

**Local Planning Appeal Tribunal**  
Tribunal d'appel de l'aménagement  
local



**ISSUE DATE:** January 17, 2020

**CASE NO(S):** PL090114  
PL110331

The Ontario Municipal Board (the “OMB”) is continued under the name Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (the “Tribunal”), and any reference to the Ontario Municipal Board or Board in any publication of the Tribunal is deemed to be a reference to the Tribunal.

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, C. P. 13, as amended

Appellants:	See below
Subject:	Rural Hamilton Official Plan
Municipality:	City of Hamilton
OMB Case No.:	PL090114
OMB File No.:	PL090114

**List of Appellants**

- | No. | Appellant  |
|-----|--|
| 1   | Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (OSSGA) |
| 2   | Paletta International Corporation                |
| 3   | P&L Livestock Limited                            |
| 9   | St. Marys Cement (Canada) Inc.                   |
| 10  | Demik Developments                               |
| 11  | 1694408 Ontario Inc.                             |
| 13  | Artstone Holdings Limited                        |
| 14  | Artstone Holdings Limited                        |
| 15  | Weizer Investments Limited                       |
| 16  | Corpveil Holdings Limited                        |
| 18  | Ancaster Christian Reform Church                 |

- 456941 Ontario Ltd., 1263339 Ontario Ltd. and Lea Silvestri ("Silvestri Investments")
- 19 Angelo Giacomelli and Mario Nesci
- 20 Keith Pickles and Brenda Pickles
- 22 John Paolini, Gino DalBello, Olindo DalBello, Luigi DeTina, Peter Djeneralovic, Jim Swick and Quinto Simone
- 23 New Country Investors Limited
- 24 1507565 Ontario Inc.
- 25 Lafarge Canada Inc.
- 27 Peter Cartwright
- 28 City of Hamilton
- 29 Dr. Tom Nugent
- 30 DiCenzo (Golf Club Road) Holdings Inc.
- 32 Dufferin Aggregates (a division of Holcim (Canada) Inc.)
- 33 David E. Mercer
- 35 Multi-Area Developments Inc.
- 36 Paletta International Corporation (Elfrida Lands)
- 37
- 39 2101510 Ontario Inc. (subsumed by Paletta International Corporation)
- 40 2000963 Ontario Inc.
- 41 Mud & First Inc.
- 42 2084696 Ontario Inc.
- 43 2188410 Ontario Inc.

The Ontario Municipal Board has received appeals under subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, from a decision of the City of Hamilton to approve Official Plan Amendment No. 35 to the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan

OMB File No. PL090779 (See Schedule "1")

OMB Case No. PL090779

The Ontario Municipal Board has received appeals under subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, from a decision of the City of Hamilton to approve Official Plan Amendment No. 128 to the Town of Ancaster Official Plan (PL090780); Official Plan Amendment No. 18 to the Town of Dundas Official Plan (PL090781); Official Plan Amendment No. 118 to the Town of Flamborough Official Plan (PL090782); Official Plan Amendment No. 75 to the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan (PL090783); Official Plan Amendment No. 220 to the City of Hamilton Official Plan (PL090784); Official Plan Amendment No. 149 to the City of Stoney Creek Official Plan (PL090785)

OMB File Nos. PL090780-PL090785 (See Schedule "1")

OMB Case No. PL090779

The Ontario Municipal Board has received appeals under subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, from the failure of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to announce a decision respecting the City of Hamilton Urban Official Plan

OMB File No. PL101381 (See Schedule “2”)

OMB Case No. PL101381

The Ontario Municipal Board has received appeals under subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, from the decision of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to approve the new City of Hamilton Urban Official Plan

OMB File No. PL110331 (See Schedule “3”)

OMB Case No. PL110331

Auburn Developments Inc. has appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board under subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, from Council’s refusal to enact a proposed amendment to Zoning By-law 6593 of the City of Hamilton to rezone lands respecting 17 Ewen Road from “J” (Light and Limited Heavy Industrial, etc.) District to the “E-3” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District to permit a 10 storey student residential building

