

**Ontario Land Tribunal**  
Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement  
du territoire



**ISSUE DATE:** April 30, 2026

**CASE NO(S).:**

OLT-25-000843

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 34(19) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: 2593000 Ontario Ltd.  
Appellant: Campo Ridge Home Corp.  
Appellant: First Baymac Developments Ltd and Canadian Property Holdings (Ontario) Inc.  
Appellant: Golden Ambra Highrise Inc. and others  
Subject: Zoning By-law  
Description: Comprehensive Zoning By-law of the City of Richmond Hill  
Reference Number: MZBA-25-0001 By-law 93-25  
Property Address: 13723 Yonge Street  
Municipality/UT: Richmond Hill/  
OLT Case No.: OLT-25-000843  
OLT Lead Case No.: OLT-25-000843  
OLT Case Name: 2593000 Ontario Ltd. v. Richmond Hill (City)

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 34(19) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Subject: Zoning By-law  
Description: Comprehensive Zoning By-law of the City of Richmond Hill  
Reference Number: MZBA-23-0001  
Property Address: Various Addresses (30 Beech Avenue; 211, 223, 235, 251, 273, 291, 305 Jefferson Sideroad; 196, 210, 226, 234, 246, 260, 276, 288 and 307 Harris Avenue)  
Municipality/UT: Richmond Hill/York

OLT Case No.: OLT-25-000340  
OLT Lead Case No.: OLT-25-000843  
OLT Case Name: 2593000 Ontario Ltd. v. Richmond Hill (City)

**Heard:** April 16, 2026 by Video Hearing

**APPEARANCES:**

**Parties**

See Attachment 1

**Counsel/Representative\***

See Attachment 1

**MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION DELIVERED BY S. BRAUN AND C. HARDY  
ON APRIL 16, 2026 AND ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

[1] This was the first Case Management Conference (“CMC”) held for Tribunal file No. OLT-25-000340, concerning appeals against the adoption of By-law No. 30-25 (“30-25”) by the City of Richmond Hill (“City”), and the first CMC for Tribunal file No. OLT-25-000843, concerning appeals against the City’s adoption of By-law No. 93-25 (“93-25”).

[2] The Tribunal received an Affidavit of Service, dated February 20, 2026, confirming that Notice of both CMCs was properly given, which was marked as Exhibit 1. No issues were raised with respect to the sufficiency of notice in relation to either matter. Accordingly, no further notice is required.

[3] The Tribunal received no written requests for status in either appeal in advance of the CMC and no individuals/entities appeared at the CMC seeking status of any kind.

## **BACKGROUND**

[4] Counsel for the City, Mr. Kehar, provided the Tribunal with a detailed overview of the matters currently before it. He explained that 30-25, which was intended to be a comprehensive zoning by-law applying to most of the City, was passed on March 26, 2025. Subsequently, in the process of dealing with appeals thereof, it was discovered that certain individuals/entities entitled to receive notice of the passing of 30-25 did not receive such notice. The City was concerned that the appeal rights of those individuals/entities could be adversely affected given the strict timelines for the submission of appeals set out in the *Planning Act*. Therefore, the City sought to repeal 30-25 and replace it with 93-25.

[5] On September 24, 2025, the City adopted 93-25, which largely mirrors and expands upon 30-25. Mr. Kehar explained that the repeal of 30-25 is operationalized by both the passing of 93-25 and the direction given at City Council's September 24, 2025, meeting. Mr. Kehar took the Tribunal to 93-25 and drew attention to s. 1.14 thereof, titled Repeal and Replacement of Former Zoning By-laws, noting that 30-25 is among those listed. He also took the Tribunal to the minutes of the September 24, 2025 meeting of City Council, at which 93-25 was adopted, drawing attention to the following excerpt containing City Council's direction with respect to the repeal of 30-25:

- ii. that upon the enactment of Comprehensive Zoning By-law 93-25, Council repeal By-law 30-25 and direct the City Solicitor, or his designate, to take any and all steps necessary before the Ontario Land Tribunal to effect the repeal of By-law 30-25.

## **REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION OF REPEAL OF BY-LAW NO. 30-25 AND REFUNDS OF APPEAL FEES**

[6] Mr. Kehar requested that the Tribunal confirm the repeal of 30-25 and direct the assigned Case Coordinator to close Tribunal file No. OLT-25-000340. He submitted that, in light of the passage of 93-25, there is no need to proceed with any adjudication of appeals of 30-25, which are now moot.

