



**The Corporation of the  
City of Sault Ste. Marie**

**C O U N C I L   R E P O R T**

March 23, 2026

TO: Mayor Matthew Shoemaker and Members of City Council  
AUTHOR: Nicholas Cicchini, MURP, Junior Planner  
DEPARTMENT: Community Development and Enterprise Services  
RE: A-4-26-Z General Housekeeping Amendments – Phase II

---

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval of a City-initiated application for housekeeping amendments to Zoning By-law 2005-150 to clarify technical language and improve implementation. The proposed amendments will be City-wide unless otherwise specified.

**PROPOSED CHANGE**

The proposed zoning by-law amendments are administrative and technical in nature and include the following:

1. Amendment to the “Contractors Yard” permitted use definition;
2. Amendment of “Salvage Yards and Recycling Centre” permitted use definition;
3. Update of “Strategic Development Area (SDA)” definition;
4. Removal of Frontage Requirements for Severing Multiple-Attached Dwellings;
5. Relocation of Site Plan Control clause for dwelling units;
6. Replace “The Downtown” with “First Neighbourhoods SDA”;
7. Removal of provisions with respect to “The Downtown”;
8. Addition of Snow Guards clause;
9. Amendment to Minimum Parking Requirements;
10. Revision of Provision 8.2.2 (c) – Accessory Structures on undersized rural lots;
11. Revision of Provision 9.3 – Removal of duplicate clause;
12. Revision of Provision 9.1.7 (a) – Accessory Structures in Interior Side Yards;
13. Increase permitted office uses gross floor area outside of the First Neighbourhood SDA;
14. Permit lot-line to lot-line Development for select properties in the C1 Zone with frontage on Gore Street, Wellington Street East, and Korah Road;
15. Removal of Special Exception 89 (Station Mall Expansion); and

16. Amendment to Special Exception 153, Gateway Site, removal of Provision No.1 (Retail Trade as an accessory use only).

### **BACKGROUND**

In October 2005 City Council passed Zoning By-law 2005-150. At the time, Planning staff noted that periodic reviews and subsequent minor amendments would be required to ensure that the By-law remains current.

Continually reviewing the By-law ensures an accurate reflection of the community's changing development requirements. Most of the proposed amendments are intended to more clearly communicate the regulations' intent or to respond to changing development trends.

### **ANALYSIS**

#### **Conformity with Official Plan**

Housekeeping amendments are typically minor, technical changes intended to clarify, correct, or align zoning regulations with current practices, legislation, and policy. These actions align with the Official Plan's overall direction to streamline implementation tools and support an efficient, user-friendly planning framework.

Other amendments, such as adjustments to performance standards, such as maximum heights and minimum setbacks, are supported by the Plan's provisions that reinforce urban design and neighbourhood compatibility.

Collectively, these technical amendments improve clarity, expedite developments, and ensure zoning standards remain aligned with the Official Plan's direction for orderly, compatible and economically vibrant development. These amendments are consistent with the Official Plan.

#### **Conformity with Provincial Planning Statement 2024**

The proposed housekeeping amendments enhance the zoning framework and ensure an accurate reflection of the municipality's development trends, thereby accommodating growth and development.

PPS Policy 6.1.6 requires Planning authorities to keep zoning by-laws up to date with official plans and the Provincial Planning Statement by establishing permitted uses, minimum densities, heights and other development standards to accommodate growth and development.

Therefore, the proposed amendments do not conflict with the PPS 2024.

#### **Conformity with Growth Plan for Northern Ontario 2011**

The Growth Plan for Northern Ontario (GPNO) establishes a framework for managing growth in Northern Ontario. Council's Decision must either conform to or not conflict with the plan. The proposed amendments have been reviewed against the GPNO and do not conflict with it.

## **COMMENTS**

Unless otherwise specified in the comments below, a list of the proposed housekeeping amendments can be found in Appendix A of this document.

