

Nicholas Cicchini

From: Nicholas Cicchini
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 11:38 AM
To: Mayor Shoemaker; Sandra Hollingsworth; Sonny Spina; Luke Dufour; Lisa Vezeau-Allen; Angela Caputo; Ron Zagordo; Marchy Bruni; Stephan Kinach; Corey Gardi; Matthew Scott
Cc: Peter Tonazzo; Freddie Pozzebon; Francois Couture; Brent Lamming; CAO Vair; Carl Rumiel
Subject: FW: Comments for Council Consideration 99 Melville Road
Attachments: Response_Public_Comments_99_Melville.pdf; 99_Melville_Rezoning Proposal.pdf

Hello,

For your information, below are the responses from the Building Divisions (in red) to the questions originally raised by Kirk Dillabough regarding Planning Act Application A-6-24-Z – 99 Melville Road. Also attached are the responses and project information provided by the applicant.

If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out.

Thanks,

Nicholas Cicchini, B.E.S.
Junior Planner
Planning and Enterprise Services
n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca
705-759-5375

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE
99 Foster Drive, Sault Ste. Marie, ON P6A 5X6
saultstemarie.ca



From: Nicholas Cicchini
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 11:28 AM
To: Kirk Dillabough [REDACTED]
Cc: Mangesh Shende [REDACTED]; Freddie Pozzebon <f.pozzebon@cityssm.on.ca>; Peter Tonazzo <p.tonazzo@cityssm.on.ca>
Subject: FW: Comments for Council Consideration 99 Melville Road

Good morning Mr. Dillabough,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns to City Council and the Planning Staff.

As requested, please see the below responses (in red) from the City's Building Division to your questions regarding rezoning application A-6-25-Z – 99 Melville Road.

- 1. Q. The City approved a six-bedroom single family residential unit. This was done through a building permit. To obtain building permits, usually design drawings are required. The 12 rooms located in the building would have been observed and are likely listed on design drawings. Why did the City of Sault Ste. Marie allow this construction to be appr**

Building Division Response: The rooms are clearly indicated by name on the plans. The permit was issued for the number of bedrooms (6) indicated on the plans.

- 2. Q. Does the City of Sault Ste. Marie has an explanation of what the six additional rooms were when**

Building Division Response: The rooms were empty at the time of the last called in inspection during the construction. Later, the Building Division was notified that the building was being illegally used as a Rooming House. During that investigation it was clear that some of the rooms were being rented out to occupants beyond the allowable 4 renters within the use as a single-family dwelling. The use of those rooms was later confirmed to be changed to storage and the illegal use as a rooming house ceased.

- 3. Q. Why did the City of Sault Ste. Marie require the applicant to document in writing that he would use the building as a single-family residential unit pr**

Building Division Response: The applicant is required to confirm there would not be any contraventions of the zoning by-law that was in place at the time.

4.

Building Division Response: Yes. This is typical in circumstances where the Building Official has requested assurances.

- 5. Q. Follow up: Did the City of Sault Ste. Marie suspects the building would possibly be used as**

Building Division Response: We review the documents for compliance with building and zoning by-law. Things either comply, or don't comply. In this case, the documents showed compliance. All applicants must fill out the permit application submission form. The applicant must declare the proposed use of the building. The application stated single family dwelling.

- 6. Q. I hope you can provide clarification on a rumour. There are rumours circulating about this project. The rumours are not varied but have a similar theme. One of the rumours is that residents were told that City of Sault Ste. Marie officials told the owner they could build the rooming house and change the zoning later. Can you comment on that it**

Building Division Response: It was more likely that the applicant was told they can perform any type of code compliant renovations in their dwelling, but the actual use of the building must always comply with the zoning by-law.

If you have any other questions, please feel free to reach out.

Kind Regards,

Nicholas Cicchini, B.E.S.

Junior Planner
Planning and Enterprise Services
n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca
705-759-5375

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE
99 Foster Drive, Sault Ste. Marie, ON P6A 5X6
saultstemarie.ca



From: Mangesh Shende [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2025 1:37 PM
To: Kirk Dillabough [REDACTED]
Cc: mayorsoffice mayorsoffice@cityssm.on.ca; Sandra Hollingsworth s.hollingsworth@cityssm.on.ca; Sonny Spina s.spina@cityssm.on.ca; Luke Dufour l.dufour@cityssm.on.ca; Angela Caputo angela.caputo@cityssm.on.ca; Ron Zagordo r.zagordo@cityssm.on.ca; Marchy Bruni m.bruni@cityssm.on.ca; Stephan Kinach s.kinach@cityssm.on.ca; Corey Gardi c.gardi@cityssm.on.ca; Matthew Scott m.scott@cityssm.on.ca; Nicholas Cicchini n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca
Subject: Re: Comments for Council Consideration 99 Melville Road

This email originated outside of the Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie.
Do not open attachments or click links unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Kirk

Thank you for your detailed submission regarding the rezoning application for 99 Melville Road. I truly appreciate the time and thought you have put into reviewing the planning report and raising important questions around both policy and process.