[7] The Tribunal notes that most of the individuals/entities with outstanding concerns with provisions in 30-25 have appealed the adoption of 93-25. With respect to the remaining few who did not, Mr. Kehar advised that the City engaged in discussions with the appellants of 30-25 prior to 93-25 being considered by City Council and as such, he felt confident that any outstanding concerns had been resolved through those discussions. The Tribunal further notes that, despite receiving proper notice of today's hearing event, none of those individuals/entities appeared, nor did they communicate with the assigned Case Coordinator in advance of this CMC.

[8] In light of the foregoing, combined with the direction of City Council, as reflected in its September 24, 2025 Meeting Minutes, and the adoption of 93-25, the Tribunal is satisfied that the appeals of 30-25 no longer require determination. The assigned Case Coordinator is directed to proceed with the closure of Tribunal file No. OLT-25-000340.

[9] As several of the Appellants to 30-25 also appealed 93-25, the Tribunal was asked about the process by which those Appellants could seek a refund of what would essentially be duplicative appeal fees paid to the Tribunal. The Parties were advised that the decision to refund appeal fees is administrative rather than adjudicative in nature. Once the Parties receive written confirmation of the closure of Tribunal file No. OLT-25-000340, they may submit a written request to the assigned Case Coordinator, who will forward the request to the Tribunal Registrar for consideration.

## **NEXT STEPS**

### **Second Case Management Conference**

[10] At the request of the Parties, the Tribunal scheduled a second CMC to proceed by video on **Wednesday, June 10, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.** ("June CMC"). At the June CMC, the City anticipates requesting an Order confirming that the unappealed portions of 93-25 are in force and effect by operation of law, pursuant to ss. 34(31) and 34(32) of the *Planning Act*. The City further anticipates providing the Tribunal updates, including further detail on the scope of the various appeals of 93-25.

[11] The City is directed to submit to the assigned Case Coordinator, no later than one week in advance of the June CMC, an updated Appeals Matrix with the Scope of Appeal column populated, as well as a suggested agenda for the June CMC. Any Parties who may seek to set hearing dates for contested appeals at the June CMC are directed to ensure a draft Procedural Order and detailed Issues List are submitted to the assigned Case Coordinator no later than one week in advance thereof.

[12] Parties are asked to log into the video hearing at least 15 minutes before the start of the event to test their video and audio connections:

**GoTo Meeting:** <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/909787981>

**Access code:** 909-787-981

[13] Parties are asked to access and set up the application well in advance of the event to avoid unnecessary delay. The desktop application can be downloaded at [GoTo Meeting](#) or a web application is available: <https://app.gotomeeting.com/home.html>

[14] Persons who experience technical difficulties accessing the GoTo Meeting application or who only wish to listen to the event can connect to it by calling in to an audio-only telephone line: **+1-647-497-9391 or (toll-free) +1-888-455-1389**. The access code is: **909-787-981**.

[15] Individuals are directed to connect to the event on the assigned date at the correct time. It is the responsibility of the persons participating in the event to ensure that they are properly connected at the correct time. Questions prior to the event may be directed to the Tribunal's Case Coordinator.

[16] As of March 30, 2026, all hearing events are governed by the Tribunal's [Artificial Intelligence Practice Direction](#). This Practice Direction requires a party, participant, or witness to include a declaration within each submitted document if generative AI was used to create or generate content.

### **Anticipated Settlements**

[17] Mr. Kehar advised that the City anticipates ongoing discussions with the Parties could result in agreements to settle some of the appeals. For the sake of efficiency, he requested that any uncontested settlements to be presented for the Tribunal's approval be heard by way of written motion. He confirmed that the Parties would not seek to have any contested settlements heard in writing.

[18] The Tribunal finds the suggested approach to be efficient and cost effective and accordingly, directs that any uncontested settlement motions be heard in writing and that materials for same be submitted in accordance with the Rules.

[19] With respect to opportunities for settlement, the Parties confirmed their awareness of the availability of Tribunal-assisted mediation and the process to request a mediation assessment should they wish to avail themselves of this resource in the future.

### **Anticipated Motions to Coordinate By-law No. 93-25 Appeals With Existing Site-Specific Zoning Appeals**

[20] Finally, Mr. Kehar advised that some of the Appellants to 93-25 also have site-specific zoning appeals before the Tribunal, at least one of which is already scheduled for a hearing in the coming months. He further advised that, in those circumstances, the Parties may seek to have the applicable appeals of 93-25 consolidated with the existing site-specific zoning appeals by way of written motions. The Tribunal finds the suggested approach to be efficient and accordingly directs such motions be heard in writing. The Tribunal further directed Mr. Kehar to file an updated Appeals Matrix, which includes a

column indicating Appellants with existing site-specific zoning appeal matters currently before the Tribunal.