### **Amendment 1**

*Amend the defined use ‘Contractors Yards’ to include “Landscaping and Snow Removal Contractors.”*

This amendment updates the defined use of “Contractor’s Yard” to explicitly include landscaping and snow removal contractors to better reflect the range of contractor operations that occur in practice. It will also include property and building maintenance functions in addition to construction activity.

The purpose is to improve clarity and consistency in interpretation and enforcement by providing a more complete definition of the use, particularly where similar operations have been occurring on sites that do not permit such activity. A clearer definition supports consistent decisions by Planning, Building, and By-law Enforcement, and helps manage land use compatibility concerns (e.g., noise, dust, vibration, and outdoor storage/activity impacts) by ensuring these operations are directed to appropriate zones.

### **Amendment 2**

*Add ‘Waste Transfer Facility’ as a defined use and establish a Holding Provision requirement.*

This amendment updates the defined use for salvage yards and recycling centres to expressly include “Waste Transfer Facility” functions. The revised definition explicitly recognizes the receiving, consolidation, temporary storage, and transfer of waste and recyclable materials, and confirms that these uses are subject to the removal of a Holding Provision.

The prerequisites to the removal of the Holding Provision requirements (site plan, land-use compatibility study regarding MECP D-series guidance and NPC-300, an operational plan, and public consultation) provide a clear and consistent checklist for staff and applicants to evaluate potential impacts and confirm appropriate site design and operations prior to the establishment of use.

### **Amendment 3**

*Update Zoning By-law mapping and provisions to reflect Official Plan Strategic Development Areas (SDAs)*

The addition of the definition for SDAs should be considered alongside amendments 6 (replacing “the downtown” with “First Neighbourhoods SDA”) and amendment 7 (repealing provisions 2.9 (The Downtown), 5.10 (Interpretation of

“The Downtown”), and 9.7.3.1 (Parking in the Downtown), as depicted in appendix A.

With the adoption of Strategic Development Areas in the City’s Official Plan for the purposes of intensifying development and adding to the city’s housing stock, Planning staff has begun to reference SDAs in Zoning By-law 2005-150.

In addition to providing clarity, replacing “the Downtown” with “First Neighbourhoods SDA” will extend the benefits of developing in the defined downtown slightly outward to the Steelton and James Town areas. The intent is that providing these reliefs will encourage revitalization and new development in the above-noted areas.

Lastly, with the adoption of the above two proposed amendments, this will make provisions 2.9 (The Downtown), 5.10 (Interpretation of “The Downtown”), and 9.7.3.1 (Parking in the Downtown) either inconsistent with or redundant in Zoning By-law 2005-150 and should be repealed for a more concise document.

#### **Amendment 4**

*Repeal the provision on the frontage requirement for severing attached residential structures.*

The purpose of repealing provision 4.14.10 of Zoning By-law 2005-150 is its redundancy and its conflict with other similar provisions of the by-law. Currently, section 4.14.10 requires all semi-attached and multiple-attached dwelling units proposed for severance to have a minimum of 8 meters of frontage, plus any required side-yard setbacks.

Repealing provision 4.14.10 will remove these frontage requirements for multiple attached dwellings located in the R2, R3, R4, and R5 Zones. Section 4.12.2 already ensures that the subject property’s overall frontage, lot area, and setbacks are in conformity with the Zoning By-law.

Furthermore, the proposed amendment establishes consistency and clarity throughout the Zoning By-law. Lastly, City Staff and the Committee of Adjustment have continually supported similar applications in the past. The proposed amendment will aid in the effort to streamline development approvals.

#### **Amendment 5**

*Relocate the Site Plan Control clause for dwelling units.*

This amendment will remove residential developments containing 11 or more dwelling units from site plan control within the permitted uses sections of the Zoning By-law, where applicable. A general Site Plan Control clause is then proposed to be added to Section 4: General Provisions for All Zones for residential

developments containing 11 or more dwelling units. Essentially, the proposed amendment will have a single provision rather than being in multiple section throughout Zoning By-law 2005-150. This establishes a more concise and consistent document, reducing the opportunity for mistakes when future amendments are proposed and adopted.