I want to start by acknowledging your recognition that the City's Planning Division took care to separate policy-based planning decisions from the construction history of the site. I agree that the report presents a thoughtful and transparent rationale aligned with the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan.

With respect to the concerns you raised regarding the Building Division and the sequence of construction, I would like to offer the following clarifications from my perspective as the applicant:

When I began work on the property I was not fully aware of the zoning implications and made mistakes out of inexperience and financial pressure. These were errors in judgment for which I take full responsibility.

A building permit was issued in November 2023 for a six-bedroom single family dwelling. City inspectors conducted follow-up inspections and after public complaints the use of the building was revised to comply with zoning. The keyed locks were also removed as directed.

Since February 2025 the property has been operating in accordance with existing zoning as an owner-occupied dwelling with up to three tenants.

This rezoning application is not intended to retroactively justify past missteps. It is a sincere effort to bring the property into full compliance with municipal regulations. The proposal is for a small-scale rooming house that meets all applicable zoning provisions including fire separations and shared amenities and is managed with oversight.

Sorry for the delay in responding to your questions. I work full-time and am also currently studying part-time in a university program. Regarding the questions you submitted please see the attached response. I have also made several attempts to connect with you directly. If you are still open to meeting or visiting the property in person I would be happy to make myself available at your convenience. Please feel free to give me a call at [REDACTED] anytime if you wish to discuss this further.

Lastly I want to emphasize that I am not a developer in any way. I am just a local resident who came to Soo in 2020 from Montreal for a job and then decided to stay and build a future here. I bought this building with all the savings I had not to exploit the process but to contribute something meaningful to the housing options available in our city. This application is about making things right and moving forward responsibly.

I respect the concerns you have raised and fully support a transparent accountable process. I trust the Council will continue to consider all perspectives carefully and uphold both fairness and good planning principles.

Sincerely,
Mangesh Shende

On Fri, Jul 11, 2025 at 10:45 AM Kirk Dillabough [REDACTED] wrote:

To: City of Sault Ste. Marie Municipal Council

Subject: Zoning Report for 99 Melville Road

At the July 14, 2025 Council meeting you will be encouraged to accept the report from the Junior Planner to allow for a zoning change at the above-noted location.

I have reviewed the report and have concluded the decisions of the planner are based on provincial policy statements and align with other regulatory guidance. The planner did a good job of separating the planning decisions from underlying items that occurred at this location. It read in a way that a developer building a new development would seek a zoning change. The report satisfied some of the concerns cited by the residents that are within the control of the planning department (ex. recommending site plan control).

Despite the comments above there is a larger issue at this location that I encourage Council to address. The applicant began construction on a 12-unit rooming house without authority. In an attempt to authorize the development, the Building Division allowed it to continue and authorized the development through a building permit for a 6-bedroom single family dwelling. A 12-unit rooming house would not have been allowed due to zoning concerns at the time. Building Division staff would have had to attend the building to approve construction (evidenced in multiple inspection reports). 12 units would have been observed. In fact, the

building division required the applicant to remove locks from the 6 units in the basement. Furthermore, they required the occupant number to be reduced after a complaint was received. I have not viewed the design drawings but did obtain inspection reports for the location. It would be strange if the additional 6 units were not noted in some form on design drawings.

As part of the public comment period I put forth a series of questions to the applicant and the City of Sault Ste. Marie. They are noted in the email chain below. The applicant did not respond. The City Planner forwarded my questions onto the Building Division. They did not respond or partially respond even after prompting.

The concerns I have that Council should address is:

1. Did an officially induced error occur on behalf of the City? Did Building Division staff allow an individual to continue project construction outside of appropriate zoning?
2. Is this zoning change allowing for legalization of the error? I appreciate that the applicant spent a considerable amount of money to make the improvements. I doubt they would have continued if they were informed that zoning changes may/may not be obtained.
3. Was this process truly transparent that allowed for meaningful public comment? Did this development go through the motions to authorize the illegally/city authorized built development in a creative way using building division approvals?

If Council approves this zoning change without considering the above-noted items, it sets a concerning precedent—one that risks undermining public trust in the planning and permitting process. It suggests that development can proceed outside the rules, and that compliance can be negotiated only after complaints arise. I urge you to ensure that decisions made at this meeting uphold not only policy consistency but also procedural fairness and accountability.

Thank you.
Kirk Dillabough
Melville Road.

From: Nicholas Cicchini n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca>
Sent: July 8, 2025 1:38 PM
To: Kirk Dillabough [REDACTED]
Cc: Mangesh Shende [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Neighbourhood meeting 99 Melville

Hello Kirk,

There has been no response at this time. I am still waiting on the Building Division to respond. I will follow up with them and get back to you at the earliest convenience.

