

# Formal Objection Report

324 Old Yonge Street

Submitted to: City Clerk, City of Toronto

Submitted by: Biao Liu, Registered Owner

Date: August 26, 2025

# Table of Contents

1. Procedural Irregularities in the Heritage Process
  2. Substantial Alterations Undermine Heritage Integrity
  3. Environmental Contamination & Public Health Threat
  4. Structural Damage and Cost-Prohibitive Repairs
  5. Selective and Inconsistent Designation
  6. Limited Historical Association
  7. Overstated Architectural Value
  8. Financial Burden to Owner
  9. Procedural Fairness and Prioritization Concerns
  10. Group Heritage Value Cannot Be Preserved by Designating One Property
- Conclusion and Homeowner's Intentions
- Attachments

Objection to Notice of Intention to Designate – 324 Old Yonge Street

To:

City Clerk, City of Toronto    Attention: Heritage Planning

Re: Objection to Notice of Intention to Designate — 324 Old Yonge Street (Part IV, s.29 Ontario Heritage Act)

From: Biao Liu, Registered Owner

Date: 2025/08/26

Dear City Clerk,

I am the registered owner of 324 Old Yonge Street. I hereby object to Council's stated intention to designate my property under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act ("OHA"), for the following reasons.

## **1. Procedural Irregularities in the Heritage Process**

As a matter of law and practice, under Section 29(2) of the Ontario Heritage Act, where a municipality has appointed a municipal heritage committee, Council must consult with its heritage committee before issuing a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID). Importantly, the process of designation is not supposed to originate at the request of the heritage committee itself. Instead, designation should be initiated by Council, with advice from its committee, and always with notice to the property owner.

In the case of 324 Old Yonge Street, this process has not been properly followed:

The designation process appears to have been initiated at the instigation of a local heritage advisory body with the intent of halting development of the property, rather than by Council through an independent and balanced review of its merits.

The homeowner was given no prior notice that the property was under consideration for designation. At no stage were owners informed that the building was being studied for heritage value, nor was there consultation to discuss impacts, remediation, or alternatives such as relocation.

The staff report simply acts as a conduit for the Heritage Designation Brief requested by the advisory committee, rather than an independent, balanced evaluation.

This raises serious concerns about due process and fairness. The designation process must be transparent, follow the statutory sequence in S.29 of the Act, and respect the rights of property owners. Where Council merely adopts the advisory committee's request without

independent assessment or notice to the affected owner, the process is procedurally defective.

## 2. Substantial Alterations Undermine Heritage Integrity

The Ontario Heritage Act requires that designation be based on identifiable heritage attributes that retain sufficient integrity to convey cultural value. In this case, the City's own Statement of Significance and research report acknowledge multiple alterations that materially compromise the building's integrity as a Georgian Revival residence:

**Original Entrance Lost:** The neoclassical hood with shell motif at the principal entrance was removed and replaced with a later porch. The main façade's central entryway, often the defining feature of Georgian Revival design, no longer exists in original form.

**Roofline Altered:** The front roofline has been significantly modified. Where it once sat neatly behind the front parapet (as it still does at the rear), it now presents a splayed base that changes the original proportions and silhouette.

**Decorative Elements Removed:** The classical urns that originally crowned the front parapet corners were removed during the roof alteration, erasing ornamental details that the City now points to as evidence of "fine craftsmanship."

**Garage Altered:** The detached garage was modified with a canopy addition in the mid-20th century, linking it awkwardly to the house. This non-original feature interrupts the architectural separation intended by the original design. Moreover, records confirm the **garage was constructed in 1956** and therefore could not have been designed by Allward & Gouinlock.

**Exterior Material Changes:** Historic photographs show that the house was originally unpainted brick. The exterior brick has since been painted white, further obscuring original fabric and craftsmanship.

These changes affect nearly every elevation and major character-defining element the City highlights in its heritage attributes list. The loss of original entrance detailing, roofline proportions, and decorative urns in particular diminishes the property's ability to be considered a representative or intact example of Georgian Revival architecture.

Ontario Regulation 9/06 requires that, for a property to be designated on design or physical value, it must be **"a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method."** By the City's own evidence, the building no longer fully reflects this style, having lost multiple defining attributes.

In addition, standard conservation guidance (including the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada) emphasizes that **when original fabric is**



**heavily altered or removed, the heritage value is weakened, and designation should be reconsidered.**

Thus, while the City asserts Georgian Revival character as justification for designation, the documented alterations show that the property is a compromised, partial example, not an intact or representative one. The integrity of the resource has been so diminished that it cannot reasonably sustain the weight of designation under the Act.

### **3. Environmental Contamination & Public Health Threat**

The Ontario Heritage Act must be applied consistently with other binding provincial statutes, including the **Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.E.19**, and the **Building Code Act, 1992**. A municipality cannot compel preservation of a structure that is contaminated or unsafe in violation of these laws.

Specifically, petroleum hydrocarbon leakage from underground storage tanks is recognized as a contaminant under **s.1** of the Environmental Protection Act, and its discharge is prohibited under **s.14**. Requiring preservation of a structure whose foundation soils are saturated with fuel oil directly conflicts with these provisions.

