

ISSUE DATE:

Jun. 20, 2011



PL100538

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

Bayview Summit Developments Limited 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 or neglect to enact a proposed amendment to the Official Plan for the Town of Markham by specifically expanding the list of permitted uses in the "Major Commercial Area" designation in the Thornhill Secondary Plan in order to permit the redevelopment of the existing Shops on Steeles retail mall on the subject lands located at 2900 Steeles Avenue East into a mixed-use community consisting of five residential point towers ranging between 18 storeys and 32 storeys above mid-rise podiums of up to 10 storeys containing 1,787 residential units, as well as office uses, open spaces, community uses, the renovation of the existing 2-storey Sears Canada Outlet to include a new relocated food store and other retail uses in a "lifestyle" retail concept
Town of Markham File No. OP 07 130802

O.M.B. Case No. PL100538

O.M.B. File No. PL100538

Bayview Summit Developments Limited 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 or neglect to enact a proposed amendment to Zoning By-law No. 2612, as amended, of the Town of Markham, by specifically seeking permission to allow residential uses and to incorporate site specific development standards to the "Community Commercial" zone for the purpose of permitting the redevelopment of the subject lands located at 2900 Steeles Avenue East into a mixed-use community consisting of five residential point towers ranging between 18 storeys and 32 storeys above mid-rise podiums of up to 10 storeys containing 1,787 residential units, as well as office uses, open spaces, community uses, the renovation of the existing 2-storey Sears Canada Outlet to include a new relocated food store and other retail uses in a "lifestyle" retail concept

Town of Markham File No. ZA 08 110745

O.M.B. Case No. PL100538

O.M.B. File No. PL100539

APPEARANCES:

Parties

Bayview Summit Developments Limited

Town of Markham

Region of York

Counsel*/Agent

J. Alati*
J. Davies*

B. Ketcheson*

G. Szobel*

City of Toronto

G. Whicher*

German Mills Residents Association

G. Diner

DECISION OF THE BOARD DELIVERED BY J. CHEE-HING

Background and Context:

Bayview Summit Developments Limited (“Bayview”) is both the Applicant and Appellant in these matters. These Appeals concern the lands located at the northeast corner of Don Mills Road and Steeles Avenue in the Town of Markham (“Town”). There is a considerable history to these Appeals and as such a review of the background of the Applications is necessary to properly place the context of these Appeals.

There is an existing shopping plaza known as the Shops on Steeles (“SOS”), three commercial buildings, and a gas station located on the subject site. SOS was built in the 1960s. The site is served by three access driveways and is located at a prominent intersection (Don Mills and Steeles) within close proximity and access to Highway 404. Steeles Avenue is the major arterial that separates the Town of Markham to the north and the City of Toronto to the south. There is a general recognition that the commercial/retail plaza itself is dated and in need of revitalization.

Bayview proposes to redevelop the site as a mixed use development. The redevelopment is substantial in that it proposes to add a significant residential component comprising 1,787 residential units within five residential towers with mid-rise podiums, triple the amount of existing office space by building a number of stand alone office buildings, and renovating and adding to the existing enclosed shopping mall. The residential component is proposed for the easterly one third of the site and the office/retail component will comprise the westerly two thirds of the site (Ex. 9). The site is 17.7 acres in size and is bounded by Don Mills Road to the west, Highway 404 to the east and Steeles Avenue to the south. There are residential neighbourhoods to the north, west and south of the subject site.

Bayview initially submitted Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBLA) applications to permit the proposed redevelopment in 2007. These

applications were revised in 2009 and 2010 following a series of consultations with Town staff and a public Working Group. Council failed to make a decision on the revised Applications within the prescribed statutory time periods and Bayview appealed both Applications to the Board in June 2010. In November of 2010, Town Council adopted the recommendations of a staff report that the applications be denied as currently proposed and that Council endorse the built form and planning principles put forth by staff for any redevelopment of the site. During this time, discussions between the Town and the Applicant continued. A Working Group consisting of the Mayor, Ward Councillor, staff and the Applicant was formed with a view to continue discussions on the redevelopment proposal. Two OMB pre-hearing conferences were held and a Procedural Order with an Issues List was approved by the Board in December, 2010.

