

Location:	Tom Davies Square
Commencement:	1:38 PM
Adjournment:	4:23 PM

## Minutes

### Planning Committee Minutes of 7/10/17

#### **Councillor Lapierre, In the Chair**

Present	Councillors Lapierre, Jakubo, McIntosh
City Officials	Keith Forrester, Manager of Real Estate; Adam Kosnick, Manager, Regulated Services/Deputy City Clerk

#### **Declarations of Pecuniary Interests and the general nature thereof**

None declared

#### Closed Session

The following resolution was presented:

PL2017-108 McIntosh/Jakubo: THAT the Planning Committee move into Closed Session to deal with one (1) Proposed or Pending Acquisition or Disposition of Land Matter:

- Lease Agreement - Kari Road, Wahnapiatae

#### **CARRIED**

At 1:39 p.m. the Planning Committee moved into Closed Session.

#### Recess

At 1:42 p.m. the Planning Committee recessed.

#### Reconvene

At 2:00 p.m., the Planning Committee commenced the Open Session in the Council Chamber.

#### **Councillor McIntosh, In the Chair**

Present Councillors Lapierre, Jakubo, McIntosh  
Councillor Dutrisac [D 4:06 p.m.]

City Officials Jason Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services; Robert Webb, Supervisor of Development Engineering; Alex Singbush, Senior Planner; Mauro Manzon, Senior Planner; Adam Kosnick, Manager, Regulated Services/Deputy City Clerk; Danielle Wicklander, Legislative Compliance Coordinator; Renée Stewart, Clerk's Services Assistant

## Declarations of Pecuniary Interests and the general nature thereof

None declared

### Public Hearings

- 1 André & Natalie Gauvin - Application for rezoning in order to permit a one-storey row dwelling containing four (4) units, Alexandre Street, Val Therese

#### **The Planning Committee meeting was adjourned and the Public Hearing was opened to deal with the following:**

Report dated June 20, 2017 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding André & Natalie Gauvin - Application for rezoning in order to permit a one-storey row dwelling containing four (4) units, Alexandre Street, Val Therese.

André Gauvin, the applicant was present.

Mauro Manzon, Senior Planner, outlined the report.

Joey Colombe, concerned area resident, stated that he has concerns in regards to the rezoning application. There is a large amount of traffic that comes into the subdivision and having the addition of the multiplex would make this worse. The neighbours do not believe that a multiplex fits in with the area. Increased traffic is his main concern and, the entrance to the property is his second concern as it is very close to a high traffic area.

Mr. Gauvin stated that he does not believe that there will be an increase in traffic within the subdivision as the entrance to the property is already located near a major arterial road. Further he stated that he is constructing his dwelling as one-storey buildings in order to not impede on the neighbours' views. The main demographic he hopes to attract will be seniors and retirees.

Mauro Manzon, Senior Planner, stated that the Roads and Transportation department had no concerns in related to this application during the pre-consultation process.

Ward Councillor Lapierre inquired as to what the radius is for the mailing notices which are sent out to area residents to make them aware that this development will be occurring.

Mauro Manzon, Senior Planer, stated that the mailing radius is 120 metres. He further stated that he does not recall exactly how many letters were sent out.

Ward Councillor Lapierre stated that he has not directly received any calls, emails or letters of concern from any of the area residents.

The Chair asked whether there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favour or against this application and seeing none:

**The Public Hearing concerning this matter was closed and the Planning Committee resumed in order to discuss and vote on the matter.**

The following resolution was presented:

PL2017-109 Jakubo/Lapierre: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by André & Natalie Gauvin to amend Zoning By-law 2010-100Z by changing the zoning classification from "RI-5", Low Density Residential One to "R3(S)", Medium Density Residential Special on lands described as PIN 73504-2745, Part 1, Plan 53R-18032 in Lot 6, Concession 2, Township of Hanmer subject to the following conditions:

- a) A maximum of four (4) dwelling units shall be permitted;
- b) The maximum building height shall be one-storey; and,
- c) A minimum privacy yard of 3 metres shall be permitted in the easterly interior side yard.

**YEAS:** Councillors Lapierre, Jakubo and McIntosh.

**CARRIED**

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

2 Maximum Construction North Limited – Application for rezoning to permit the construction of a four unit multiple dwelling, 237 Sixth Avenue, Lively

**The Planning Committee meeting was adjourned and the Public Hearing was opened to deal with the following:**

Report dated June 21, 2017 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Maximum Construction North Limited – Application for rezoning to permit the construction of a four unit multiple dwelling, 237 Sixth Avenue, Lively.