A heritage property must be capable of safe occupation and conservation without endangering residents, neighbours, or the public. A designation that entrenches the preservation of a contaminated, unsafe structure runs contrary to the public interest that the Act is intended to serve.

This property presents exactly such risks:

**Buried Heating Oil Tank & Ongoing Leakage:** The house was historically heated with oil, and a buried fuel tank has remained in the ground for decades. Evidence suggests it has been leaking, as every sump pump cycle produces oily, odorous water. **(Refer to attachment 1)** This is consistent with petroleum contamination of soil and groundwater.

**Prohibition on Hazardous Discharges:** Discharging oily water to the sewer is expressly prohibited under the Toronto Sewer By-law (Municipal Code Chapter 681), which classifies petroleum hydrocarbons as “prohibited wastes.” Allowing designation of a property that cannot comply with municipal health and safety by-laws is inconsistent with responsible governance.

#### **Toxic Substances and Health Impacts:**

Benzene, a common petroleum component, is classified by Health Canada as a Group 1 human carcinogen linked to leukemia, bone marrow suppression, and immune system damage (Health Canada – Benzene Fact Sheet <https://gost.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/Contfs.aspx?ID=8&lang=eng>).

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency warns that underground storage tank leaks pose risks of groundwater contamination, vapor intrusion into homes, and long-term cancer risk (EPA – Underground Storage Tanks <https://www.epa.gov/ust>).

The Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA) in Ontario confirms that fuel oil spills are among the most frequent and costly residential environmental hazards, with remediation costs often reaching the tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars (TSSA – Oil Tanks <https://www.tssa.org/fuel-oil>).

**Engineering Assessment:** My consulting engineer has advised that proper remediation would require complete excavation of the basement soils, which would destabilize the foundation and could destroy the structure. This demonstrates that practical conservation of the house is incompatible with proper environmental remediation.

**Financial and Institutional Burden:** Cleanup costs for home heating oil contamination in Canada are routinely reported in the range of tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of dollars (Insurance Business Canada). Imposing designation in this context places an untenable burden on the homeowner while failing to address the underlying hazard.

**Conclusion on Public Health:** A contaminated property that leaches petroleum hydrocarbons into groundwater, produces oily effluent, and emits hazardous vapors cannot be considered an appropriate candidate for heritage designation. To do so would contravene the principles of the Ontario Heritage Act, which is meant to conserve cultural heritage in the public interest, not to compel the preservation of unsafe, hazardous structures.

While the Ontario Heritage Act empowers municipalities to designate, it must be applied in harmony with broader laws and policies protecting public health and safety. Council cannot reasonably designate a property that is contaminated, structurally unsafe, or poses risks to occupants or neighbours. Doing so would contradict the public interest purpose of Section 29, conflict with the Ontario Building Code Act and Environmental Protection Act, and disregard the Provincial Policy Statement's direction to balance heritage conservation with health and safety.

Refer to

- OHA Section 29 (discretionary designation),
- OHA Section 34 (alteration/demolition subject to other laws), and
- Provincial Policy Statement (2020, Section 2.6.1 & public health policy lens)

#### **4. Structural Damage and Cost-Prohibitive Repairs**

The property has been uninhabitable for more than four years, suffering repeated flooding, foundation leakage, and severe cracking. These conditions have rendered the building unsafe and unsuitable for occupancy.

Independent sources confirm the extent of deterioration. A photo-essay on abandoned Ontario mansions documents that the house at 324 Old Yonge Street has been vacant for years, with damage from flooding and vandalism, and that it was at one point occupied by homeless individuals. **(Refer to attachment 2)** This has accelerated the property's decline and introduced further below-ground damage and safety concerns (Talking Walls Photography – Abandoned \$6M Doctor's Mansion <https://www.talkingwallsphoto.com/abandoned-ontario-mansions/the-abandoned-6-million-doctors-mansion/>).

Municipal guidance is clear that basement flooding can cause serious structural damage, requiring extensive and costly repairs to foundations, drainage systems, and walls before a home can be safely occupied (City of Toronto – Basement Flooding).

Repairing such structural failures would be extraordinarily costly and disproportionate relative to the property's diminished heritage value. Unlike typical conservation work, these repairs involve major excavation, structural stabilization, and environmental remediation. This imposes a level of financial and technical burden far beyond what is reasonable to expect from a private homeowner.

**In these circumstances, imposing designation would unfairly force the preservation of a property that is both unsafe and financially unfeasible to restore.**

## **5. Selective and Inconsistent Designation**

The City's heritage report emphasizes that 324 Old Yonge Street is "one of the seven original mansions" constructed in the 1930s along Old Yonge Street. However, the treatment of these properties has been selective and inconsistent:

Three of the original seven mansions have already been demolished.

Of the four that remain, several (including 372 and 388 Old Yonge Street) were listed on the City's Heritage Register much earlier than my property but have not been designated to date. Despite their longer listing history, stronger architectural integrity and well maintained condition **(Refer to attachment 3)**, the City has chosen to issue a Notice of Intention to Designate against my property first.

