

City of Mississauga Department Comments

Date Finalized: 2022-01-19	File(s): A41.22 Ward 11
To: Committee of Adjustment	
From: Committee of Adjustment Coordinator	Meeting date:2022-01-27 3:00:00 PM

Consolidated Recommendation

The City recommends that the application be deferred.

Application Details

The applicant requests the Committee to approve a minor variance to allow the construction of a new apartment building proposing:

1. A total of 8 parking spaces whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, requires a minimum of 52 resident spaces and 10 visitor spaces in this instance;
2. A driveway aisle width of 5.99m (approx. 19.65ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, requires a minimum driveway aisle width of 7.00m (approx. 22.97ft) in this instance;
3. A front yard setback of 5.23m (approx. 17.16ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum front yard setback of 3.00m (approx. 9.84ft) in this instance;
4. An exterior side yard setback of 4.71m (approx. 15.45ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, requires a maximum exterior side yard setback of 3.00m (approx. 9.84ft) in this instance; and,
5. A landscaped buffer of 0.0m between a Commercial Zone property and a Residential Zone property whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, requires a minimum landscaped buffer of 4.5m (approx. 14.76ft) between a Commercial Zone property and a Residential Zone property in this instance.

Background

Property Address: 25 Thomas Street

Mississauga Official Plan

Character Area: Streetsville Community Node
Designation: Mixed Use

Zoning By-law 0225-2007**Zoning: C4-32 - Commercial****Other Applications:** SP 21-181**Site and Area Context**

The subject property is located on the south-east corner of the Thomas Street and Victoria Street intersection in Streetsville. Currently each address contains a detached residential structure and mature vegetation. The combined property has a lot area of +/- 1,686m² (18,150ft²). The surrounding area context includes a mix of residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial properties with varying built forms and lot sizes.

The applicant is proposing a 3 storey residential structure requiring variances for parking, driveway aisle width, setbacks, and landscape buffer.

**Comments****Planning**

Section 45 of the *Planning Act* provides the Committee of Adjustment with the authority to grant relief from the requirements of a municipal zoning by-law. Approval of applications must meet the requirements set out under 45(1) and/or 45(2) (a) or (b) in the *Planning Act*.

Staff comments concerning the application of the four tests to this minor variance request are as follows:

The subject property is located in the Streetsville Community Node Character Area and is designated Mixed Use in Schedule 10 of the Mississauga Official Plan (MOP). This designation permits detached, semi-detached, duplex and triplex dwellings, as well as other low-rise dwellings with individual frontages. Section 9 of MOP promotes development with appropriate urban form and site design, regulating that such development is compatible with the existing site conditions, the surrounding context, and the landscape of the character area. It directs the City's growth to certain areas, including Community Nodes such as Streetsville. Furthermore Section 14 of MOP encourages a compact built form of 2 to 3 storeys in height with parking areas to be located in the rear when possible within the Streetsville Community Node. Staff are satisfied that the application maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan.

Variance 1 requests a reduction in the required parking for the subject property. CPS staff have reviewed the variance request and note as follows:

The applicant submitted a Parking Justification Report, prepared by Indwell Community Homes, dated December 10, 2021, in support of the submitted application.

The proposed development will create 52 affordable rental housing units (41 studio and 11 accessible studio units) with enhanced programs and supports to house people experiencing mental health issues, chronic disease and histories of homelessness or housing instability.

The Parking Justification Report explains that Indwell owns and manages other similar developments across the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), including similar tenant demographics, rent levels, number of building support staff and uses. Tenants are anticipated to be single-person households, all of who live on a very low income due to disability, precarious living circumstances or other forms of marginalization.