Max Rivard, Maximum Construction North Limited, the applicant was present.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, outlined the report.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, illustrated the lot line between the proposed development and the church.

Mr. Rivard stated that the lot line is located 70 feet from the post located in the school yard. He further stated that he will have trucks on the property during demolition making sure that the property is free of debris to allow for the construction on the small property.

Glen Miller, concerned area resident, stated that he is the congregation leader of the church situated next to the subject property. He stated that the congregation does not object to the application. However, they have a few concerns, but he is satisfied they are being addressed

by the applicant. He wished to clarify that the lot line is actually situated at the edge of the pavement. He stated that they are concerned about the size of the lot and how the applicant anticipates fitting four (4) units on the property.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, stated that the church can contact Building Services should there be an issue with encroachment on their property.

The Chair asked whether there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favour or against this application and seeing none:

**The Public Hearing concerning this matter was closed and the Planning Committee resumed in order to discuss and vote on the matter.**

The following resolution was presented:

PL2017-110 Jakubo/Lapierre: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by Maximum Construction North Limited to amend Zoning By-law 2010-100Z by changing the zoning classification of lands described as PIN 73377-0828, Parcel 23592, Lot 656, Plan M-925, Lot 7, Concession 5, Township of Waters from "C1", Local Commercial to "R3(S)", Medium Density Residential Special subject to the following condition:

1) That the minimum landscaped open space shall be 22%.

**YEAS:** Councillors Lapierre, Jakubo and McIntosh.

**CARRIED**

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

3 Ginette Filion and 1085937 Ontario Inc. - Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning in order to permit a severance and lot consolidation in the Agricultural Reserve, Seguin Street, Chelmsford.

**The Planning Committee meeting was adjourned and the Public Hearing was opened to deal with the following:**

Report dated June 20, 2017 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Ginette Filion and 1085937 Ontario Inc. - Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning in order to permit a severance and lot consolidation in the Agricultural Reserve, Seguin Street, Chelmsford.

Dave Dorland, agent for the applicant, and Ginette and Pierre Fillion, the applicants, were present.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, outlined the report.

Rules of Procedure

The Committee, by two-thirds majority, allowed Councillor Dutrisac to speak to Public Hearing 3 on the agenda.

**CARRIED BY TWO THIRDS MAJORITY**

Ward Councillor Dutrisac inquired as to what the applicants have consolidated and how many acres of agricultural land are remaining.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, illustrated the lands and where the proposed new lot would be

situated. The lands have a total lot area of 78 acres and application proposes to create a two (2) acre lot. Therefore there would be a approximately 74 acres of land remaining in the consolidation.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac asked how many homes are built on these three (3) lots.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, stated that the lands are currently vacant. He further illustrated the existing residential dwellings surrounding the lands, which included the home owned by Mrs. Fillion's parents.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac asked about the size of the other residences that have been severed.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, stated that for the frontages of the other lots that have been taken out, two (2) of them are approximately 60 metres and the other is approximately 50 metres. These lots were created in the past when the lot creation standards in the Official Plan were different.

Mr. Dorland stated that he had a few questions. Firstly, under the present property configuration, would a building permit be issued to the property on PIN 0766 in the area outlined in blue on the application? Further, for the property to the west, presently owned by Ginette Filion, can a building permit be issued on that property? He stated that he does not understand how the zoning By-law is consistent with the Official Plan Policies and Provincial Policy Statement that permit the disposal of a surplus dwelling. Would the lot creation to dispose of surplus a dwelling (if the house had been constructed) be permitted under the current Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement with consistent rezoning or down zoning of the remaining lands? Would a boundary realignment be permitted if the dwelling already existed on the agricultural land? Would the construction of one residential dwelling on one of the lots be removing less agricultural land then having two buildings on the two stand alone properties?