### **Amendment 8**

*Require snow guards on steep or metal roofs near lot lines.*

This amendment adds a new subsection (4.14.14) under the “Additional Regulations for All Zones” to require snow guards on buildings/structures with metal roofs, or roofs with a 10/12 (or greater) slope, where the roof slope faces a property boundary, and the building is within 1.0 m of that boundary. The intent is to address a recurring winter condition issues of snow and ice shedding, where buildings or structures are situated close to lot lines.

Introducing a clear requirement improves predictability for applicants and supports consistent staff review by establishing a measurable standard that can be considered early in the building design process. The amendment is consistent with the housekeeping objective of improving implementation and reducing avoidable disputes or safety concerns, while maintaining the broader land-use permissions and built-form intent of the applicable zones.

### **Amendment 9**

*Amend parking requirements in Strategic Development Areas to reflect the intended reduced rates.*

This amendment corrects and clarifies minimum parking rates within Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) to better reflect the City’s intended reduced parking approach in these areas.

The purpose is to address errors and improve internal consistency in the minimum parking requirement table so that requirements align with the planning intent for SDAs, where a more compact, walkable development pattern and proximity to services and transit can support reduced parking demand. Clear, accurate parking standards assist applicants, reduce interpretive issues, and support the City’s broader land use and transportation objectives.

Please see Appendix B for the complete table of the minimum parking requirements for all permitted uses (Section 5.7).

### **Amendment 10**

*Permit R2 building regulations for accessory structures on undersized rural lots.*

This is a proposed amendment to provision 8.2.2 (c) which will permit Gentle Density Residential (R2) Zone Building Regulations to be applied to buildings and structures on certain undersized Rural residential lots. It will provide regulatory flexibility for established properties that do not meet current minimum lot standards. The intent is to support reasonable residential uses on existing lots while maintaining appropriate built-form controls.

This technical amendment improves consistency throughout the Zoning By-law and provides regulatory flexibility. It reduces the likelihood of minor variance applications for routine accessory structures and streamlines development approvals. Furthermore, the proposed amendment maintains the overall rural residential character and intent of the applicable zones.

### **Amendment 11**

*Remove duplicate clause.*

Section 9.3 (Parking Regulation in all Residential Zones) states, “Every residentially zoned lot shall provide the required parking space(s) as set out in Section 5.7. Such required parking shall not be located within any required front and exterior side yard.” This wording is redundant, as section 5.3 (Location of Parking Spaces) specifically describes where parking spaces may be located within each zone, including residential zones. Furthermore, section 5.7 (Minimum Parking Requirements for All Permitted Uses) states and displays required parking minimums.

### **Amendment 12**

*Permit accessory buildings and structures in interior side yards.*

The proposed amendment reads the same as the current one, except for adding a permission for accessory buildings and structures to be located in an interior side yard. Permitting accessory buildings and structures in the interior side yard is minor in nature, within the general intent of the provision. It will also aid in reducing the number of Minor Variance applications going before the Committee of Adjustment.

### **Amendment 13**

*Increase permitted office use gross floor (GFA) area outside of the First Neighbourhoods SDA.*

The 2022 Draft Official Plan proposes increasing the maximum size of office space outside the downtown from 300 m<sup>2</sup> to 700 m<sup>2</sup>. This allows a broader range of office types and sizes to be located outside the downtown core, to address vacancies in other commercial areas, support the adaptive reuse of vacant commercial buildings, and promote greater access to services. The proposed increase in the maximum GFA is consistent with the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation’s (MPAC) definition of “minor’ office space.

The current definition of major office space (300 m<sup>2</sup>) restricts relatively smaller office spaces, such as medical offices or similar uses that should be spread throughout the community to provide ease of access. Furthermore, the 2016 Downtown Strategy places greater emphasis on making downtown a more complete neighbourhood, with additional residential, cultural and recreational development.