Approval Authority File No. ZAC-07-062

OMB File No. PL120574

OMB Case No. PL120574

Auburn Developments Inc. has appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board under subsection 22(7) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, from Council’s refusal to enact a proposed amendment to the Official Plan for the City of Hamilton to redesignate land at 17 Ewen Road from “Industrial” to “High Density Residential” to permit a 10 storey student residential building

Approval Authority File No. OPA-07-016

OMB File No. PL120575

OMB Case No. PL120574

### **Schedule “1”**

Appellants to the amendments to the in-force Official Plans of the former Region of Hamilton-Wentworth, Towns of Ancaster, Dundas and Flamborough, Township of Glanbrook and Cities of Hamilton and Stoney Creek (OMB Case No. PL090779)

**OMB FILE NO.**

PL090784

**APPELLANT NAME**

Shawcor Ltd.

**Schedule "2"**

Appellants to the failure of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to announce a decision respecting the City of Hamilton Urban Official Plan (OMB Case No. PL101381)

<b>OMB FILE NO.</b>	<b>APPELLANT NAME</b>
PL101381	A. DeSantis Developments Ltd. LIUNA Group Corp. St. Joseph's Villa

**Schedule "3"**

Appellants to the new City of Hamilton Urban Official Plan (OMB Case No. PL110331)

<b>OMB FILE NO.</b>	<b>APPELLANT NAME</b>
PL110331	2000963 Ontario Inc. 2051206 Ontario Inc. 2084696 Ontario Inc. 2188410 Ontario Inc. 456941 Ontario Ltd., 1263339 Ontario Ltd., and Lea Silvestri 909940 Ontario Inc. Artstone Holdings Limited Carmen Chiaravelle, 1694408 Ontario Ltd., John Edward Demik, Peter Demik, Demik Brothers Hamilton Ltd., and Elaine Vyn City of Hamilton Corpveil Holdings Limited Flamborough Power Centre Inc., Flamborough South Centre Inc., Clappison Five Six Properties Inc. Freeland Developments Limited Gino and Olindo DalBello Lynmount Developments Limited Mondelēz Canada Inc. (formerly Kraft Canada Inc.) Mud and First Inc. Multi-Area Developments Inc. Norman Vartanian Paletta International Corporation Paletta International Corporation (re: Elfrida) Spallacci & Sons Limited Sullstar Twenty Limited Twenty Road Developments Inc. Upper Centennial Developments Ltd. Waterdown Bay Ltd.

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 12(1) of the *Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, 2017*, S.O. 2017, c. 23, Sched. 1, and Rule 10 of the Tribunal's Rules of Practice and Procedure

Request by: City of Hamilton  
Request for: Request for Directions

**Heard:** October 24 and 25, 2018 in Hamilton, Ontario

**APPEARANCES:**

**Parties**

**Counsel**

City of Hamilton

M. Kovacevic  
J. Wice

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and  
Housing

C. Young  
J. Evola

1507565 Ontario Inc.

J. Doherty

Demik Developments  
Carmen Chiaravalle  
1694408 Ontario Inc.  
Demik Brothers Hamilton Ltd.  
John Edward Demik  
Peter Demik  
Elaine Vyn  
(together known as "Twenty Road  
East Landowners")

D. Baker  
S. Rosenthal  
S. Lampert

Sullstar Twenty Limited, 909940  
Ontario Inc., Lynmount Developments  
Limited, Twenty Road Developments  
Inc., Spallacci & Sons Ltd, 2051206  
Ontario Inc. and Yehezkel Zahavy  
(together known as "Twenty Road  
West Landowners")

J. Farber  
A. M. Engel

2000963 Ontario Inc.  
2084696 Ontario Inc.  
2188410 Ontario Inc.  
Mud & First Inc.

M. Noskiewicz

Multi-Area Developments Inc.  
Paletta International Corporation  
(together known as “Elfrida  
Landowners”)

456941 Ontario Ltd.  
1263339 Ontario Ltd.  
Lea Silvestri  
Lea Silvestri Investments Limited  
(together known as “Silvestri”)

