

**Ontario Municipal Board**  
Commission des affaires municipales  
de l'Ontario



**ISSUE DATE:** January 23, 2017

**CASE NO(S):** PL140905

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 17(24) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: 90 Eglinton West Limited  
Appellant: Leaside Property Owners Association  
Incorporated  
Appellant: Upper Village Investments Ltd.  
Appellant: RioCan Holdings (Sunnybrook) Inc.  
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. OPA 253  
Municipality: City of Toronto  
OMB Case No.: PL140905  
OMB File No.: PL140905  
OMB Case Name: Leaside Property Owners Association  
Incorporated v. Toronto (City)

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

Appellant: 346-350 Eglinton Avenue West Holdings Ltd.  
Appellant: 352-356 Eglinton Avenue West Holdings Ltd.  
Appellant: Leaside Property Owners Association Incorporated  
Appellant: Upper Village Investments Ltd.  
Subject: By-law No. 1030-2014  
Municipality: City of Toronto  
OMB Case No.: PL140905  
OMB File No.: PL141112

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Applicant and Appellant: RioCan Holdings (Sunnybrook) Inc.  
Subject: Application to amend the former Town of Leaside  
Zoning By-law - Neglect of the City of Toronto to  
make a decision

Existing Zoning:	Mixed Use Residential Commercial – site specific MRC-1 in the former Town of Leaside Zoning By-law and CR 1.2 (c0.4; r0.8) SS2 (x1164) under Zoning By-law 569-2013
Proposed Zoning:	Site Specific (To be determined)
Purpose:	To permit a mixed-use development
Property Address/Description:	660 Eglinton Avenue East
Municipality:	City of Toronto
Municipality File No.:	14 267342 NNY 26 OZ
OMB Case No.:	PL160085
OMB File No.:	PL160085

**Heard:** December 6, and 7, 2016 in Toronto, Ontario

## **APPEARANCES:**

### **Parties**

### **Counsel**

City of Toronto (“City”)

S. Bradley

Leaside Property Owners Association (“Leaside”)

R. Holland

## **DECISION OF THE BOARD DELIVERED BY BLAIR S. TAYLOR AND ORDER OF THE BOARD**

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

[1] The matters before the Board concern two site-specific appeals by Leaside from the City’s Official Plan Amendment No. 253 (“OPA”) and the City’s Zoning By-law Amendment No. 1030-2014 (“ZBA”) both of which arise out of the City’s Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit initiative.

[2] The OPA appeal concerns an area specific policy (Site and Area Specific Policy No. 475) for certain lands on the south side of Eglinton Avenue East, west of Hanna Road. Here it is proposed that on approximately seven existing lots each with an existing two-storey detached dwelling, that four-storey townhouses with a common access taken from Hanna Road will be permitted. To implement the proposed OPA, a

site-specific zoning by-law amendment application would be required, along with site plan approval.

[3] The ZBA appeal concerns lands generally found on Eglinton Ave. E. between Sutherland Drive and Laird Drive. More specifically, there are four exceptions that are appealed. Exception CR 2638 is located at the north east corner of the intersection and proposed to have a maximum height of 22.5 metres (“m”). Exception CR 2639 is a row of lots fronting onto the north side of Eglinton Avenue East extending from Laird Drive to Sutherland Drive and proposed to have a maximum height of 22.5 m. Exception CR 2640 is at the south west corner of Laird Drive and Eglinton Avenue East and proposed to have a maximum height of 25.5 m. And finally, Exception CR 2644 occupies most of the mid-block of the south side of Eglinton Avenue East from Laird Drive to Sutherland Drive proposed to have a maximum height of 25.5 m.

## **DECISION**

[4] For the reasons set out below, the Board dismisses the appeals against the OPA and the ZBA.

## **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

[5] The Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit initiative covers a distance of about 19 kilometres from the Mount Dennis station at Weston Road in the west, to the Kennedy Subway station in the east. It is scheduled to be open in 2020 and to involve an investment of over \$5 billion by Metrolinx.