#### **Amendment 14**

*Permit lot-line to lot-line Development for select properties in the C1 Zone with frontage on Gore Street, Wellington Street East, and Korah Road.*

This amendment adds a new subsection (13.1.3.2) to the Traditional Commercial (C1) Zone to provide alternative building regulations for specific C1 Zone properties with frontage on Gore Street, Wellington Street East, and Korah Road.

The amendment enables a more urban, corridor-appropriate built form, such as reduced front and exterior side yard setbacks, while maintaining clear transition controls where development abuts Residential Zones through defined setbacks and a maximum height requirements.

This amendment improves the usability of certain properties in the C1 Zone by identifying street segments where the established built form is already consistent with the proposed amendment. Also, where parcel fabric is narrow and current setbacks are too restrictive for new development.

By introducing explicit, mapped street limits and a clear table of performance standards, the amendment supports consistent interpretation, reduces reliance on site-specific relief for normal built form. Furthermore, it continues to manage land use compatibility with nearby residential uses.

#### **Amendment 15 – 293 Bay Street**

*Rezone to remove Special Exception S-89 (Station Mall Expansion)*

This is a site-specific amendment to repeal special exception 89 (S-89) from the lands having civic address 289 Bay Street (Station Mall). It was passed by City Council in 1985 for the phase 3 development of the Station Mall. The special exception limits the mall's gross leasable area to a maximum of 9300 m<sup>2</sup>, including residential uses, thereby limiting the site's future development potential, located in an area – First Neighbourhoods SDA – that is actively encouraging intensification through residential and commercial uses. Repealing S-89 enables growth for a prominent downtown property/area.

**Amendment 16 – 15, 29, 30 Bay Street West & 261 Queen Street West  
(Gateway Site)**

*Amend Special Exception S-153 by repealing Special Provision No. 1 (Retail Trade as an Accessory Use Only).*

Provision Number 1 of the special exception (S-153) pertaining to the subject properties states that retail trade is only permitted as an accessory use. The proposed amendment is to repeal provision 1 of special exception 153 to allow retail trade as a primary use as permitted in the underlying C3 Zoning. The subject property is located within the defined Downtown and First Neighbourhoods SDA, both of which encourage a range of mixed-use development opportunities to enable complete communities.

**CONSULTATION**

Public notices for the site-specific special exception amendments (S-89 & S-153) were mailed to all neighbouring properties within 120m (400') of the subject property on Friday, February 27, 2026. The notices that were mailed to property owners are attached to this report.

The notices for all proposed housekeeping amendments were advertised on the City website on Friday, February 27, 2026, and in the Sault Star Newspaper on Saturday, February 28, 2026.

**Public Comments**

At the time of drafting this report, no public comments were received by Planning Staff.

**Application Circulation**

As part of the application review, this proposal was circulated to City divisions and external agencies for detailed technical review and comment. At the time of drafting this report, no city departments and/or external agencies had any comments or concerns with the list of proposed housekeeping amendments.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Approval of this application will not result in any incremental changes to municipal finances.

**STRATEGIC PLAN / POLICY / CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACT**

Housekeeping amendments keep the Zoning By-law relevant and streamlined, ensuring ease in the development approvals process. This complements the service delivery focus area of the strategic plan. The proposed amendments are minor in nature and therefore have no direct climate change impact.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is therefore recommended that Council take the following action:

Housekeeping Amendments – Phase II

March 23, 2026

Page 9.

Resolved that the report of the Junior Planner dated March 23, 2026 concerning City-initiated *Planning Act* application A-4-26-Z Housekeeping Amendments – Phase II be received and that Council approve the housekeeping amendments listed in appendices “A” and “B”.

And that the Legal Department be requested to prepare the necessary by-law(s) to effect the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicholas Cicchini, MURP

Junior Planner

705.759.5375

[n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca](mailto:n.cicchini@cityssm.on.ca)