial use, institutional use, medical office, office, personal service shop, pharmacy, private club, professional office, retail store, commercial recreation centre, restaurant, scientific or medical laboratory, commercial school and service trade.

ii. That no residential units shall be permitted on the ground floor;

iii. That all non-residential uses shall have a maximum net floor area of 1 673m2;

iv. That the minimum parking requirements shall be 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit and 1 space per 30m2 of net floor area for non-residential uses;

v. That reduced setback requirements where required for the existing building and the addition be provided;

vi. That the maximum building height for a mixed use building shall be 22 metres and the maximum building height for the accessory parking garage shall be 7 metres;

vii. That the maximum lot coverage for the overall development shall be 60%;

viii. That the minimum landscaped open space for the overall development shall be 27%;

ix. That parking areas be permitted in the required front yard and corner side yard;

x. That the only permitted use on Lots 88 and 89, Plan M31S shall be a parking garage accessory to the permitted residential and non-residential uses;

xi. That a minimum setback to the parking garage on Lots 88 and Lot 89, Plan M31S from the westerly lot line shall be 1.2m, 0m from the lane to the south and 1.1m from Victoria Street; and,

xii. The minimum landscape strip abutting Victoria Street shall be 1.1m next to the parking garage.

CARRIED
Monday, November 21, 2016

Councillor McIntosh, Chair

Committee Resolutions are not ratified until approved by Council

Yea
Landry-Altmann
Al Sizer
Jakubo
Lapierre
McIntosh

Planning Committee

Greater Grand Sudbury
www.greatersudbury.ca

Bill 73 Requirements

Regarding Resolution No. PL2016-190

Date November 21, 2016
Public Hearing No. 6

Option 1:

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

Option 2:

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

Option 3:

☐ Public comment has been received and considered and has effected Planning Committee's decision in the following manner:

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

d) _____

e) _____

Councillor McIntosh, Chair

ONLY THE ORIGINAL OF THE MOTION IS AN OFFICIAL DOCUMENT