

City of Mississauga Department Comments

Date Finalized: 2023-04-12	File(s): A56.23
To: Committee of Adjustment	Ward: 3
From: Committee of Adjustment Coordinator	Meeting date:2023-04-20 1:00:00 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 existing cabana proposing:

1. An accessory structure area of 37.58sq m (approx. 404.51sq ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum accessory structure area of 10.00sq m (approx. 107.64sq. ft) in this instance;
2. A combined accessory structure area of 37.58sq m (approx. 404.51sq ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum combined accessory structure area of 30.00sq m (approx. 322.92sq ft) in this instance; and,
3. A lot coverage of 37.7% whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum lot coverage of 35% in this instance.

Background

Property Address: 3619 Autumn Harvest Dr

Mississauga Official Plan

Character Area: Applewood Neighbourhood
Designation: Residential Low Density I

Zoning By-law 0225-2007

Zoning: R3- Residential

Other Applications: BP 9NEW 22-4443

Site and Area Context

The subject property is located south-east of the Burnhamthorpe Road East and Tomken Road intersection in the Applewood neighbourhood. It currently contains a single-storey detached dwelling with an attached garage. Limited landscaping and vegetative elements are present in both the front and rear yards. The property has a lot area of +/- 646.49m² (ft²), characteristic of other detached dwellings in the area. The surrounding context is predominantly residential, consisting of detached dwellings on similarly sized lots. Semi-detached dwellings are present in the larger area context.

The applicant is seeking to legalize the existing accessory structure requiring variances for floor area, combined floor area, and lot coverage.



City Department and Agency Comments	File:A56.23	2023/04/12	3
-------------------------------------	-------------	------------	---

such development is compatible with: the existing site conditions, the surrounding context and the landscape of the character area.

While staff acknowledge that the structure is open on all 4 sides and does not require height or setback variances, which limits the impacts of the massing, Planning staff remain of the opinion that the structure is oversized for the lot given that the single structure requires a variance from the combined floor area provision for accessory structures.

Given the above Planning staff are of the opinion that the proposal is not minor in nature and does not maintain the general intent of the zoning by-law. Staff therefore recommend that the application be deferred in order to allow the applicant to reduce the size of the structure.

Comments Prepared by: Alexander Davies, Committee of Adjustment Planner

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Transportation and Works Comments

We note that the Transportation and Works Department has no objections to the accessory structure as it does not impact or alter the existing grading and drainage pattern for this property. From our site inspection we note that the drainage from the structure is directed towards the rear into the mature cedar hedge (on the applicant's property) and then directed towards the front of the property within the gravel drainage swale. We also observed that the property to the rear is at a higher elevation so there should be no drainage impact to the property at the rear.







Comments Prepared by: Tony Iacobucci, Development Engineering Technologist

Appendix 2 – Zoning Comments

The Building Department is currently processing a Building Permit under file BP 9NEW 22-4443. 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

City Department and Agency Comments	File:A56.23	2023/04/12	7
-------------------------------------	-------------	------------	---

Appendix 3 – Region of Peel Comments

We have no comments or objections.

Comments Prepared by: Patrycia Menko, Junior Planner