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, stated that the issuance of building permits is done by Building Services, therefore he can not comment if a building permit can be issued. The zoning By-law states that an individual agriculturally zoned property is entitled to a dwelling unit. Therefore, the vacant properties as they exist today would be entitled to a dwelling unit. The existing zoning By-law does not accommodate for the possibility of exceptions to create surplus farm dwellings as listed in the Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statements. The applicant would need to undertake a rezoning application if they are perusing the severance of an existing farm dwelling. This is not the same situation as the current application. This application is a proposal to create a new vacant lot for residential purposes, not to allow the reuse of an existing habitable farm dwelling. If there was an existing house on the property today, there are criteria in the Official Plan that would allow for the creation of a new lot. That situation does not exist in this application. In regards to the question that stated if more than one (1) dwelling is permitted on the lands today would the creation of a lot for one (1) dwelling leave more agricultural land available, the size of the parcels remains the same. The By-law has entitlements that allow agricultural parcels to have dwelling units. This proposal would allow for the creation of one (1) lot for one (1) dwelling where there are rights to have more than one.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac stated that there will be 74 acres of remaining agricultural land remaining after the consolidation of the three (3) lots. What are the applicants' intended use of the remaining 74 acres of land?

Mr. Dorland stated that the Seguin family and this family have lived on this property for 100 years. They will continue to utilize the lands for their agricultural operations.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac stated the lands will continue to be used for sod. She further stated that you can build two (2) residences on each of these lots before they were consolidated. Why is the applicant asking to consolidate the lots when she could have left them separate and could still build two (2) dwellings? Why does the applicant want to build a residence near her parents?

Mrs. Fillion stated that they want to build near her parent's and that they do not want to waste agricultural land.

Mr. Dorland stated that the ownership of the large parcel on which they wish to build a home is owned by a farming corporation. He further stated that the applicant would prefer to do this land exchange to provide them with a small piece of land on which they can get a mortgage for the construction of the residence. They could build on on the large severed portion, however, the family owned corporation would have the financial burden on them. This application is to provide what would be possible if they had applied for a building permit and built the house. The result when the house is built will be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statements and a larger portion of agriculturally zoned land that will be used for agricultural purposes. He stated that there is currently no home there but there could be.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, stated that the applicant is proposing that the lands that are left would be zoned to prohibit the construction of a residence. Should someone wish to build a home on this property, they could make an application for rezoning in order to withdraw this condition. He further stated that the lands are entitled to a dwelling on them today.

Jason Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services, stated that the applicant and their agent are suggesting that this is about the construction of homes. Whereas in the Planning report, staff viewed this as a creation of a lot. Mr. Dorland stated that the application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the City's Official Plan. He would disagree with Mr. Dorland because the intent of City's Official plan and the Provincial Policy is to protect agricultural land for long term use for agricultural purposes. The City's Official Plan allows for agricultural uses and related uses and prohibits the creation of lots in the agricultural reserve for non-agricultural purposes. Planning staff believe that this application is for the creation of a lot and fragmentation of the agricultural land as opposed to building permits. In regards to the letter received by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA), they rarely receive comments from a provincial ministry. They are reminding the City of the policies outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement that prohibit lot creation. In the enabling policies, there are limited circumstance which allow for City Council to sever lots in the agricultural reserve. They are requesting a copy of City Council's decision and it is within their practice to appeal decision, that adversely affect a matter of provincial interest.

#### Recess

At 3:21 p.m. the Planning Committee recessed.

#### Reconvene

At 3:26 p.m. the Planning Committee reconvened.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac stated that she does not understand fragmentation of the land. We want to protect agricultural land, we have two (2) lots that we could build two (2) homes on. The last time the applicants were here they were asked to consolidate one (1) lot and have

another lot they could build a home on near the mother. What will be the fragmentation of the agricultural land?

Jason Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services, stated that the fragmentation of agricultural land is a term used to describe the severing and creating new lots from agricultural parent parcels.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac stated that she does not believe we are creating a new lot but rather shifting the boundaries. They are simply shifting the two (2) existing lots in order to allow the Fillions to have a property in their name. Further, the family has every intention on continuing the family business of selling sod. It is there livelihood.

Jason Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services, stated that he empathizes with the applicant's situation. However, planning staff's perspective of the application would result in the creation of a new lot in the community's agricultural reserve. The application would result in the creation of a new residential lot which is not consistent with the City's Official Plan or with the Provincial Policy Statement.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac stated that her perspective is to keep agricultural land, which she agrees with. However, her perspective is a shifting of boundaries. She further stated that she has never seen a letter from OMAFRA in her time with the Planning Committee. She asks if they review the City's applications or if were they notified.