P. Pickfield  
C. Leger

Artstone Holdings Limited  
Corpveil Holdings Limited  
Weizer Investments Limited  
(together known as “Effort Trust”)

S. Snider  
A. Toumanians

DiCenzo (Golf Club Road) Holdings I  
Inc.  
DiCenzo Construction Company  
Limited

E. Cheeseman

New Country Investors Limited

P. Gross

## **DECISION DELIVERED BY SUSAN de AVELLAR SCHILLER AND ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL**

---

### **BACKGROUND**

[1] The City of Hamilton (“City”) has adopted two, complementary official plans: the Rural Hamilton Official Plan (“RHOP”) and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (“UHOP”). The RHOP is case PL090114 and the UHOP is case PL110331.

[2] The by-law adopting the RHOP was passed by Council on September 27, 2006. The by-law adopting the UHOP was passed by Council on July 9, 2009. At the time of the passage of these by-laws, the Provincial plan known as the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2006 (“Growth Plan 2006”) was in effect.

[3] Parties in each of these cases have been grouped according to the subject area of the issues in which they have an interest. Both cases have been the subject of pre-

hearing conferences and have been phased into several topic-specific hearings that have resulted in the disposition of a large number of the appeals. As a result, several appeals in these two cases have been decided under the Growth Plan 2006.

[4] Section 3(5) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, C. P. 13, as amended (“Act”) requires:

**Policy statements and provincial plans**

(5) A decision of the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board, a minister of the Crown and a ministry, board, commission or agency of the government, including the Tribunal, in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter,

(a) shall be consistent with the policy statements issued under subsection (1) that are in effect on the date of the decision; and

(b) shall conform with the provincial plans that are in effect on that date, or shall not conflict with them, as the case may be...

[5] The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 (“Growth Plan 2017”) came into effect on July 1, 2017. When the Growth Plan 2017 came into effect there were still some appeals in these two cases that had not yet been disposed.

[6] The City has brought a motion seeking an order of the Tribunal that the remaining appeals in each of these cases be continued and disposed of in accordance with the Growth Plan 2017.

[7] The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (“MMAH”) responded to the City’s motion in support of the City.

[8] Artstone Holdings Limited, Corpveil Holdings Limited and Weizer Investments Limited (together “Effort Trust”) responded to the City’s motion in support of the City.

[9] Multi-Area Developments Inc., Mud and First Inc., Paletta International Corporation, 2000963 Ontario Inc., 2084696 Ontario Inc., and 2188410 Ontario Inc. (together “Elfrida Landowners”) also responded to the City’s motion in support of the City.

[10] 1507565 Ontario Inc. (“150”) also responded to the City’s motion in support of the City.

[11] Demik Developments, Carmen Chiaravalle, 1694408 Ontario Inc., Demik Brothers Hamilton Ltd., John Edward Demik, Peter Demik, and Elain Vyn (together “Twenty Road East Landowners Group” or “TRE”) responded in opposition to the City’s motion.

[12] Sullstar Twenty Limited, 909940 Ontario Inc., Lynmount Development Ltd. Twenty Road Development Inc., Spallacci & Sons Limited, 2051205 Ontario Inc. and Yehezkel Zahavy (together Twenty Road West Landowners Group or “TRW”) also responded in opposition to the City’s motion.

[13] Lea Silvestri, 456941 Ontario Ltd., 1263339 Ontario Ltd., and Lea Silvestri Investments Limited (together “Silvestri”) also responded in opposition to the City’s motion.

[14] Although the relief sought by TRE, TRW and Silvestri was worded slightly differently in each response, they all sought an order that the appeals be continued and disposed of in accordance with the Growth Plan 2006.

[15] The RHOP and the UHOP cases have been on separate hearing streams and are not consolidated. This decision deals with the City’s motion that the remaining appeals in each of these cases should be continued and disposed of in accordance with the Growth Plan 2017.