At the onset of the Board hearing on March 7, 2011, the Board was advised by Bayview's representatives that a settlement had been reached with the Town and the German Mills Residents Association ("GMRA") on a revised proposal. The GMRA is an incorporated body that represents residents who reside in neighbourhoods within the Town in proximity to the subject lands. Additionally, the Region's representatives advised that they had settled their issues with Bayview and that the Region supports the revised proposal. Toronto's representatives were not involved in the settlement discussions. The details of the settlement remained confidential as it was not yet executed. Toronto was the only Party that remained opposed to the settlement. Mr. Whicher, Counsel for Toronto requested an adjournment so that he could present the confidential settlement to Toronto Council in-camera. The Board adjourned the hearing to April 7, 2011.

Motions for Adjournment:

On April 7, 2011, the Board heard the motion brought by Toronto to further adjourn the hearing to April 14, 2011 so that the now executed Minutes of Settlement between the Town, the GMRA and Bayview could be presented at its Council meeting scheduled for April 12-13, 2011. This was the second adjournment being requested by Toronto. The other Parties consented to the adjournment request subject to the following conditions:

1. The adjournment to April 14, 2011 is preemptory on Toronto;

2. Toronto will not seek to add any issues to the approved Issues List;
3. Toronto will not seek any further adjournments;
4. Toronto will not seek further relief from the courts for any injunction to these proceedings.

Toronto agreed to these conditions and the Board granted the adjournment. It is important to note at this juncture, that in the motion filings, Toronto in its opposition to the settlement raised the issue of the 1974 Agreement between then Metropolitan Toronto and the Region of York as it relates to the jurisdiction of Steeles Avenue and the purported planning authority Toronto has on the lands within 45 metres north of Steeles Avenue. This was not an issue in the Approved Issues List and the aligned Parties in support of the settlement vociferously objected to Toronto's attempts to introduce this issue at the hearing. Toronto agreed not to raise the 1974 Agreement as a ground for their opposition to the settlement agreement when the hearing resumed. Toronto did not question or challenge the jurisdiction of this Board to hear and decide on the merits of the Appeals before it. The Board adjourned the hearing until April 14, 2011.

The Minutes of Settlement:

The Board was advised that the Region has settled its issues relating to transportation, water and sewer capacity with Bayview and the Region has withdrawn all of its issues on the Issues List. Additionally, the Region supports the settlement agreement reached between the Town, Bayview and the GMRA.

The settlement agreement as between the Town, Bayview and the GMRA found in Exhibit 4 contains the following key features:

1. The proposed redevelopment of the existing shopping plaza is for mixed uses, including residential, retail, office, open space and community functions. It will maintain roughly the same amount of existing retail space, triple the existing office space and add a significant residential component to the site. The redevelopment will proceed on a phased basis.

2. A maximum of 1,235 residential units, to be contained within five residential towers ranging in heights of 15-25 storeys above mid-rise podiums. The taller buildings will be facing Steeles Avenue and will be stepped back with the tallest buildings fronting on Steeles. The residential component of the proposal will be located at the eastern one third portion of the site near Highway 404. The residential component will contain 1,159,771 ft² of floor space and a floor space index (FSI) of 1.5. The original application contemplated 1,787 residential units consisting of five residential towers ranging between 18-32 storeys above mid-rise podiums.
3. The commercial component consists of 58,200 ft² of office and 212,413 ft² of retail floor space for a total of 270,613 ft². This area comprises the western two-thirds portion of the site. The total FSI of the mixed use redevelopment is 1.85. The existing two storey building will be maintained, renovated and expanded to include a relocated food store, drug store and food court. Six new stand alone office and retail buildings are proposed (Ex. 10A).
4. Private open space (47,600 ft²) in the form of a park will be provided on the eastern portion of the site nestled within the proposed residential buildings. This open space will be available for public use.
5. Section 37 Agreement provides for the payment of \$1,852,000.00 to the Town.
6. Dedication of land abutting Don Mills Road to the Region for transportation purposes.
7. Modified OPA and ZBLA to appropriately designate and rezone the subject site for a range of permitted uses as contained within the redevelopment proposal.
8. Redevelopment of the site will occur in phases subject to the site plan approval process and the phased provision of municipal infrastructure to the site including water and wastewater capacity. Holding zone provisions

will be applied to the site and lifted by the Town upon confirmation that certain requirements are met. These include the submission of further transportation and servicing studies by Bayview, the availability of servicing and transportation capacity, Section 37 Agreement, and execution of development agreements.