Jason Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services, stated that it is unusual to receive a comment from a member of provincial staff other than the ones included in the formal comment process. When they receive applications for Official Plan Amendments, they circulate them to the province and the province has the opportunity to comment on them. This case is unique as it did not come through the formal comment process but rather came from outside of the process. OMAFRA has a rural planning team, based in that area of the province, and their job is to provide advice to municipalities within the province as it relates to agricultural planning matters.

Ward Councillor Dutrisac stated that the province wants to give municipalities more say in these type of situations. She believes in agriculture, but she finds that municipal governments have the power to be flexible and look at these types of situation in a different perspective.

Mr. Dorland stated that he does not understand how two (2) resulting in two (2) creates a new lot. If he has permission to build a house in the area they are seeking permission to rearrange the boundary lines and leave a smaller parcel, it does not create a new lot. It just means they need consideration for a unique situation. It has been stated that if the house was already present on the lot, the resulting configuration on reapplication would be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan. He would like to suggest an alternative recommendation that includes a condition that would allow the matter to move forward so that this family can build the house they require for their needs. If the Committee wishes to do so, he suggests that acquiring a building permit be added as a condition of the approval so that the application meets the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan. OMAFRA is not aware of the purpose of this application. He would like the Committee to consider approving the application with the building permit condition.

The Chair asked whether there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favour or against this application and seeing none:

**The Public Hearing concerning this matter was closed and the Planning Committee**

**resumed in order to discuss and vote on the matter.**

Recess

At 3:45 p.m. the Planning Committee recessed.

Reconvene

At 3:57 p.m. the Planning Committee reconvened.

The following alternate resolutions were presented:

Recommendation regarding Application for Official Plan Amendment:

PL2017-111 Jakubo/Lapierre: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by Ginette Filion and 1085937 Ontario Inc. in order to provide an exception to Section 6.2.2. to permit a lot boundary adjustment resulting in a remainder having a lot area of less than 30 ha in the Agricultural Reserve for the lands described as PINs 73345-0766, 73345-0243, and 73345-0770, Parts 1 & 2, Plan 53R-19093, and remainder of Parcel 234 SWS, Lot 4, Concession 5, Township of Rayside.

**YEAS:** Councillors Lapierre, Jakubo and McIntosh.

**CARRIED**

Recommendation regarding Rezoning Application:

PL2017-112 Jakubo/Lapierre: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by 1085937 Ontario Inc. to amend Zoning By-law 2010-100Z by changing the zoning classification of lands described as PINs 73345-0766, 73345-0243, and 73345-0770, Parts 1 & 2, Plan 53R-19093, and remainder of Parcel 234 SWS, Lot 4, Concession 5, Township of Rayside from "A", Agricultural to "A(S)", Agricultural Special with a special exception to allow one parcel with a minimum lot area less than 30.0 hectares and a lot frontage of less than 90 and to change the zoning classification of the lands to be consolidated from "A", Agricultural to "A(S)", Agricultural Special with a special exception to permit only agricultural use., subject to the following condition:

1. That prior to the adoption of the amending By-law a building permit for single detached dwelling be issued for the proposed remainder of parcel PIN 73345-0766 to the satisfaction of the chief building official.

**YEAS:** Councillors Lapierre, Jakubo and McIntosh.

**CARRIED**

No public comment, written or oral, was received, there was no effect on the Planning Committee's decision.

**Matters Arising from the Closed Session**

Councillor Lapierre reported that the Committee met in Closed Session to deal with one (1) Proposed or Pending Acquisition or Disposition of Land Matter and the following resolution emanated therefrom:

The following resolution was presented:

PL2017-113 Lapierre/Jakubo: WHEREAS through Resolution CC2017-154, Council directed

staff to extend the City of Greater Sudbury operated Pound for an additional two years at 39 Kari Road, Wahnapiatae.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury authorize a lease Agreement with Robin and Gail Pauley for the lands and premises municipally known as 39 Kari Road, Wahnapiatae;

AND THAT the appropriate by-law be presented to authorize the execution of the Lease Agreement and renewal term, if applicable;

AND THAT the annual rent be funded from the Security and By-Law Services Operation Budget.

**CARRIED**

### **Adopting, Approving or Receiving Items in the Consent Agenda**

#### Rules of Procedure

Councillor Lapierre asked that item C-1 be pulled and voted on separately.