[6] The City in response to that investment in public transit undertook a comprehensive land use planning review of Eglinton Avenue that commenced in 2012 and was completed in 2014 with the adoption of the OPA and ZBA. The Eglinton Connects Planning Study made some 21 recommendations, which included the encouragement of mid-rise buildings on Eglinton Avenue through as-of-right zoning

permissions. Additionally, a number of land-use designation changes and/or the addition of special policies to facilitate intensification were made, including the lands fronting onto Eglinton Ave. E. at Hanna Road.

## **OPA**

[7] Site and Area Specific Policy No. 475 concerns the block of seven lots designated Neighbourhoods in the Official Plan, containing two-storey detached homes located at the south west corner of Hanna Road and Eglinton Avenue East all having lot frontage onto Eglinton Avenue East. As Hanna Road continues south there are more single detached homes. To the immediate south and east of those seven lots is the Leaside High School, around which is located the Howard Talbot Park. North of the seven lots is Eglinton Avenue East and on the north side is a place of worship. The OPA proposes to permit townhouse development to a maximum of four storeys with access via a common laneway to Hanna Road.

## **ZBA**

[8] ZBA Exception CR 2640 is located at the south west corner of the Eglinton Avenue East and Laird Drive intersection and is the location of the Laird LRT Station which is presently under construction. To the west of that site in Exception CR 2644 are two 2 1/2-storey apartment buildings, and then further west is a seven storey seniors' apartment building. On the north side of Eglinton Avenue East between Sutherland Drive and Laird Drive (Exception CR 2639) are predominantly two-storey buildings generally with retail at the ground level and residential above, which all back onto a public laneway at the rear which separates the lands which are designated Mixed Use from the detached residences designated Neighbourhoods, which are located on Donlea Drive, but also have access and garages off the public laneway. Exception CR 2638 is located at the north east corner of the Eglinton Avenue East intersection and it too is designated Mixed Use.

[9] Generally in this area, the as-of-right zoning would allow four storeys, except for the seniors' apartment building that has a site-specific permission for seven storeys. The ZBA would allow maximum heights of 22.5 m on the north side of Eglinton Avenue East (about seven storeys) and 25.5 m on the south side (about eight storeys).

## **THE HEARING**

[10] During the course of the two day hearing the Board heard evidence from eight participants representing interests in both the OPA and others from Donlea Drive concerning the proposed exceptions for additional height along Eglinton Ave. E. The Board also heard expert opinion evidence from Brian Gallagher a land use planner who had been responsible for drafting and processing both the OPA and the ZBA, and also from Geoff Kettel co-president of Leaside.

[11] The witness statements of Mr. Kettel were challenged by the City as they contained land use planning opinions and the City submitted that Mr. Kettel was neither a qualified land use planner entitled to give planning opinion evidence, nor was he independent. Mr. Kettel had been quite candid in his description of involvement with Leaside: a director since 2007, and Co-President since 2014.

[12] The City submitted that the ruling by the Board in *Citizens Coalition of Greater Fort Erie v. Niagara (Regional Municipality)* 77 O.M.B.R 76 required the Board to find that a potential expert witness had to possess both the necessary expertise and the necessary independence to be qualified. The City submitted that Mr. Kettel did not meet either branch of the test.

[13] The Board gave an oral ruling that in light of Mr. Kettel's extensive involvement with Leaside that it was not necessary to consider the first branch of the test, as the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Kettel was independent from Leaside. Thus the Board directed that it would hear evidence from Mr. Kettel on: the relevant facts, the concerns of Leaside, and its recommendations. The Board also directed that Mr. Kettel's witness

statements at Exhibits 18 and 19 would be read as if the opinions expressed had been redacted.

## **PARTICIPANTS**

[14] As noted above, the Board heard from eight participants: six with regard to the OPA, and two with regard to the ZBA.

[15] Dealing firstly with the OPA, five of the six participants were opposed to the OPA and all live in the immediate vicinity. They raised issues with regard to traffic, safety, access, inappropriate development, height, change of character, loss of trees, and lack of notice. With regard to the latter, it appeared to the Board that a number of the participants had only recently been made aware of the OPA through the efforts of Leaside.