As such, the Town, Region and GMRA have withdrawn all their issues from the approved Issues List. The only issues left were that of Toronto which remained as the only Party opposed to the settlement agreement.

The City of Toronto's Opposition to the Settlement:

Toronto is opposed to the intensity and location of the proposed residential component at 1,235 units. They support a reduced proposal of 1,000 units and 1.5 times density spread across the entire site which they contend was the Town's planning staff recommendation prior to the settlement agreement. The height of the residential towers fronting on Steeles should be reduced and stepped back in accordance with its by-law standards relating to the 45 degree angular plane. Toronto did not object to the proposed retail/office components.

The Evidence:

The expert evidence proffered in support of the settlement can be divided into four main components – urban design, servicing, traffic and planning. Bayview called the following expert witnesses: Messrs. C. Korman (urban design), S. Schaefer (Servicing), A. Mihalj (transportation/traffic planning), W. Sorensen (planning) and Ms M. Gatzios (planning). The Town called the following expert witnesses: Messrs. M. Sterling (urban design), R. Blake (planning) and D. Butler (planning). These experts also addressed the City's issues on the approved Issues List.

In its opposition to the settlement agreement, Toronto called no expert witnesses to proffer evidence. Toronto relied on its Counsel's cross-examination of the Town's and Applicant's experts and the testimony of those Participants opposed to the settlement to advance its case before this Board.

Eight participants – P. Boler, B. Compson, M. Cook, P. Hough, E. Lowcock, R. James, G. Kay, and D. Shiner (Toronto Councillor for Willowdale) spoke in opposition to the proposal. One participant – D. Slotnick spoke in support of the proposal.

Urban Design:

Mr. Korman is the Applicant's urban designer and architect responsible for the design of the proposal. He testified that as a result of the settlement, the overall density has been reduced from 2.5 to 1.85 FSI (floor space index) and the residential component is at 1.50 FSI. There will be 1,235 residential units, to be contained within five residential towers ranging in heights of 15-25 storeys above mid-rise podiums. The taller buildings will be facing Steeles Avenue and will be stepped back with the tallest buildings fronting on Steeles.

The residential component of the proposal will be located at the eastern one-third portion of the site near Highway 404. It is his opinion that this is the most appropriate location as it is furthest away from the homes on the south side of Steeles. At this location there is a buffer on the south side of Steeles. The combined setbacks of the proposed location of the residential towers on the north side of Steeles and the homes on the south side of Steeles are such that there will be no shadow impacts to those homes on the south side.

It is his view that the angular plane is not an issue as there will be no shadow impacts on homes on the south side of Steeles. In terms of the impacts to the townhouses to the north, the residential component will be stepped back such that there will be minimal shadow impacts. It is his view that the proposal will result in a much needed revitalization of the existing mall which was built in the 1960s and will serve as a significant gateway to this major intersection. The redevelopment proposal will be phased. The redevelopment of the existing plaza will occur first followed by a phased construction of the residential component. It is anticipated that the construction program will occur over 10-12 years.

Mr. Sterling, an architect and urban designer felt that the settlement represents a good compromise from the Applicant's original proposal and reflects a high quality of urban design. He supports the proposed design and the mix of uses for the site and in

his opinion it is consistent with the built form design guidelines for the Town which he authored. It is his opinion that there will be no impact on the residential areas on the south side of Steeles both in terms of shadow and sky-view impacts. The 45 degree angular plane as advocated by Toronto is, in his opinion, not an appropriate tool to be used at this location because of the significant separation distances between the proposed residential towers and the low-rise homes south of Steeles.

Servicing:

Mr. Schaefer is the servicing engineer for the Applicant and is responsible for the site servicing design. He confirmed that Toronto staff expressed no concerns with the proposed site servicing design as it relates to storm water and sanitary sewers. The existing watermains are sufficient to accommodate the development, the proposal will continue to use the existing storm water connections, and the sanitary system will connect to the York/Durham sanitary system. There will eventually be a requirement for an additional sewer line under Steeles Avenue. Mr. Schaefer confirmed that the site will be appropriately serviced.

