

City of Mississauga Department Comments

Date Finalized: 2022-11-23	File(s): A525.22
To: Committee of Adjustment	Ward: 2
From: Committee of Adjustment Coordinator	Meeting date:2022-12-01 1:00:00 PM

Consolidated Recommendation

The City has no objection to the variances.

Application Details

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

1. A lot coverage of 31.16% whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum lot coverage of 30% in this instance;
2. A gross floor area of 421.40sq m (approx. 4535.91sq ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum gross floor area of 385.07sq m (approx. 4144.86sq ft) in this instance; and,
3. An underside eave height of 6.96m (approx. 22.83ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum underside eave height of 6.40m (approx. 21.00ft) in this instance.

Background

Property Address: 636 Sequin Cres

Mississauga Official Plan

Character Area: Clarkson-Lorne Park Neighbourhood
Designation: Residential Low Density I

Zoning By-law 0225-2007

Zoning: R2-4 - Residential

Other Applications: Site Plan Infill application under file SPI 22-93 W2

Site and Area Context

The subject property is located in the Clarkson-Lorne Park Neighbourhood Character Area, northeast of the Indian Grove and Indian Road Truscott Drive intersection. The immediate neighbourhood primarily consists of a mix of one and two-storey detached dwellings with mature vegetation in the front yards. The subject property contains a one-storey detached dwelling with mature vegetation in the front yard.

The applicant proposes a new detached dwelling requiring variances related to lot coverage, eave height and gross floor area.



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 designated Residential Low Density I in Schedule 10 of the Mississauga Official Plan (MOP), which permits detached dwellings. New housing is encouraged to fit the scale and character of the surrounding area to ensure that new development has minimal impact on adjacent neighbours regarding overshadowing and overlook. The proposed detached dwelling respects the designated land use and has regard for the distribution of massing on the

property as a whole. The new development will not negatively impact the character streetscape. Staff is of the opinion 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?

Variance #1 pertains to lot coverage. The intent of the zoning by-law is to ensure there is not an overdevelopment of the lot. In this instance, the applicant is proposing a lot coverage of 31.16% where a maximum lot coverage of 30% is permitted. Staff note that the request represents a minor deviation from the zoning by-law's requirement. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling only represents 27% of the total lot coverage. The remaining lot coverage is attributable to covered entries and a rear patio, which results in minimal massing to the dwelling.

Variance #2 pertains to gross floor area. The intent of the zoning by-law is to maintain compatibility between existing and newer dwellings to ensure the existing and planned character of the neighbourhood is preserved. The proposed dwelling contains architectural features that break up the first and second storey, minimizing the overall massing in relation to the streetscape and neighbouring properties. The proposal is consistent with newer two-storey dwellings in the immediate area and does not pose a negative impact to the established neighbourhood character.

Variance #3 pertains to eave height. 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 will keep the dwelling within human scale. Planning staff note that no overall height variance is being requested. Staff have no concerns with the proposed eave height, as the proposed dwelling contains a variety of architectural materials and design features that visually breaks up the massing of the dwelling, such as roofline gables and a staggered façade. Furthermore, staff note a 0.96m (2.46ft) discrepancy between average grade and the grade where the dwelling sits. From the façade, the dwelling would appear 0.96m (2.46ft) shorter in height than the value of the variances. As such, the proposed dwelling maintains compatibility with the surrounding area and would not negatively impact the character streetscape.

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

Planning staff are of the opinion that the impacts created by the proposed variances are minor in nature. The proposal respects the property's designated land use and is compatible with the surrounding area context. Staff are satisfied that the proposal represents appropriate development of the subject property.

Comments Prepared by: Connor DiPietro, 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 dwelling will be addressed through the current Site Plan application SP-22/093.



Comments Prepared by: John Salvino, Development Engineering Technologist

Appendix 2 – Zoning Comments

The Building Department is currently processing a Site Plan Infill application under file SPI 22-93 W2. Based on review of the information currently available in this permit application, the variances, as requested are correct.

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: Maria Fernandez, Zoning Examiner

Appendix 3 – Region of Peel

We have no comments or objections.

Comments Prepared by: Patrycia Menko, Junior Planner