[16] In contrast to this, was a participant whose spouse had written an email in support of the OPA and opposing the appeal by Leaside. They are property owners within the area affected by the OPA. Exhibit 6 notes that during the consultation process they participated and expressed their support for the OPA and had made oral submissions before the City's Development Committee to that effect on behalf of themselves and also their neighbours. The exhibit further rhetorically raises this question:

“Why build the LRT but keep the density the same, have we not learned our lesson from the Danforth? Given the significant investment by the City, Province, and Federal Government in the LRT, it is ridiculous to suggest that the properties ought to remain as single family residences.”

[17] Dealing with the ZBA, the Board heard two participants both of whom reside on Donlea Drive and have rear access to the public lane. Both participants were of the view that the ZBA would allow eight storeys, and that such height was far too high, and would

result in loss of privacy through overview, and loss of sunlight. Additionally there were concerns with increased traffic in the public lane, and the noise associated with that.

## **CITY CASE**

[18] Brian Gallaugher was the sole witness for the City.

[19] He gave some considerable background with regard to the public consultation process that had been carried out by the City in a two-year period for the Eglinton Connects Planning Study, involving 238,000 flyers mailed out, 13 public workshops and open houses, 5 surveys, 22 meetings with stakeholder groups, 5,000 people engaged at events or through surveys, 1,700 people signed up for email updates, etc.

[20] At the conclusion of the Eglinton Connects Planning Study, a City staff report (“Final Directions”) was prepared and dated March 19, 2014, which *inter alia* included Recommendation 15: encourage Mid-Rise Buildings on Eglinton Avenue through as-of-right zoning permissions.

[21] The City staff report also contains Attachment 4 being recommendations for further study that include: Block 16 being the Eglinton Ave. E. and Hanna Road site, for townhouse permission to a height of four storeys, and proposed mid-rise zoning for the lands generally located at Laird Dr. and Eglinton Ave. E.

[22] The next City staff report is dated May 22, 2014 (“Implementation Report Part 1”). With specific regard to this hearing, this report details the proposed permission sought to build townhouses in Leaside. The report notes that the proposed block of houses does not form an integral part of the neighbourhood and would remove multiple driveways from Eglinton Ave. E. to a rear laneway off Hanna Road. This would improve pedestrian access and the impact would be limited by the fact that the properties abut a school site to the rear.

[23] The next City staff report is dated July 24, 2014 (“Implementation Report Part 2”) and the report only dealt with specific implementation measures related to mid-rise buildings. There it notes that: “new height limits range from 13.5 metres, which translates to 4 storeys, to 25.5 metres, which translates to an 8 storey building.”

[24] Further the report provides that the portion of Eglinton Ave. E. where mid-rise buildings are most appropriate is where there is a 27 m right-of-way, which pursuant to the Performance Standards for Mid-Rise Buildings, would have allowed up to 27 m in height based on a one-to-one ratio between the street right-of-way width and permissible height.

[25] This staff report contains the specific exceptions for the ZBA.

[26] Having outlined the background, context and specific provisions of both the OPA and ZBA, Mr. Gallagher took the Board through his policy analysis for both appeals, first citing s. 2 of the *Planning Act* regarding matters of Provincial interest. There he highlighted s. 2 (j) the adequate provision of a full range of housing, including affordable housing, and s. 2 (q) the promotion of development that is designed to be sustainable, to support public transit and to be oriented to pedestrians. The permission to allow townhouses would meet both these provincial interests, and the ZBA was clearly in support of the investment in public transit.

[27] He then took the Board to the Provincial Policy Statement (“PPS”) and highlighted s. 1.1.1 Healthy liveable and safe communities that are sustained by: (b) accommodating an appropriate range and mix of housing, and s. 1.6.7.4 that a land use pattern, density, and mix of uses should be promoted that will minimize the length and number of vehicle trips, and support current and future use of transit and active transportation, along with s. 1.6.7.5 that transportation and land use considerations shall be integrated at all stages of the planning process.



[28] This he opined was exactly what the City had done through its Eglinton Connects Study, and the Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit initiative.

[29] Turning to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (“Growth Plan”) he directed the Board to s. 3.2.3. “Moving People” where it provides: “All decisions on transit planning and investment will be made according to the following criteria: (a) using transit infrastructure to shape growth, and planning for high residential and employment densities that ensure the efficiency and viability of existing and planned transit service levels.”

[30] He also referenced the General Intensification provisions found in s. 2.2.3 that encourage intensification generally throughout the built up area.