Transportation/Traffic:

Mr. Mihalj is the Applicant's traffic engineering expert who conducted a number of traffic impact studies for the redevelopment proposal. He confirmed that his studies were circulated and reviewed by the Town, Region and Toronto. He testified that Toronto staff noted no significant infiltration of traffic from the proposal at the existing signalized intersection into the Townsend neighbourhood on the south of Steeles. Based on his traffic analysis, it is his conclusion that the existing road network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposal. He testified that this intersection (Don Mills and Steeles) is typical of many busy intersections within the GTA where at peak traffic periods the level of service is rated at F (the worse rating). It is his opinion that the added road traffic generated by this proposal would be marginal to the existing traffic patterns at this intersection. He noted that the Minutes of Settlement require further traffic impact studies to be done at each phase of the redevelopment to measure traffic impacts on the surrounding road network.

Planning:

Four planners spoke in support of the redevelopment proposal. Ms Gatzios and Mr. Blake proffered land use planning evidence and Messrs. Sorensen and Butler proffered policy planning evidence in support of the proposed OPA and ZBLA and the Minutes of Settlement.

Ms Gatzios is of the opinion that the revised proposal in terms of density, mix of uses and the site layout are appropriate for the site and compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood context. She holds the view that the location of the residential component at the eastern part of the site next to Hwy. 404 is the best possible location given that it creates the least impact to the residential uses to the south and the north. The Town's OP permits residential uses on the site but the secondary plan does not. The site has been identified as a major corridor site for residential intensification by the Town. The proposal achieves the Town's 60 percent residential intensification target. The proposed ZBLA and OPA would in her opinion implement a redevelopment proposal that is much needed for the existing plaza which has been in existence since the 1960s. The proposed OPA is consistent with the Town's OP and the ZBLA conforms to both the Town's OP and the Secondary Plan for the subject lands. The proposed development will help achieve the Town's intensification targets and is consistent with the residential intensification policies of the PPS 2005 and the Growth Plan (GP).

Mr. Blake, planner for the Town and author of several staff reports concerning the redevelopment proposal supports the planning opinions of Ms Gatzios. It is his view that the settlement represents a good balance among competing interests and represents good planning. He notes that planning staff held the view that there was significant residential intensification potential for the site and that the issue was one of appropriate density and location. Mr. Blake testified that the various iterations of the applications were properly circulated to Toronto for comments and that the response from Toronto planning staff related only to the angular plane of the proposed residential towers. Toronto staff participated in working group meetings up to April 2010. He also testified that it was his staff report of November 2010 which suggested that 1,000 residential units be used as guideline to aid in the negotiation process with the Applicant. This was in response to the Applicant's original proposal of 1,787 units. He

testified that it was never the position of Markham Council to use this number of units as a final non-negotiable target.

Both Messrs. Sorensen and Butler proffered policy planning evidence in support of the proposed OPA and ZBLA. Mr. Butler testified that the residential component of 1,235 units is consistent with the Town's Growth Management Strategy. The Town has adopted a 60 percent residential intensification target to help achieve its population growth forecasts. This intersection falls within the Town's hierarchy of where it wants to direct growth through residential intensification. In his opinion it is an ideal site for intensification given its proximity to major arterial roads and the Highway 404. He had no concerns with the retail/commercial component of the proposal adding that it is an excellent revitalization proposal. Mr. Sorensen supports the planning opinions of Mr. Butler. It is his view that the existing mall is in dire need of revitalization and the redevelopment proposal fulfills the residential intensification policies of the PPS and the GP as it relates to focussing intensification in built up areas that are served by public infrastructure and transit.

The Participants' Concerns:

The common concern shared by those Participants in opposition was the potential traffic that would be generated from this proposal. The Board heard that the Steeles and Don Mills intersection is very busy and backups during rush hour are common. Residents are concerned that cars will use local streets as shortcuts and that there will be traffic infiltration into the neighbourhoods south and west of the subject site. There were objections to the density and the clustering of the residential component to the east of the site. The residential towers are too high and the number of units should be scaled back to no more than 1,000 units spread across the site in buildings no taller than six storeys. This was a view advanced by Councillor Shiner and other Participants.