The following resolution was presented:

PL2017-114 Lapierre/Jakubo: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves Consent Agenda C-2 to C-4.

**CARRIED**

The following are the Consent Agenda items:

### **Routine Management Reports**

C-2 Philippe and Louise Landry - Application to extend draft plan of subdivision approval, Part of PIN 73508 1102, Part of Parcel 698 S.E.S., in Lot 12, Concession 3, Township of Capreol, Cote Boulevard, Hanmer (Nature's Haven II Subdivision)

Report dated June 20, 2017 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Philippe and Louise Landry - Application to extend draft plan of subdivision approval, Part of PIN 73508 1102, Part of Parcel 698 S.E.S., in Lot 12, Concession 3, Township of Capreol, Cote Boulevard, Hanmer (Nature's Haven II Subdivision).

PL2017-115 Lapierre/Jakubo: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury's delegated official be directed to amend the conditions of draft approval for the draft plan of subdivision on lands described as Part of PIN 73508 1102, Part of Parcel 698 S.E.S., in Lot 12, Concession 3, Township of Capreol, City of Greater Sudbury, File 780 7/08006 as follows:

a) By deleting Condition #10 and replacing it with the following:

"That this draft approval shall lapse on September 30, 2020."

b) By replacing the references to the "General Manager of Infrastructure Services" with "General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure" in Conditions # 9 and 11.

c) By deleting Condition #12.

d) By replacing the reference to "Growth and Development Department" with "Planning

Services Division” and deleting the reference to Condition # “2” in Condition #32.

e) By adding the following as Condition #33:

“Final approval for registration may be issued in phases to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning Services, provided that:

i) Phasing is proposed in an orderly progression, in consideration of such matters as the timing of road improvements, infrastructure and other essential services; and

ii) All agencies agree to registration by phases and provide clearances, as required, for each phase proposed for registration; furthermore, the required clearances may relate to lands not located within the phase sought to be registered.”

f) By adding the following as Condition #34:

“That the owner shall have completed all major outstanding infrastructure deficiencies that are critical to the overall function of the subdivision in previous phases of the plan that have been registered, or have made arrangements for their completion, prior to registering a new phase of the plan, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure.”

**CARRIED**

C-3 Unopened Lane East of Aubrey Street, Coniston - Lane Closure and Declaration of Surplus Land

Report dated June 21, 2017 from the General Manager of Corporate Services regarding Unopened Lane East of Aubrey Street, Coniston - Lane Closure and Declaration of Surplus Land.

PL2017-116 Jakubo/Lapierre: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury close by by-law and declare surplus to the City's needs, the unopened lane east of Aubrey Street, Coniston, legally described as PIN 73560-1085(LT), Plan M-147, Township of Neelon, City of Greater Sudbury, and offer the lane for sale to the abutting property owners pursuant to the procedures governing the sale of limited marketability surplus land as outlined in the Property By-law 2008-174, all in accordance with a report from the Director of Assets and Fleet Services, dated June 20, 2017.

**CARRIED**

C-4 Deeming By-law for Lots 1, 2 and 3 Plan 4S, 5 MacLachlan Street, Sudbury

Report dated June 20, 2017 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Deeming By-law for Lots 1, 2 and 3 Plan 4S, 5 MacLachlan Street, Sudbury.

PL2017-117 Lapierre/Jakubo: That the City of Greater Sudbury approves designating Lots 1, 2 and 3, Plan 4S as being deemed not to be part of a registered plan for the purposes of Section 50(3) of the Planning Act, and;

That Staff be directed to prepare a by-law for Council to enact deeming Lots 1, 2 and 3 of Plan 4S not to be part of a plan of subdivision for the purposes of Section 50(3) of the Planning Act.

**CARRIED**

Item C-1 was dealt with separately.

C-1 Northern Home Builders – Proposed change to an amending zoning by-law and conditions of draft plan of subdivision, Brabant Street, Azilda

Report dated June 20, 2017 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Northern Home Builders – Proposed change to an amending zoning by-law and conditions of draft plan of subdivision, Brabant Street, Azilda.