[31] Reference was also made to the Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016. This document although not as of yet officially part of the Provincial Plan does provide some guidance as to the future direction of the Growth Plan. More specifically s. 2.2.1 Managing Growth references in s. 2 that population and employment growth will be accommodated by “...focusing growth in areas with existing or planned transit, with a priority on higher order transit.” S. 2.2.4 Transit Corridors and Station Areas provides in s. 9 that lands with easy access to frequent transit service, including higher order transit, should be identified as strategic growth areas and should be planned and developed to be transit supportive, including through setting minimum density targets to reflect existing and planned transit service levels where no minimum density target is specified in this Plan.

[32] Turning to the City’s Official Plan, Mr. Gallagher pointed to s. 2.2 “Structuring Growth in the City: Integrating Land Use and Transportation”. There the narrative section of the Official Plan states: “In keeping with the vision for a more liveable Greater Toronto Area, future growth within Toronto will be steered to areas which are

well served by transit...Generally, the growth areas are locations where good transit access can be provided along bus and streetcar routes and at rapid transit stations.”

[33] In the Neighbourhoods section he noted that neighbourhoods were physically stable areas made up of residential uses in lower scale buildings, such as townhouses, and no higher than four storeys.

[34] Turning to the ZBA appeal he directed the Board to s. 4.5 Mixed Use Areas wherein the narrative portion anticipates that the Mixed Use Areas will absorb most of the anticipated increase in retail, office, and service employment as well as much of the new housing.

[35] The development criteria are found in s. 4.5.2: In Mixed Use Areas, development will: (b) provide for new jobs and homes for Toronto’s growing population on underutilized lands in the Downtown, the Central Waterfront, Centres, Avenues, and other lands designated Mixed Use Areas, and (h) take advantage of nearby transit services.

[36] In providing his expert land use planning opinion, Mr. Gallagher opined that both the OPA and ZBA had regard for the Provincial interests of s. 2 of the *Planning Act*, were consistent with the PPS, conformed to the Growth Plan (and the proposed Growth Plan) and conformed to the City’s Official Plan.

[37] It was his opinion that the OPA and ZBA would appropriately encourage, guide, and restrict the anticipated development that should be forthcoming in association with the Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit.

[38] With regard to the OPA, he noted that townhouses are a permitted use, a maximum height of four storeys is permitted, the redevelopment would provide a modest form of intensification, there would be a number of driveways removed from Eglinton Ave. E., and the townhouses served via a shared laneway that would be

located off Hanna Road, that there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts due to the location of the lands of the OPA, and the abutting school and park.

[39] With regard to the ZBA, he noted that the as-of-right zoning height is currently four storeys, with the existing seniors' apartment building approved by the City at seven storeys. The areas of the ZBA appeal are in close proximity to and actually include the transit station lot, and intensification there is appropriate. As to the heights, as there is already a seven storey building existing on the south side of Eglinton Ave. E., he testified the height at 25.5 m (eight storeys) was appropriate. For the north side of the street, the ZBA proposed heights at 22.5 m (seven storeys and not eight as referenced by some of the participants). He further testified that the Mid-Rise Performance Standards report has a sun/shadow study that indicated insignificant shadowing on the abutting properties to the north. Coupled with the location of these lands in close proximity to the transit station, he was of the opinion that the ZBA conformed to the Official Plan, that it was in the public interest to encourage higher residential densities near public transit, and that it was good land use planning to do so.

[40] Thus, he recommended that the Board dismiss the appeals of Leaside, and uphold the decision of City Council to approve the OPA and ZBA.

## **LEASIDE**

[41] Counsel for Leaside called one witness: Geoff Kettel. As noted above, the City had challenged the witness statements of Mr. Kettel and the Board ruled that his evidence was to deal with the relevant facts, the concerns of Leaside, and its recommendations.

[42] Mr. Kettel provided a series of photographs that he had taken for both the Hanna Road area, and the Eglinton Ave. E. area: Exhibits 20A and 20B.

[43] Exhibit 20A firstly displays the detached homes that front onto Eglinton Ave. E., and then turning the corner and heading south on Hanna Road. The detached dwellings in the photographs are all two-storey with attached garages. Then there is a series of photographs of the school and surroundings, and finally, photographs of the north and south sides of Eglinton Ave. E. depicting two-storey detached homes with driveways to the street.