Thanks,

Nicholas Cicchini, B.E.S.

Junior Planner

Planning and Enterprise Services

n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca

705-759-5375

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

99 Foster Drive, Sault Ste. Marie, ON P6A 5X6

saultstemarie.ca



**SAULT
STE. MARIE**

From: Kirk Dillabough [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:29 PM

To: Nicholas Cicchini n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca>

Cc: Mangesh Shende [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Neighbourhood meeting 99 Melville

**This email originated outside of the Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie.
Do not open attachments or click links unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Good Morning,

I wanted to check in and see if I would be receiving a reply prior to the item going back to council for consideration. If you have sent a reply please let me know.

Thanks.

Kirk

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 26, 2025, at 09:19, Nicholas Cicchini n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca> wrote:

Good morning Kirk,

Thank you for providing us your questions, some of the questions that are directed to me, are more related to the Building Division. I have forwarded those questions to the necessary individuals for a proper response. When I receive the response from the building division, I will forward them to you.

Furthermore, I have been in contact with Mr. Shende, and he has informed me that he is working on providing you responses to the questions directed to him.

We will be in touch as soon as possible.

If you have any other questions, please feel free to reach out.

Regards,

Nicholas Cicchini, B.E.S.

Junior Planner

Planning and Enterprise Services

n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca

705-759-5375

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

99 Foster Drive, Sault Ste. Marie, ON P6A 5X6

saultstemarie.ca

<image001.jpg>

From: Kirk Dillabough [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 1:56 PM

To: Mangesh Shende [REDACTED]; Nicholas Cicchini n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca

Subject: Neighbourhood meeting 99 Melville

This email originated outside of the Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie. Do not open attachments or click links unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

I was really looking forward to meeting you both on July 2, 2025. I was hoping in person questions would help address the concerns I have.

Unfortunately, due to another commitment I am unable to attend this meeting. I know the logistics of scheduling these sessions are complex so I have put below a few questions I was hoping ask at the meeting. Perhaps you could answer them since I cannot attend. I have divided the questions by person to try and be helpful.

Thanks.

Kirk

Questions for Mangesh Shende:

Q. What is your plan to manage garbage, recycling and general property standards if the zoning is approved? This seems to be an ongoing concern despite fewer tenants.

Q. Do you intend to operate a short-term rental at this location? An example is rooms by the night on Air BnB.

Q. How do you intend to be the responsible party for your tenants to ensure issues/concerns with neighbours are managed? Ex. contact information etc. if you don't live on site.

Q. Do you plan on having any agreements with your tenants about rules for the property? If so, what type of rules do you intend to have?

Q. Have you ever considered altering the building to not accommodate 12 residents in individual rooms? Ex. du-plex, tri-plex or smaller rooming house.

Q. I completed a freedom of information request from the City of Sault Ste. Marie. I obtained a copy of the email you sent them on June 13, 2024. This was related to an occupancy permit for the building. In that email you stated: ***“This email, is just to confirm that I understand that the occupancy to be granted is as a single family dwelling at this time.”*** Why did you not follow this item and rent out individual rooms?

Q. Follow up to above. When you wrote “at this time” was it always your intention to have a rooming house and the zoning change would be applied for later? If it was not intended that way, why did you change your mind and never occupy it as a single-family home?

Q. Do you currently reside at 99 Melville Road?

Questions for Nicholas Cicchini:

Q. The City approved a six bedroom single family residential unit. This was done through a building permit. To obtain building permits, usually design drawings are required. The 12 rooms located in the building would have been observed and are likely listed on design drawings. Why did the City of Sault Ste. Marie allow this construction to be approved as it is clearly not six bedrooms?

Q. Does the City of Sault Ste. Marie have an explanation of what the six additional rooms were when building officials completed inspections?

Q. Why did the City of Sault Ste. Marie require the applicant to document in writing that he would use the building as a single-family residential unit prior to an occupancy permit?

Q. Follow up: Is this a normal procedure to do?

Q. Follow up: Did the City of Sault Ste. Marie suspect the building would possibly be used as something other than a single-family dwelling?

Both:

Q. Either person can answer this question or both. I hope you can provide clarification on a rumour. There are rumours circulating about this project. The rumours are varied but have a similar theme. One of the rumours is that residents were told that City of Sault Ste. Marie officials told the owner they could build the rooming house and change the zoning later. Does either party have a comment on that item?

Sent from my iPhone

Individuals who submit written correspondence or information to the City should be aware that any personal information contained in their communications may become part of the public record and made available to the public through the Council Agenda process or that of a committee of Council or a local board.

Individuals who submit written correspondence or information to the City should be aware that any personal information contained in their communications may become part of the public record and made available to the public through the Council Agenda process or that of a committee of Council or a local board.