### **Exclusion of one Remaining Appeal**

[16] New Country Investors Limited (“New Country”) is one of the remaining appellants of the RHOP, specifically listed as such in the City’s motion. New Country did not file a response to the City’s motion.



[17] New Country, also known and referred to as Ponderosa Nature Resort, had filed applications for an official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment and site plan for its property at 1218 Concession 8 West in the former Town of Flamborough, now in the City. These matters were appealed to this Tribunal by New Country and are in case PL050179, separate from the RHOP proceedings.

[18] At an earlier pre-hearing dealing with the RHOP and before a panel differently constituted, the possibility of consolidating New Country's RHOP appeal with the site-specific appeals was considered. On reviewing the decision of that pre-hearing, it appears clear that the panel's intent had been to separate out the New Country appeal from the RHOP to enable it then to be consolidated with the site-specific matters at an appearance in that case.

[19] There is no indication in the decision from that pre-hearing in the RHOP matter that the City, or any other Party, objected to removing the New Country appeal so that it might be consolidated with its site-specific matters. The decision from that pre-hearing, however, did not order the separation.

[20] The City and New Country have been engaged in ongoing discussions, mediation appearances and several pre-hearings in the site-specific matters. In all of these, it appears that these Parties assumed the New Country RHOP appeal had been separated from the RHOP proceedings and consolidated with the site-specific proceedings.

[21] New Country appeared at this motion hearing to ask that the Tribunal not make a determination on which Growth Plan applies to its RHOP appeal and, instead, confirm that its RHOP appeal is to be heard and considered with its site-specific matters.

[22] The City confirmed New Country's recitation of events and understanding of the matter and agreed with New Country's request. No Party objected to the Tribunal's decision to confirm the intent of the earlier panel to separate out the New Country RHOP appeal from the RHOP proceedings. In confirming the separation of the New

Country appeal from the RHOP proceedings, the Tribunal amends the City's motion to delete New Country from the motion and makes no finding on the question of which Growth Plan applies to the New Country appeal of the RHOP in this motion. If a question remains regarding which Growth Plan governs the disposition of the separated New Country appeal, a separate motion will have to be brought.

## **ISSUES**

[23] While the RHOP and the UHOP are separate official plans, together they form the City's vision for its future. As their names imply, the RHOP covers the rural area and the UHOP covers the urban area. The appropriate boundary between urban and rural in certain parts of the City is at the heart of the substantive dispute between the Parties.

[24] The City's adoption of the RHOP and, later, of the UHOP were preceded by an extensive growth management study called the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy ("GRIDS"). The GRIDS report contemplated urban boundary expansions and identified a preferred Potential Urban Boundary Expansion Area for lands bounded generally by Mud Street, Second Road and Hendershot Road to the east, gold Club Road to the south, Trinity Church Road to the west and the existing urban boundary of the west side of Centennial Parkway to the north. The area is known as the Elfrida Lands. Elfrida Landowners, Effort Trust and 150 all own lands within this area.

[25] Both the adopted RHOP and the adopted UHOP set the Elfrida Lands as an area of future urban growth.

[26] MMAH deleted these references in both the RHOP and the UHOP. MMAH approved the RHOP, with modifications, on December 24, 2008 and approved the UHOP with modifications on March 16, 2011.

[27] Several interests appealed the MMAH decision to modify the RHOP and the UHOP, including the City.

## **Transition Rules for Growth Plans**

[28] As noted above, the *Planning Act* requires the Tribunal to make decisions affecting a planning matter in conformity with provincial plans in effect at the time of the decision. Growth Plan 2006 and Growth Plan 2017 have different requirements for urban settlement boundary expansions.

[29] The Growth Plans are made and approved under the *Places to Grow Act*, 2005. Ontario Regulation 311/06 is the Transition Regulation for Growth Plans. The Transition Regulation sets out the requirements for determining which Growth Plan applies to a matter. The dispute in this motion hearing centres on the interpretation of the Transition Regulation and its application to the facts of this case.

[30] The sections of the Transition Regulation that are most relevant to this motion are:

1. section 1, definitions;
2. subsection 2(b), deemed day of commencement; and
3. subsection 3(6), which sets out the requirements to consider and dispose of a matter under the Growth Plan 2006.