[44] Exhibit 20B contains photographs of the streetscape along Eglinton Ave. E. as it approaches Laird Road with most being two-storey buildings with retail at the ground level and residential above. Some of the anomalies include the two-storey Trinity Grace Church on the north side, and the seven-storey seniors' apartment building on the south side. To the rear of the buildings on the north side of Eglinton Ave. E. is a public lane that provides access to both the commercial buildings fronting onto Eglinton Ave. E., and (rear) access to the residential homes that front onto Donlea Drive.

[45] With regard to the OPA, Mr. Kettel testified that the Leaside area has a remarkably consistent lot pattern that was based on Frederick Todd's plan for a model town in 1912, and directed the Board's attention to the lotting plans from 1912. These lots were different from the grid pattern elsewhere in the City as they were curvilinear, and the seven lots on Eglinton Ave. E. were part of the fabric of the Leaside area.

[46] To allow the OPA, would mean the introduction of new smaller lots, with a four-storey structure, both of which would be out of character with the Leaside area.

[47] Moreover, he pointed out that there were other much more significant sites that were being intensified, and that this site was so small as to be trivial in comparison, while the costs to the neighbourhood were significant, through the introduction of new smaller lots which would lead to instability in the area, new heights, loss of trees, issues of traffic, and loss of heritage.

[48] Thus, he recommended that the Board allow the appeal, and refuse the OPA as there was negative impact on the neighbourhood and little to gain from the proposed townhouses.

[49] With regard to the ZBA, Mr. Kettel was clear in his witness statement that while Leaside objected to the ZBA, it did not object to that portion of the ZBA that related to the proposed zoning on the portion of the south side of Eglinton Ave. E. between Sutherland Drive and Laird Drive occupied by the seniors' apartment building.

[50] Turning to those portions of the ZBA remaining of concern to Leaside, Mr. Kettel expressed concerns that the City by pre-zoning of these areas would lose the ability to work with developers to ensure that the development proposals were truly mixed use, and by pre-zoning the lands in question, the City and the public would not have the benefit of the usual detailed studies that were required as part of a rezoning application.

[51] With regard to the ZBA on the north side of Eglinton Ave. E., he noted that the lots fronting onto Eglinton Ave. E. were shallower (about 110 feet deep) than the south side (about 135 feet deep). Moreover, the public laneway was currently only about 15 feet wide and that was all that separated the Mixed Use area from the residential neighbourhood fronting onto Donlea Drive. This he testified would result in more sun impact on the north side and the City had not done any sun/shadow analysis.

[52] In conclusion, he testified that this was a viable business area, and that the change being proposed was not evolutionary change but catastrophic change with little to be gained as opposed to the negative impacts on adjacent properties.

[53] In cross-examination, Mr. Kettel admitted that he was unaware of the Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards and in particular the provisions concerning the angular plane and that they are contained within the underlying parent zoning by-law.

[54] Also in cross-examination, Mr. Kettel volunteered that Leaside was of the view that five- and six-storey structures were more appropriate: six storeys on the south side of Eglinton Ave. E. and five storeys on the north side.

## **COMMENTARY**

[55] To the Board, much has changed in Ontario land use planning since the model plans of Frederick Todd in 1912.

[56] First and foremost, the Province of Ontario has established a vision for Ontario land use planning through its PPS. That provincial policy mandates intensification generally in settlement areas, and more particularly near public transit.

[57] Another change is the Growth Plan, which is a provincial plan that complements the PPS. It too mandates intensification generally in built up areas, and near public transit.

[58] While some may argue that at the macro level, the intensification that would be achieved through either the OPA or the ZBA is trivial in comparison to other, larger developments; such modest intensification is still consistent with the PPS and in conformity with the Growth Plan, and not to be casually dismissed.

[59] The Board is satisfied that the City conducted a broad based and thorough public consultation process, enabling members of the public if they were so inclined to participate.

[60] The Board is also satisfied that there are no heritage issues associated with these appeals as none of the properties in question have been designated.

[61] The Board would also note that the public lane north of Eglinton Ave. E. will be widened as part of the development application process.

