

City of Mississauga Department Comments

Date Finalized: 2022-03-23	File(s): A147.22
To: Committee of Adjustment	
From: Committee of Adjustment Coordinator	Meeting date:2022-03-31 1:00:00 PM

Consolidated Recommendation

The City has no objections to the application. The applicant may wish to defer the application to ensure the accuracy of the requested variances and that additional variances are not required.

Application Details

The applicant requests the Committee to approve a minor variance to allow the construction of an addition proposing:

1. A building height of 6 storeys for Building B whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum building height of 4 storeys for Building B in compliance with Schedule RA4-15 (Map 22) in this instance;
2. A total of 104 units in Building B whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum of 98 units in Building B compliance with Schedule RA4-15 (Map 22) in this instance; and,
3. A maximum of 261 units per hectare whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum of 247 units per hectare in this instance.

Background

Property Address: 3015-3023 Parkerhill Rd

Mississauga Official Plan

Character Area: Cooksville Neighbourhood
Designation: Residential High Density

Zoning By-law 0225-2007

Zoning: R4A-15 - Residential

Other Applications: None

Site and Area Context

The subject property is located on the north-east corner of the Dundas Street West and Parkerhill Road intersection in the Cooksville neighbourhood. Currently the property contains 2 apartment buildings, one measuring 7-storeys and the other measuring 13-storeys, as well as both surface and underground parking. Limited landscaping and vegetation elements are present on the subject property. The surrounding area context consists of a mix of commercial and residential uses with a variety of built forms. Parkland is present immediately adjacent to the property.

The applicant is proposing an addition to the north side of the 7-storey building requiring variances for height, number of units, and density.



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:

Does the proposal maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan?

The subject property is located in the Cooksville Neighbourhood Character Area and is designated Residential High Density in Schedule 10 of the Mississauga Official Plan (MOP). This designation permits apartment dwellings, as well as select commercial uses at grade. 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. Staff are satisfied that the proposal is appropriate for the existing site conditions and poses no negative impacts to the surrounding context. Staff are therefore satisfied that the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan is maintained.

Does the proposal maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law?

Variances 1 & 2 seek to alter Schedule RA4-15 in the zoning by-law regarding the maximum number of units and maximum building height at the north end of building "B". Variance 3 seeks to increase the maximum number of dwelling units per hectare set out in the exception zone. The intent of these provisions are to establish an appropriate built form and density on the property, while allowing for a proper transition to a lower density residential area to the north.

Staff find that the proposed increase in height is appropriate and does not significantly impact abutting properties. It remains lower than the overall height of the remainder of the structure and continues to provide a form of transition. Furthermore it fits appropriately into the existing building and does not increase the footprint of the structure.

In regards to the increased number of units and density, staff are of the opinion that the proposal does not significantly increase the intensity of the residential use and will maintain an appropriate built form originally envisioned by the exception schedule and zone.

Given the above, staff are of the opinion that the application maintains the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

Is the proposal desirable for the appropriate development of the subject lands and minor in nature?

Planning staff are of the opinion that the proposal is minor in nature and will not create undue impacts on abutting properties. Staff are satisfied that the application represents appropriate development of the subject lands.

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 what we understand is a two storey addition to the fifth and sixth floors (total of six additional units) will be addressed through the Building Permit Process.

Comments Prepared by: Tony Iacobucci, Development Engineering Technologist

Appendix 2 – Zoning Comments

The Building Department is not in receipt of any permit applications at this time and the applicant is advised that a zoning review has not been completed. We are unable to confirm the accuracy of the requested variance(s) or determine whether additional variance(s) may be required.

We note that a Building Permit is required.

The applicant is advised that a completed zoning review may identify additional instances of zoning non-compliance. The applicant may consider applying for a preliminary zoning review application and submit working drawings for a detailed zoning review to be completed. A minimum of 6-8 weeks will be required to process a preliminary zoning review application depending on the complexity of the proposal and the detail of the information submitted.

Comments Prepared by: Brandon Eidner, Zoning Examiner