Two Participants claimed that the proposed towers will have a sun shadow impact on their homes. Councillor Shiner expressed concern that the proposal will put undue stress on the storm and sanitary sewers under Steeles Avenue. Residents were concerned with the types of stores that would be located in the proposal fearing that the renovated mall will go upscale and local residents would not be able to shop there.

There was also a concern that the existing food court is used as a community gathering area for local residents which would be lost in the renovated enclosed mall.

Some residents expressed the concern that by clustering the residential units to the east of the site that in the future the developer would seek approvals to build more residential units on other parts of the site.

One Participant spoke in support of the settlement proposal. Mr. Slotnick who lives on the south side of Steeles and is a member of the SOS Working Group expressed the view that the settlement represents the best compromise possible among the Parties. It is his view that the proposal will revitalize the existing plaza and benefit the surrounding neighbourhoods within the Town and Toronto. He was shocked by the implied threat by Toronto Council to close access to the existing mall from Steeles Avenue stating if this were done that it would cause traffic chaos to the surrounding neighbourhoods.

Board Findings and Reasons:

At this juncture before the Board delves into its findings and reasons, this panel of the Board makes the following observation. Toronto in opposing the settlement chose not to call any expert witnesses to proffer evidence in support of its position and to address its issues on the approved Issues List. Toronto decided to advance its case before this Board by relying on its Counsel's cross-examination of the aligned Parties expert witnesses, the concerns of the Participants and the closing arguments of its Counsel. This the Board views as unusual particularly in light of the motions passed by Toronto Council strongly opposing the settlement. Particularly the motion of April 12, 2011, which gave notice to the Town and the Region of its intention to close access to the existing shopping mall from Steeles Avenue at Townsend Road.

In making its findings, the Board gave consideration to the evidence of the expert witnesses, the filed witness statements, the submissions of Counsel and the concerns of the Participants that spoke at the hearing.

The only expert evidence given at this hearing were those proffered by the expert witnesses qualified in their respective fields in support of the redevelopment proposal.

This expert evidence included urban design, traffic, servicing, and planning. The Board finds that the testimony of these experts was unshaken under cross-examination by Toronto. Toronto brought no contrary expert evidence in support of its position. This is not to give short shrift to the concerns of the Participants which the Board finds to be legitimate concerns of the community. However, it is the Board's finding that these concerns were for the most part appropriately addressed by expert evidence proffered, the Minutes of Settlement and the conditions imposed by the Town.

With respect to the concerns of Toronto and the Participants, traffic at the intersection and potential traffic infiltration into the local neighbourhoods was of significant concern. The Board accepts the evidence of the traffic expert that the added traffic generated from this redevelopment proposal will be marginal to the existing traffic already generated at this intersection and that the existing road network is capable of accommodating the proposed development. The Board notes that the only concern raised by Toronto traffic staff in its review was potential traffic infiltration at Townsend Road into the Townsend neighbourhood.

However, the Board is cognizant of the valid concerns regarding potential traffic spill over onto Toronto streets south of Steeles. Counsel for Toronto pointed out in his closing submissions that holding provisions contained in the Minutes of Settlement are tied to future traffic studies that meet with the approval of the Town in consultation with the Region. He submitted that Toronto should be consulted during the review of these future traffic studies especially when it concerns potential traffic spill over onto Toronto streets. The Board agrees with Toronto's submission on this. Section 4.4 of the proposed Zoning By-law amendment is to be modified to state that Toronto's Director of Transportation Planning will be consulted on the additional transportation monitoring and impact studies required to be done as part of the conditions for removing the Hold.

With respect to the concerns of shadow impact and loss of sky view, it was the testimony of the urban design experts that the separation distances between the homes on the south side of Steeles and the proposed residential towers are such that there will be no shadow impacts. The concern of the Participant to the north of the site regarding shadow impact was proven to be unfounded as it was shown to her that the shadow studies indicated that her home would not be impacted. In light of the evidence given

the Board finds that there will be no shadow impacts to those homes on the south side of Steeles.

