

## Maria Gonzalez Santos

---

**From:** Wendy Kaufman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2024 8:59 AM  
**To:** Maria Gonzalez Santos  
**Subject:** FW: FW: File: 701-7/23-02. notice of application

---

**From:** Daniel Bouchard <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:49 AM  
**To:** Wendy Kaufman <Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca>  
**Subject:** Re: FW: File: 701-7/23-02. notice of application

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Thank you for the update.

On Fri, Feb 2, 2024 at 8:17 AM Wendy Kaufman <[Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca)> wrote:

Good Morning Daniel,

Thank you for your comment. I have not reviewed the text of the easement document to confirm whether septic systems/field beds are mentioned specifically. The easement was previously established on the property and is not proposed to be changed.

Thanks again,

Wendy

---

**From:** Daniel Bouchard <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 2, 2024 5:34 AM  
**To:** Wendy Kaufman <[Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: FW: File: 701-7/23-02. notice of application

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Thank you for the update. Reading your email you say " it is my understanding...." but is it the same for everybody that a septic or field bed is considered a structure ??

Concerning a road, it is my interest as I am the owner of the adjacent land as 844367 Ontario inc.... where the road will have to be built if I pursue the project of developing the R2 and R3 along the Spruce street extension up to Dominion dr. Thanks for the sending that I am waiting for.

On Thu, Feb 1, 2024 at 9:26 AM Wendy Kaufman <[Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca)> wrote:

Good Morning Daniel,

We mailed the package yesterday including the conceptual consent sketch.

My understanding is that the easement registered on title would serve to restrict development in this location.

The costs of building a road would be discussed when it is proposed to be constructed. The road is not proposed to be constructed at this time.

Thank you,

Wendy

**Wendy Kaufman, MCIP, RPP**

Senior Planner - Development Approvals

Planning Services Division

P: (705) 674-4455, ext. 4318

F: (705) 673-2200



*At the City of Greater Sudbury, we value and respect flexible work arrangements. My work day may look different than yours. Please do not feel obligated to respond outside of your normal working hours.*

---

**From:** Daniel Bouchard <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 30, 2024 9:35 AM  
**To:** Wendy Kaufman <[Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: FW: File: 701-7/23-02. notice of application

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Thanks for your reply, and as you confirmed the easement located on the northern portion of the land subject to this application . My understanding from the beginning when I bought the land was to build a road to access Dominion drive from Theresa street ( or Spruce street extension ) going on the easement. My concern is if a new lot is being created will there be condition attached to prevent any building or structures ie. field bed, septic tanks etc...to take place on the easement. Also if a road is being built on the easement, who will be responsible for all the cost associated with it, will it be a cost sharing already stipulated in the consent to split as a condition ?? You have mentioned a conceptual consent sketch that show the easement but I did not received it, is it possible to have it.

Thanks

On Mon, Jan 29, 2024 at 2:02 PM Wendy Kaufman <[Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Wendy.Kaufman@greatersudbury.ca)> wrote:

Email 2 of 2

Thank you,

Wendy

---

**From:** Wendy Kaufman  
**Sent:** Monday, January 29, 2024 12:42 PM  
**To:** Daniel Bouchard <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Véronique BOUCHARD <[REDACTED]>; Rene Lapierre <[Rene.Lapierre@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Rene.Lapierre@greatersudbury.ca)>; Alex Singbush <[Alex.Singbush@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Alex.Singbush@greatersudbury.ca)>  
**Subject:** RE: File: 701-7/23-02. notice of application

Good Afternoon Mr. Bouchard,

I understand you left a voicemail for Alex Singbush regarding a response to your correspondence, and I have been asked to follow up.

Thank you for these comments. They will be taken into consideration as part of the City's review of the application, and will be provided to the Planning Committee as part of their agenda package.

I have attached the applicant's conceptual consent sketch for your reference that shows existing development and proposed new lot.

I can confirm that there is an easement located on the northerly portion of the lands subject to this application, to allow for a connection from the easterly lands to Dominion Drive. The easement is shown on the conceptual consent sketch.

I have also attached the applicant's planning justification report for your reference.