### **Growth Plan 2019:**

[31] Between the time this motion was heard and the time of this decision being issued, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019 (“Growth Plan 2019”) has come into effect. The Tribunal takes notice that the transition rules for the Growth Plan 2019 have made certain changes to the Transition Regulation and left other subsections intact.

[32] Unchanged is the definition of “matter” in s. 1. Also unchanged is s. 2(b) that

determines the deemed day of commencement and s. 3(6), which sets out the conditions for a matter to be considered under the Growth Plan 2006.

[33] Under these circumstances, the Tribunal finds that there is no need for any further submissions from any Party to deal with the question of transition from the Growth Plan 2019.

### **Growth Plan 2006:**

[34] Subsection 3(6) is the clause that sets out the requirements to come under the Growth Plan 2006, and it reads:

#### **Transition Rules**

#### **3. ...**

(6) A matter that is described in clause 2(b) and commenced by an upper-tier or single-tier municipality after June 15, 2006 and before May 18, 2017 that would add any amount of land to an area of settlement shall be continued and disposed of in accordance with the 2006 Growth Plan as it read on June 16, 2006.

[35] This clause identifies three key requirements. The first two requirements are: an official plan commenced by a single-tier municipality, within a specified date range. The third requirement is that the official plan would add any amount of land to an area of settlement. The first two requirements are met and are not in dispute; the dispute is over the interpretation of the third requirement.

[36] Both the RHOP and the UHOP were commenced by the City, a single-tier municipality.

[37] Clause 2(b) is the deemed day of commencement:

...in the case of an official plan ... on the day the by-law adopting the plan ... is passed.

[38] The dates of adoption of the RHOP and of the UHOP are after June 15, 2006 and before May 18, 2017, as set out earlier in this decision, and fall clearly within the

requisite date range.

[39] The third requirement, "...would add any amount of land to an area of settlement...", is at the core of the dispute on the motion. And the focus within this phrase is on the word "*would*".

### **Defining an "area of settlement"**

[40] The *Places to Grow Act, 2005* defines an "area of settlement" as:

"area of settlement" means an area of land designated in an official plan for urban uses, including urban areas, urban policy areas, towns, villages, hamlets, rural clusters, rural settlement areas, urban systems, rural service centres or **future urban use areas**, or as otherwise prescribed [emphasis added by the Tribunal]

[41] The *Planning Act* defines an "area of settlement" as:

"area of settlement" means an area of land designated in an official plan for urban uses including urban areas, urban policy areas, towns, villages, hamlets, rural clusters, rural settlement areas, urban systems, rural service centres or **future urban use areas**, or as otherwise prescribed [emphasis added by the Tribunal]

[42] The core of these two definitions is the same in each Act.

### **What the RHOP and the UHOP say:**

[43] Within the adopted RHOP, Special Policy Area B on Map A – Special Policy Areas identified the Elfrida Lands as a Future Urban Growth Node. Volume 3, Chapter A, Policy 2.0 of the RHOP identified the Elfrida Lands as a Future Urban Growth District.

[44] Within the adopted UHOP, B.2.2.1 dealt with urban boundary expansions and identified a Future Urban Growth District. The boundaries of this Future Urban Growth District are the same boundaries set out in the adopted RHOP that identified the Elfrida Lands as a Future Urban Growth District.

### **The City's Perspective**

[45] The City's submissions, supported by the Parties appearing in support of the City in this motion, focused on two main points.

[46] First, the RHOP and the UHOP must add the lands to the area of settlement and, secondly, they must have done so at the time of adoption.

[47] The definition of "area of settlement" in the *Places to Grow Act, 2005* and in the *Planning Act* both state that the "area of settlement" is an area of land *designated* in an official plan. The City's submissions are that both the RHOP and UHOP *identified* the Elfrida lands as a Future Urban Growth District but did not *designate* those lands as a Future Urban Growth District. As such, the City asserts that the requirements to come under the Growth Plan 2006 have not been met.