The following resolution was presented:

Resolution regarding Rezoning Application and Conditions of Draft Plan Approval:

PL2017-118 Lapierre/Jakubo: WHEREAS the City of Greater Sudbury Planning Committee adopted Resolution PL2013-220 on December 9, 2013 approving a rezoning application by Northern Home Builders to change the zoning classification from "FD", Future Development to "R1-5", Low Density Residential One, "R2-2", Low Density Residential Two, "R3-1(S)", Medium Density Residential Special, and "FD(S)", Future Development Special in order to permit the development of 39 detached dwellings, 26 semi-detached dwellings, and one multi-family block that permits a retirement home as an additional use on those lands described as PIN 73347-1572 & part of PIN 73347 1620, Lot 6, Concession 1, Township of Rayside, subject to certain conditions;

AND WHEREAS Council for the City of Greater Sudbury on December 10, 2013 adopted Resolution CC2016-375;

AND WHEREAS the conditions of approval have not yet been satisfied;

AND WHEREAS the owner has subsequently advised Planning Services that they are now seeking approval to relocate the proposed park blocks;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that items 2 ii) and iii) of PL2013-220 from the Planning Committee Meeting of December 9, 2013 and ratified by City Council Resolution CC2013-375 on December 10, 2013 shall be replaced and superseded with the following:

2.ii) That Lots 40 to 52 and Block 1 be zoned "R2-2", Low Density Residential Two;

iii) That Lots 15 and 16 and the Street A cul-de-sac be zoned "P", Park.

AND THAT in accordance with Subsection 34(17) of the Planning Act no further notice is required to be provided for changes to the proposed by-law, as provided for in this resolution.

That the City of Greater Sudbury's delegated official be directed to amend the conditions of draft approval for plan of subdivision on those lands known as PIN 73347-1572 & part of PIN 73347-1620, Lot 6, Concession 1, Township of Rayside, File 780-5/12003, upon the payment of the processing fee of \$1,565.00 as follows:

a) By deleting in Condition # 2 the word "from" and replacing it with "form".

b) By deleting in Condition # 32 reference to "Lot 40 and Block 1" and replacing it with "Lots 15 and 16 and the Street A cul-de-sac".

c) By adding Conditions # 35 and 36 as follows:

"35. That Block 40 be relotted into 3 semi-detached lots to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning Services."

"36. That the cul-de-sac on Street "A" be removed and lots 13 and 14 be reconfigured to front

onto the street to the north to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning Services.

**CARRIED**

### **Referred and Deferred Matters**

R-1 Dalron Construction Ltd. - Extension to draft plan of subdivision approval, Greenwood Subdivision, Sudbury

Report dated June 7, 2017 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Dalron Construction Ltd. - Extension to draft plan of subdivision approval, Greenwood Subdivision, Sudbury.

The following resolution was presented:

PL2017-119 Jakubo/Lapierre: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury's delegated official be directed to amend the conditions of draft approval for the draft plan of subdivision on those lands known as PIN 73578-0515, Part 1, Plan 53R-18272, Part of Lots 11 & 12, Concession 3, Township of Neelon, File # 780-6/07002, upon payment of Council's processing fee of \$2,161.00 as follows:

a) By deleting Condition #10 and replacing it with the following:

"10. That this draft approval shall lapse on November 28, 2019."

b) By deleting in Condition 18 the words, "and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans".

c) By adding a new Condition #32 as follows:

"32. Final approval for registration may be issued in phases to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, provided that:

i) Phasing is proposed in an orderly progression, in consideration of such matters as the timing of road improvements, infrastructure and other essential services; and;

ii) All agencies agree to registration by phases and provide clearances, as required, for each phase proposed for registration; furthermore, the required clearances may relate to lands not located within the phase sought to be registered."

d) By adding a new Condition #33 as follows:

"33. That the owner shall have completed all major outstanding infrastructure deficiencies that are critical to the overall function of the subdivision in previous phases of the plan that have been registered, or have made arrangements for their completion, prior to registering a new phase of the plan, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Infrastructure Services."

**CARRIED**

### **Addendum**

No Addendum was presented.

### **Civic Petitions**

No Civic Petitions were submitted.

### **Question Period and Announcements**

No Questions were asked.

### **Notices of Motion**

No Notices of Motion were presented.

### **Adjournment**

Jakubo/Lapierre: THAT this meeting does now adjourn. Time: 4:23 p.m.

**CARRIED**

---

Adam Kosnick, Deputy City Clerk