Indwell Community Homes acknowledges the significant extent of the requested parking reduction, however based on proxy site examples a total of 8 proposed parking spaces (3 residential and 5 visitor spaces) would be sufficient on the subject property, given the deeply supportive housing model and program. The Parking Justification Report presents car ownership data and effective parking demand rate for five proxy sites at Woodfield Gate, Parkdale Landing, Strathearne Suites, Blossom Park and Wentworth. These proxy sites are the most comparable with a similar level of social supports/services as the proposed development and the applicant emphasizes the importance of program design over geographic location when assessing parking demand and supply.

Based on car ownership data from the five proxy sites, a maximum number of 3 residential vehicles was reported, with a peak demand rate of 0.07 spaces per dwelling unit.

The Parking Justification Report explains that the vast majority of tenants cannot afford to own a vehicle due to limited income and range of socioeconomic challenges, which directly impacts the extremely low residential parking demand.

Tenants heavily rely on public transit, cycling and walking for daily needs and the applicant favoured the property's location in Streetsville with a robust pedestrian network and convenient access to public transit and the Streetsville GO Station.

Given the tenant demographics, most of them have severed relationships with families/friends and as a result, there are rarely any visitors for the tenants. The visitor parking will be mainly used by support workers coming for an apartment visit. The Parking Justification Report explains that the support program and model will have a maximum of five staff at any given time onsite and the staggered nature of the program staff prevents a visitor peak demand.

The applicant will also provide secure, long-term bike parking for up to 52 bicycles (one for every unit), in addition to short-term outdoor spaces for up to 5 bicycles.

Staff are generally supportive of affordable housing however staff have concerns with the Parking Justification Report and are seeking additional justification in the form of proxy site survey data to justify the residential and, in particular, the visitor parking component.

Variance 2 requests a reduction in the drive aisle width. The Transportation and Works Department has raised concerns regarding the proposed reduction and its impacts on circulation and maneuverability within the site.

Variances 3 & 4 request increased front and exterior side yard setbacks. The intent of these regulations is to create a streetscape with buildings located close to the street and maintain the character of the Streetsville area. The proposed front yard setback represents an existing condition which is to remain. While the proposed exterior side yard setback would represent an increase from the existing façade of the Victoria Street property staff are of the opinion that the proposal has been appropriately designed to maintain the Streetsville character, while respecting the constraints of the subject property.

Variance 5 requests a reduced landscape buffer between the subject property's proposed parking area and the abutting property to the south. The intent of this portion of the by-law is to ensure that an appropriate buffer exists abutting all lot lines. Staff note that the constraints of the site require the proposed parking to be located where it is, and that the eliminated buffer abuts a parking lot on the neighbouring property. Staff are satisfied that, in this instance, the reduced buffer will not create any negative impacts.

Given the above staff have no objections to variances 3, 4 & 5, however CPS and Transportation & Works staff have raised concerns regarding variances 1 & 2. Staff therefore recommend that the application be deferred.

Comments Prepared by: Alexander Davies, Committee of Adjustment Planner

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Transportation and Works Comments

We are noting for Committee's information that any Transportation and Works Department concerns/requirements for the proposed new apartment building are being addressed through the Site Plan Application process, File SP-21/181. We also note; however, that through the Site Plan review, a few concerns have been raised surrounding the functionality of the internal driveway aisle and driveway entrance width as well as significant reduction in parking. Through our comments, we have requested additional information and justification. Until this additional justification is provided, we would recommend the minor variance application **be deferred**.







Comments Prepared by: Tony Iacobucci, Development Engineering Technologist

Appendix 2 – Zoning Comments

The Building Department is currently processing a Site Plan Approval application under file SP 21-181. Based on review of the information currently available in this application, we advise that more information is required in order to verify the accuracy of the requested variance(s) or determine whether additional variance(s) will be required.

Please note that comments reflect those provided through the above application and should there be any changes contained within this Committee of Adjustment application that have not been identified and submitted through the application file noted above, these comments may no longer be valid. Any changes and/or updates to information and/or drawings must be submitted, as per standard resubmission procedures, separately through the application process in order to receive updated comments.

Comments Prepared by: Richard Thompson, Zoning Examiner