

City of Mississauga Department Comments

Date Finalized: 2022-08-10	File(s): A168.22 Ward: 11
To: Committee of Adjustment	
From: Committee of Adjustment Coordinator	Meeting date:2022-08-18 3:00:00 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 gross floor area of 408.36sq.m (approx. 4,395.55sq.ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum gross floor area of 346.47sq.m (approx. 3,729.37ft) in this instance;
2. An eaves height of 6.53m (approx. 21.42ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum eaves height of 6.40m (approx. 21.00ft) in this instance; and,
3. A roof ridge height of 9.65m (approx. 31.66ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum roof ridge height of 9.0m (approx. 29.53ft) in this instance.

Background

Property Address: 260 Hillside Dr

Mississauga Official Plan

Character Area: Streetsville Neighbourhood
Designation: Residential Low Density I

Zoning By-law 0225-2007

Zoning: R3-69 - Residential

Other Applications: PREAPP 21-10041

Site and Area Context

The subject property is located south-east of the Thomas Street and McFarren Boulevard intersection in the Streetsville neighbourhood. It currently contains a detached dwelling with a lot frontage of +/- 17.9m (58.7ft) and a lot area of +/- 981.23m² (10,562ft²). There are limited landscaping and vegetation elements in both the front and rear yards. The surrounding area context is exclusively residential, consisting of a mix of detached, semi-detached, and townhouse dwellings.

The applicant is proposing to construct a new detached dwelling requiring variances for gross floor area, eave height, and overall height.



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 Streetsville Neighbourhood Character Area and is designated Residential Low Density I in Schedule 10 of the Mississauga Official Plan (MOP). This designation permits only detached dwellings in this instance. 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. Planning staff have worked with the applicant to reduce the scale of the dwelling, which now more appropriately fits into the surrounding context. It is the opinion of staff that the revised application maintains the general intent and purpose of the official plan.

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

Variance 1 requests an increase in gross floor area. The intent in restricting gross floor area is to maintain compatibility between existing and new dwellings in order to ensure the existing and planned character of a neighbourhood is preserved. While the revised proposal represents an increase to the permissions of the by-law, staff are satisfied that the revised proposal appropriately balances the existing built form and character of the neighbourhood with the planned character envisioned by the by-law.

Variances 2 & 3 relate to the height of the structure. Variance 2 requests an increase in height to the eaves, and variance 3 is to permit an increase in height to the highest ridge. The intent of restricting height to the highest ridge and eaves is to lessen the visual massing of dwelling, while lowering the overall pitch of the roof and bringing the edge of the roof closer to the ground. This keeps the overall height of the dwelling within human scale. The subject property slopes from a higher elevation on the southern side to a lower elevation on the northern side, presenting challenges due to the Average Grade calculation methodology. The applicant has designed the dwelling with varying roof heights in order to minimize impacts and complement the change in grade on the property. When considering the grades of the property staff are satisfied that the proposed increases in height are appropriate in this instance.

Given the above it is the opinion of Planning staff 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?

Upon review of the application staff are satisfied that the proposal represents appropriate development of the subject lands. The variances, both individually and cumulatively, are minor in nature and will not create any undue impacts to adjoining properties or the planned or existing character of the area.

Comments Prepared by: Alexander Davies, Committee of Adjustment Planner

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Transportation and Works Comments

It is our understanding that the abutting neighbour (262 Hillside Drive) has expressed some concerns with regards to “What water/flood management features will be put in place”. We note that at the time of the Building Permit Review, a Grading Plan will be reviewed by our Development Construction Section which would address drainage related concerns.

We recently re-inspected the property and from our observations we noted that the existing downpipe at the rear of the dwelling is buried and then outlets in the rear yard in a relatively low area and also in close proximity to the abutting property which may be experiencing drainage concerns. Should this be the drainage concern, a simple remedy would be to relocate and extend this existing downpipe in a manner which redirects any drainage further away from the abutting property.

From the enclosed photos it is very evident that this property has a very large and sodded rear yard which can adequately accommodate drainage from the proposal, provided that the drainage is directed in the proper direction.







Comments Prepared by: Tony Iacobucci, Development Engineering Technologist

Appendix 2 – Zoning Comments

The Building Department is currently processing a Preliminary Zoning Review application under file PREAPP 21-10041. Based on review of the information currently available in this permit 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 permit 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: Alana Zheng, Zoning Examiner