The applicant's agent could be contacted to further discuss the application and any more specific questions you may have. His name is Ryan Vis, and is available at [REDACTED] or by email at [REDACTED]

Also, please feel free to contact me directly to discuss further, and thanks again,

**Wendy Kaufman, MCIP, RPP**

Senior Planner - Development Approvals

Planning Services Division

P: (705) 674-4455, ext. 4318

F: (705) 673-2200

*At the City of Greater Sudbury, we value and respect flexible work arrangements. My work day may look different than yours. Please do not feel obligated to respond outside of your normal working hours.*

---

**From:** Daniel Bouchard <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 2, 2024 8:04 AM  
**To:** Alex Singbush <[Alex.Singbush@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Alex.Singbush@greatersudbury.ca)>  
**Cc:** Véronique BOUCHARD <[REDACTED]>; Rene Lapierre <[Rene.Lapierre@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:Rene.Lapierre@greatersudbury.ca)>  
**Subject:** File: 701-7/23-02. notice of application

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

First of all, thanks for making me aware of this application and sorry for my writing because I am french and only received this letter in english. I am very concerned as being a direct neighbour as an individual living on Guenette drive as RU (13 ) and also as the owner -developer of the rest of the property also shown as P, R3.D45 and R2-2. owned by my # Ontario company. First, I do not understand your sketch 1 provided with the letter sent as it only shows a big square as the subject property along Notre-Dame street and Guenette drive, Hanmer. It is not an empty lot as it has a house, a garage and sheds on the property, and that since I bought the adjacent property in +\_ 1986 ( 88 acres ). This could be misleading as you could think that it is an empty lot and it is not the case.

I do know Mr. Houle as being my neighbour for many years and also know from himself, that he did attempt many times in the past to split a lot from the subject property but always been refused by the city to do it. Receiving the letter of notice of application , I understand that he is trying again to do it.

As mentioned before, I am the owner of the property along Guenette drive and also my company owns the rest of the northern part as shown on your sketch provided as lots: P, R3.D45, C1, R2-2 and R1-5.

In 1989, a draft plan of proposed subdivision of parcels 1072 & 8783 being part of lot 12, con.2 township of Capreol, town of Valley East, Regional municipality of Sudbury, was submitted by Dennis consultants LTD, civil engineers on my behalf and was later accepted by the regional municipality of Sudbury as a plan of subdivision. After five years I did not renew the application as the market was down and it was too costly to pursue the development of it. I also have to mention that during the phasing of the development I was stopped to pursue with the development of the Spruce street extension as it was my intentions ( even if it was prior accepted by the planning department and soil testings done by Trows engineerings and reports were submitted and accepted as asked ) after all acceptances, due

to a new software program that the planning department has received it apparently showed that there was a possibility that there was insufficient water flow in case of a fire and I had to start from the northern part of the property( ie. Carmen street, Hanmer ) for looping the system. This was done as Carmen street in between Chenier and Pharand street (even though I only owned one side of the street that had been constructed and developed). As you know, before a plan of subdivision is submitted, a number of meetings in between the developer, the engineers, the surveyors, other professionals, members of the planning department and committee for approvals at the Region are necessary.

At those meetings, it was imposed that Part 2 and Part 3 of Plan 53R-4689 also known as Spruce street ( extension ) was necessary as it was designated as a collector road connecting to Dominion Drive street also described in multiple plans submitted by the planning department to us.

So my real concern with this application, is it still in effect that there is a right of way or easements for the creation of the spruce street ( extension ) connecting to Dominion Drive street for all those R3.D45, C1 and R2-2 and traffic from other streets and neighborhood nearby, because the sketch clearly shows that with this application it would not be possible to go through from Spruce street to Dominion Drive as the subject property would block its access. Too much time, energy and money (a lot of it has already been spent; ie. engineers, surveyors, lawyers, fees, etc..) to see it going down the drain because of this notice of application being as mentioned in the notice as a site-specific exemption to permit lot creation within the Urban Expansion Reserve, to facilitate the creation of one new lot for rural residential purposes, having no connections to municipal water and sewer disposal and being located in a Vulnerable Area as identified in the Greater Sudbury Source Plan, jeopardizing the creation of several houses ( R2-2 ), multiples appartements blocs ( R3.D45 ) and business ( C1 ), that would be part of a plan of subdivision with municipality services.

At this point, with the information given in this notice, I am totally against the approval of the said application.