## **OPA DECISION**

[62] With regard to the OPA, the Board has the uncontroverted expert land use planning evidence of Mr. Gallagher and finds that the proposal for townhouses of four storeys with a common access, has appropriate regard for the matters of Provincial Interest in s. 2 of the *Planning Act*, is consistent with the PPS as a modest form of intensification, conforms to the Growth Plan as being modest intensification in support of public transit, and conforms to the Official Plan in terms of built form and height. Moreover, the OPA would result in fewer private driveways onto Eglinton Ave. E. The Board notes that only the OPA has been approved. The actual implementation of the OPA will come through a zoning by-law amendment, which will entail a further public process that will once again seek community input as to the actual development proposal including the means of ingress and egress, and likely with detailed elevations.

[63] Thus, the Board dismisses the OPA appeal.

## **ZBA DECISION**

[64] Turning to the ZBA, again the Board has uncontroverted expert land use planning evidence that the proposed ZBA has appropriate regard for s. 2 of the *Planning Act*, is consistent with the PPS, and conforms to the Growth Plan and the City's Official Plan. Moreover, the Board has evidence from the Leaside witness that there is no objection to the proposed zoning (at eight storeys) on the south side of Eglinton Ave. E. for that portion of the street occupied by the seven storey seniors' apartment building.

[65] Additionally, the Board has evidence from the Leaside witness that Leaside was of the view that six storeys was appropriate for the remainder of the south side of Eglinton Ave. E., and five storeys appropriate for the north side of Eglinton Ave. E.

[66] The issue before the Board is the appropriateness of the proposed heights at 25.5 m (south side) and 22.5 m (north side).

[67] The Board notes that the Mid-Rise Performance Standards envision building heights on a one-to-one ratio with the street right-of-way, which in this case is 27 m. Thus, the proposed heights at 25.5 m and 22.5 m are less than the Mid-Rise Performance Standards.

[68] Dealing with the transit station site, the Board finds that a height of eight storeys is reasonable and appropriate for the site given its location and use. With regard to the remaining lands on the south side of Eglinton Ave. E., they are actually closer to the transit station than the seniors' apartment building, and the redevelopment of those sites would enhance public access to public transit. To the Board it would be reasonable and appropriate for those lands to have the same allowable zoning height (eight storeys) as the seniors' apartment building.

[69] Dealing with both of the appeals for the north side of Eglinton Ave. E., the ZBA proposes seven storeys, and Leaside was of the view that five storeys was appropriate, but without having taken into account the angular plane analysis that is contained within the underlying parent zoning by-law and also being unaware of the sun/shadow analysis done in conjunction with the Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards.

[70] The Board fully understands the concerns expressed by the residents with regard to proximity to lands that will have development potential. The Board agrees that there will be impacts from the redevelopment of the adjacent lands including but not limited to: some likely loss of sun light, some likely loss of privacy through increased overviews, more people using the widened public lane, and increased ambient noise.

[71] However, all these issues arise within an urban context.



[72] The impacts must be weighed against the public benefit that accrues from the public planning for the betterment of the City through the expenditure of significant public monies invested in public transit.

[73] The Board finds that the proposed height for the north side of Eglinton Ave. E. has been reduced from that of the south side, in recognition of the shallower lots, and the public lane, that the sun/shadow study illustrates only minor impact on those residential properties and the angular plane imbedded in the parent zoning by-law will direct appropriate rear elevations. Hence, the Board finds that while there will be impacts, the nature and extent of the anticipated impacts have been foreseen by the City and mitigated and are not unacceptable adverse impacts.

[74] Thus, the Board will dismiss the Leaside ZBA appeals.

[75] In conclusion, the Board dismisses all the Leaside appeals against the OPA and the ZBA.

[76] This is the Order of the Board.

*“Blair S. Taylor”*

BLAIR S. TAYLOR  
MEMBER

If there is an attachment referred to in this document,  
please visit [www.elto.gov.on.ca](http://www.elto.gov.on.ca) to view the attachment in PDF format.

**Ontario Municipal Board**

A constituent tribunal of Environment and Land Tribunals Ontario  
Website: [www.elto.gov.on.ca](http://www.elto.gov.on.ca) Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248