[21] Ms. Barrett, counsel for Norfolk Development Inc. (“Norfolk”), advised that her client’s site-specific zoning appeal is scheduled to be heard in mid-late July 2026 and further advised that the deliverable deadline for the exchange of witness statements, as specified in the Procedural Order governing those proceedings, is May 29, 2026.

[22] The Tribunal expressed concern with the quickly approaching hearing and the date for the exchange of witness statements, urging the Parties to determine whether consolidation was preferred, and if so, to request a date for a written motion and submit materials as soon as practicable to ensure the preservation of all hearing dates and deliverable deadlines.

[23] While the other counsel present advised that none of their clients are in similar circumstances to Norfolk, the Tribunal notes that some counsel appeared as agents for others, and as such, they were unable to speak to the status of appeals for clients they do not represent.

[24] Should there be any Parties with existing site-specific zoning appeals already scheduled for a hearing, they are also urged to make consolidation determinations and, if required, request a date for a written motion and submit materials as soon as practicable to ensure preservation of all hearing dates and deliverable deadlines.

## **ORDER**

[25] The Tribunal confirms the repeal of City of Richmond Hill By-law No. 30-25 and hereby dismisses all appeals thereof, having found them to be moot. The assigned Case Coordinator shall proceed with the closure of Tribunal file No. OLT-25-000340 upon the issuance of this Decision and Order.

[26] The remainder of the case management directives above are so ordered.

[27] The Panel is not seized but may be available for further case management, should the Tribunal's calendar permit.

*"S. Braun"*

S. BRAUN  
VICE-CHAIR

*"C. Hardy"*

C. HARDY  
VICE-CHAIR

### **Ontario Land Tribunal**

Website: [www.olt.gov.on.ca](http://www.olt.gov.on.ca) Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

The Conservation Review Board, the Environmental Review Tribunal, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and the Mining and Lands Tribunal are amalgamated and continued as the Ontario Land Tribunal ("Tribunal"). Any reference to the preceding tribunals or the former Ontario Municipal Board is deemed to be a reference to the Tribunal.

## ATTACHMENT 1

Counsel/Representative*	Party
R. Kehar C. Conroy C. Thorne	City of Richmond Hill
J. Park (agent for I. Kagan, <i>in absentia</i> )	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Campo Ridge Home Corp.</li> <li>2. Golden Ambra Highrise Inc.</li> <li>3. Leslie Elgin Developments Inc.</li> <li>4. Parioli Peak Estates Inc.</li> </ol>
J. Park	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First Baymac Developments Limited and Canadian Property Holdings (Ontario) Inc.</li> <li>2. Lakeview Modern Residences Inc. and 2753502 Ontario Inc.</li> <li>3. Whitehorn Investments Ltd., Stephen Mitchell Realty Ltd., 891566 Ontario Limited and Ledbrow Investments Ltd.</li> </ol>
J. Streisfield	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. J-G Cordone Investments Limited</li> <li>2. North Elgin Centre Inc.</li> <li>3. Robert Salna</li> </ol>
J. Park (agent for P. DeMelo <i>in absentia</i> )	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sabella Ridges Estates Inc.</li> <li>2. Streamgrove Developments Inc.</li> <li>3. Worthington Ridge Developments Inc.</li> </ol>
N. Pileggi*	One Cynthia Inc.
J. Reyes (agent for C. Tanzola, <i>in absentia</i> )	2593000 Ontario Ltd.

I. Andres (agent for D. Bronskill, <i>in absentia</i> )	White Owl Properties Limited
M. Barrett (agent for E. Costello, <i>in absentia</i> )	CD Capital Partners Ltd. and 2705785 Ontario Limited (Dilawri Group of Companies)
I. Andres	Baif Developments Limited
J. Reyes	9712 Yonge Street General Partner Inc. and 9712 Yonge Street Limited Partnership
M. DiVona	Yonge and Bloomington Ltd.
J. Reyes (agent for R. Barron, <i>in absentia</i> )	Laurier Homes (Richmond Hill) Inc.
M. Barrett S. Tomasella ( <i>in absentia</i> )	Norfolk Development Inc.