

City of Mississauga

Memorandum:

City Department and Agency Comments

Date Finalized: 2025-04-24	File(s): A100.25
To: Committee of Adjustment	
From: Committee of Adjustment Coordinator	Meeting date:5/1/2025 1:00:00 PM

Consolidated Recommendation

The City has no objections to the application. The Applicant may wish to defer the application to ensure that all required variances have been accurately identified.

Application Details

The applicant requests the Committee to approve a minor variance to allow an accessory structure proposing:

1. A side yard setback for an accessory structure of 0.05m (approx. 0.16ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, requires a minimum side yard setback for an accessory structure of 0.61m (approx. 2.00ft) in this instance; and
2. An accessory structure height of 3.23m (approx. 10.60ft) whereas By-law 0225-2007, as amended, permits a maximum accessory structure height of 3.00m (approx. 9.84ft) in this instance.

Background

Property Address: 2616 Cynara Rd

Mississauga Official Plan

Character Area: Cooksville Neighbourhood (West)

Designation: Residential Low Density II

Zoning By-law 0225-2007

Zoning: R3-Residential

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 Low Density II. Section 9 of the Mississauga Official Plan (MOP) promotes development (including its features such as driveways and landscaping) with appropriate urban form and site design, regulating that such development is compatible with the existing conditions, the surrounding context and the landscape of the character area. The structure is compatible with the surrounding area and does not pose any significant impact to the abutting properties. 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 requests relief from the side yard setbacks for the existing pergola. The general intent of this portion of the by-law is to ensure that an adequate buffer exists between the massing of the structures on adjoining properties, that maintenance can be performed on the structures and that appropriate drainage patterns can be maintained. With the proposed structure being open on all four sides, staff are of the opinion that there is a sufficient setback that will allow for the ability to perform any required maintenance on the structure or provide appropriate drainage patterns. Further, staff note Transportation and Works staff have not raised any drainage related concerns and have confirmed that any drainage from the rear yard can be adequately directed to the front of the property.

Variance 2 relates to an existing shed height. The intent of the height provision is to ensure that the structure is proportional to the lot and dwelling and are clearly accessory, while not presenting any massing concerns to the neighbouring lots. Staff note that the proposed height represents a minor deviation from what is currently permitted as of right in the zoning by-law and does not create any significant massing concerns to abutting properties. Staff note that the required side yard setbacks are being met for this structure and that the shed has a sloped roof design further limiting massing impacts.

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?

Staff are of the opinion that the proposed accessory structures does not have any significant impacts on neighbouring properties and represent appropriate development of the subject lands. As such, the variances are minor in nature and result in orderly development of the subject property.

Comments Prepared by: Sara Ukaj, Planning Associate

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Transportation and Works Comments

Attached for Committee's easy reference is a number of photos, specifically the accessory structure and deck on 2616 Cynara Road. We have reviewed our records and note that area grading Plan No: C-14830 prepared by R.E. Winter & Associates Ltd (Nov 1975) depicts the approved grading for this subdivision. As drainage from the subject lands was designed to drain in a southerly direction to a catch basin located at the south-west corner of 2610 Cynara Road we therefore advise we have no objection from a grading perspective.

The owner of the abutting property, 2610 Cynara Road has submitted a 94-page pdf titled "A100.25. Com.Res1.0" which also includes a survey plan on page 72 prepared by AKM Surveying Ltd dated August 2, 2024. The survey plan depicts a 10 ft storm easement, part 2A Plan 43R-4285 (LT 87534) located between 2610 and 2606 Cynara Drive where a shed and concrete pad appear to be encroaching into the easement. The 10ft storm easement is also depicted on Plan C-14835 and the neighbour should be advised that the shed and concrete pad should be removed from the city storm sewer easement.







Comments Prepared by: Tony Iacobucci, Development Engineering

Appendix 2 – Zoning Comments

In the absence of a Development application, we are unable to confirm the accuracy of the information provided, or determine whether additional variance(s) may be required. It should be noted that a zoning review has NOT been completed. The applicant is advised that should they choose to proceed without zoning verification, a full zoning review may result in further variances being required in the future.

For scope of work that does not require Site Plan Approval/Building Permit/Zoning Certificate of Occupancy Permit, the applicant may consider applying for a Preliminary Zoning Review application. A detailed site plan drawing and architectural plans are required for a detailed zoning review to be completed. A minimum of 6-8 weeks is required depending on the complexity of the proposal and the quality of information submitted.

Comments Prepared by: Carrie Chan Patch, Zoning Examiner

Appendix 3 – Region of Peel Comments

We have no comments or objections.

Comments Prepared by: Petrele Francois, Junior Planner