With respect to the servicing of the site, it was the evidence of the Applicant's servicing engineer that the existing watermains are sufficient to accommodate the development. The proposal will continue to use the existing storm water connections, and the sanitary system will connect to the York/Durham sanitary system. There will eventually be a requirement for an additional sewer line under Steeles Avenue. The Board notes that Toronto servicing/engineering staff in its review had no concerns on the servicing scheme as proposed. It was also the evidence of the servicing engineer that the requirement of the additional sewer line under Steeles Avenue would be dealt with through the normal course between the Region and Toronto as per the 1974 Agreement. The Board accepts the evidence of the servicing engineer.

With respect to the proposed density and clustering of the residential towers to the easterly portion of the site, Toronto argued that the Town's December 2010 proposal of 1,000 units spread across the entire site would be more appropriate and that the 45 degree angular plane should be applied to any tall buildings facing Steeles Avenue. Furthermore, it was Toronto's argument that the subject site has not been identified by the Town's Growth Management Strategy as designated for its 60 percent residential intensification target.

It was the evidence of the Town's planner that he had in fact suggested the 1,000 unit for the site as a negotiating basis with the Applicant in response to its original application for 1,787 residential units. He testified that the Town was not committed to this number nor did Council adopt any resolutions as such. Toronto did not bring any contrary expert evidence to support its proposal of 1,000 units spread across the entire site. The Board accepts the evidence of the two architects and the two planners that the internal site design layout of the redevelopment proposal with the residential component to the east of the site as being the most efficient and creating the least impact to the homes on the south side of Steeles. The Board finds that the density as proposed is appropriate for the site.

The Board finds that the separation distances between the proposed residential towers and the homes on the south side of Steeles to be sufficiently wide that there will

be no shadow impact or loss of sky view on the homes south of Steeles. Given the separation distances the Board finds that it is not necessary to apply Toronto's 45 degree angular plane standard at this location (Board emphasis). This finding relates to this location only for the reasons stated and it is not to be interpreted to apply elsewhere along Steeles Avenue.

With respect to the Town's 60 percent residential intensification target, the Board accepts the evidence of Messrs. Butler and Sorensen that the proposed density is consistent with the residential intensification target found in the Town's Urban Management Strategy.

With respect to the concern of the residents that there is no designated community space within the proposal even though the use will be permitted in the amending ZBL, it is the Board's view that this is a legitimate concern and during the hearing encouraged the Town to investigate. As part of its closing submissions, the Town confirmed that the proposed ZBL will be modified to include publicly accessible mall space for community gathering similar to the type of community gathering space currently in existence at the mall.

Conclusion:

It is for all the aforementioned reasons that the Board finds that the Minutes of Settlement to be satisfactory subject to the Board modification relating to future traffic monitoring and impact studies. It is the Board's view that this redevelopment proposal will bring much needed revitalization of this shopping centre and the subject lands. The Board is satisfied that the redevelopment of this site with the clustered residential component is compatible with the surrounding uses and will fit within the context of the surrounding neighbourhood.

The proposed amendment to the Official Plan found in the Minutes of Settlement is satisfactory subject to the addendum regarding the inclusion of community space in the renovated mall. The proposed Zoning By-law amendment is satisfactory subject to the modification that Toronto's Director of Transportation Planning will be consulted on the additional transportation monitoring and impact studies required to be done as part of the conditions for removing the Hold. The ZBL amendment conforms to the Town's

OP, and it is not premature. The Board finds that both amending documents meet the planning policies of the Province, Region and the Town.

Therefore it is the decision of the Board that:

1. The Appeal is allowed and the Official Plan for the Town of Markham is amended in accordance with the form of document attached as Schedule "C" to the Minutes of Settlement and as amended by addendum.
2. The Appeal is allowed and By-law No. 2612 of the Town of Markham is amended in accordance with the form of document attached as Schedule "D" to the Minutes of Settlement subject to the modification as stated in this Decision.
3. The Minutes of Settlement found in Exhibit 4 are satisfactory subject to the modifications as stated in this Decision.

The Board will withhold its Order approving the amendments to the OP and ZBL pending receipt of written notification from the Town's solicitor that the Section 37 Agreement attached as Schedule "E" to the Minutes of Settlement has been executed by Bayview and receipt of the modified OP and ZBL amendments in accordance with the Board's Decision.

"J. Chee-Hing"

J. CHEE-HING
MEMBER