### **The Perspective of Parties in Opposition to the City**

[48] Submissions from Parties opposed to the City's motion were led by TRE. TRE's submissions focused on five key points:

1. Neither *designate* nor *identify* are defined terms.
2. The definition of areas of settlement includes specific reference to future urban use areas, consistent with the RHOP and the UHOP setting the Elfrida lands as a Future Urban Growth District.
3. The date of adoption of the RHOP and the date of adoption of the UHOP are the dates of commencement only and do not freeze the content of either plan.
4. The phrase "...*would add any amount of land to an area of settlement...*" should be understood as forward-looking. The expansion of the settlement area is a live issue to be decided in the proceeding.

5. TRE asserts that the requirements to come under the Growth Plan 2006 have been met.

## **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

[49] Having considered the submissions, the Tribunal is persuaded by the analysis presented in the submissions from TRE, supported by TRW and by Silvestri. The requirements to come under the Growth Plan 2006 have been met. These are the Tribunal's reasons.

### **Transition Requirements not in Dispute**

[50] The RHOP and the UHOP were both initiated by a single-tier municipality, the City, and that transition requirement is met.

[51] The by-law adopting the RHOP was passed by Council on September 27, 2006. The by-law adopting the UHOP was passed by Council on July 9, 2009. The transition requirement for the deemed date of commencement is met.

### **Identification or Designation**

[52] An official plan is the statement of a community's ambition and a road map for its preferred direction of growth.

[53] Both the RHOP and the UHOP, specifically and unambiguously, clearly state that that the Elfrida Lands are a Future Urban Growth District. The boundaries of the Future Urban Growth District that is the Elfrida Lands are the same in these two Plans.

[54] In 2016, the City began further work and analysis to refine the urban land uses within the Future Growth District. This work is known as the Elfrida Growth Area Study. TRE asserts, and it was not disputed, that this study assumes that this is the only urban boundary expansion for residential uses; no other area is under City consideration or

analysis for an urban boundary expansion.

[55] The Tribunal finds no practical or on-ground difference in the phrase “future urban use area” used by the definition of areas of settlement and the RHOP and UHOP use of “Future Urban Growth District”.

[56] For the purposes of the definition of area of settlement, the Tribunal also finds no difference between the use of the two undefined words ‘designate’ or ‘identify’. In each case, the RHOP and the UHOP as adopted stated where the Future Urban Growth District is located and where the urban boundary expansion will occur.

[57] In the context of this motion, the Tribunal had nothing to suggest that the City was wavering in this determination or that its studies were examining *whether* the Elfrida Lands should be the site of the Future Urban Growth District. As such, the Tribunal finds that, as adopted, the RHOP and the UHOP would add an amount of land to an area of settlement and that transition requirement is met.

[58] Appeals of the decision of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on the RHOP and on the UHOP are still before the Tribunal. Remaining appeals engage specifically the issue of settlement area expansion. What is known is what the RHOP and the UHOP as adopted did. What is not known is what the Tribunal will decide on the issue of settlement area expansion. The question of whether there is a difference between ‘would’ and ‘could’ in this context is irrelevant. Once an appeal has been filed, and the City itself filed an appeal, ‘would’ effectively becomes ‘could’ in reference to the decision outcome of the hearing of the merits. That fact does not change the very specific language in the RHOP and the UHOP regarding the settlement area expansion with the Future Urban Growth Node of the Elfrida Lands.

## **ORDER**

[59] The Tribunal Orders that:



1. The motion brought by the City of Hamilton is denied.
2. Pursuant to Ontario Regulation 311/06 regarding transitional matters for Growth Plans, the applicable Growth Plan for the remaining appeals regarding the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and the remaining appeals regarding the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2006.
3. No decision on the applicable Growth Plan is taken in this motion for the appeal of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan by New Country Investors Limited.

*“Susan de Avellar Schiller”*

SUSAN de AVELLAR SCHILLER  
VICE-CHAIR

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.

**Local Planning Appeal Tribunal**

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