This approach is both inconsistent and unfair. If the heritage value lies in the ensemble of seven properties, as the City's report suggests, then protecting only one of them in isolation undermines the very rationale advanced for designation. Conversely, if each property is being evaluated on its own merits, there is no transparent explanation for why my house

has been prioritized over 372 and 388 Old Yonge Street, which were listed nearly 15 years earlier and retain substantial intact features.

Under Ontario Regulation 9/06, municipal councils are expected to apply criteria consistently. Arbitrary or selective application of designation powers is contrary to the principles of fairness and undermines public confidence in the City's heritage program. The Ontario Heritage Act contemplates that the heritage register and designation process will be used to conserve properties in a rational and transparent manner, not in an ad hoc fashion.

The inconsistency is further underscored by the City's own acknowledgment that with over 4,000 listed properties, it cannot possibly designate them all and must therefore "prioritize" which properties move forward. Without a clear, published, Council-approved prioritization framework, the selection of my property appears arbitrary. This lack of transparency creates the impression of unfair treatment and erodes the credibility of the designation process itself.

In summary, singling out 324 Old Yonge Street while leaving comparable or stronger candidates undesignated is neither fair nor logical. Unless the City can demonstrate clear and consistent criteria that explain this prioritization, the proposed designation should not proceed.

## **6. Limited Historical Association**

While the City's NOID refers to city directories as indicating occupancy by Alfred Jephcott until 1940, no independent archival evidence corroborates this claim, and there is no record of Jephcott or Sanderson having civic or cultural significance. Alfred Jephcott constructed the house as a gift for his daughter. His son-in-law, Arthur Sanderson, was a salesman and later secretary-treasurer of a brick company, but he was not a figure of historical significance in Toronto's civic, cultural, or economic life. Subsequent owners, including an insurance broker, similarly had no influence of broader historical importance.

Ontario Regulation 9/06 establishes that, in order for a property to have associative or historical value, it must have "direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community."

As noted in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Evaluating Heritage Properties booklet, 2021, Criterion 4 offers a two-part test:

1. The association is direct - whether the property exemplifies or has strong evidence of its connection to a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution.
2. It is significant to the community - because a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution has made a strong, noticeable or influential contribution to the evolution or pattern of settlement and development in the community.

Candidate properties **must meet both these tests to meet this criterion.**

In this case, no such association exists. The individuals connected with the property do not meet the threshold of significance contemplated under the regulation.

This absence of recognition is also reflected in community awareness. A recent survey of neighbors demonstrated that approximately 90% of local residents have no knowledge of the Jephcott or Sanderson families at all. This lack of enduring community recognition underscores that the property does not contribute to the understanding of a historically significant person or family, and therefore fails to satisfy the associative value criteria required for designation.

## **7. Overstated Architectural Value**

The City's report places emphasis on the architectural pedigree of the firm Allward & Gouinlock, suggesting that their involvement elevates the heritage value of the property. However, this claim is overstated and does not withstand closer scrutiny.

**Timeline Inconsistency in Attribution:** The City's report contains a factual inconsistency in dating the construction (finished in 1935 **Refer to attachment 4**) against the founding of Allward & Gouinlock (**April 1935**). This discrepancy demonstrates that the attribution of the house to that firm is at best partial and likely overstated. Any involvement by the firm would have been limited to completion or minor design input, not the original conception. Furthermore, the **adjacent garage was not constructed until 1956**, as confirmed by the MPAC property records (**Refer to attachment 4**). This means that even the secondary structure on the lot, sometimes cited as part of the "ensemble," falls outside the timeframe of Allward & Gouinlock's practice. Their direct contribution to the property is therefore minimal. Accordingly, the claimed "associative value" with a prominent architectural practice should carry little or no weight in determining cultural heritage value under **Ontario Regulation 9/06**.

**Not a Distinctive Work in the Architects' Portfolio:** Allward & Gouinlock designed numerous homes, civic buildings, and institutional structures across Toronto and Ontario. Many of their works — such as public schools, theatres, and more prominent residences — are stronger and more intact examples of their design philosophy. By comparison, 324 Old Yonge Street is neither a unique nor a particularly representative specimen.

**Contemporary Assessment Questioned Its Value:** Historical sources from the 1930s described the house as a "modernish interpretation of Queen Anne" rather than a pure exemplar of Georgian Revival. Even at the time of construction, the design was viewed as a derivative interpretation rather than a masterwork.

**Architectural Integrity Compromised:** As detailed in Ground 2, major alterations have removed or obscured defining Georgian Revival features— including the original entrance, urns, and roofline. This further weakens its claim as a valuable architectural exemplar.

**Lack of Public Recognition:** Architectural significance should be supported not only by authorship but also by recognition and resonance within the community. A recent informal survey of neighbours showed that the majority had never heard of Allward & Gouinlock and did not associate this property with architectural distinction. Without public awareness or recognition, it is difficult to argue that the house contributes meaningfully to the community's understanding of the architects' legacy.

Ontario Regulation 9/06: Under provincial criteria, a property may be designated for its design or physical value if it is “**a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.**” Given its derivative style, compromised integrity, and limited public recognition, 324 Old Yonge Street does not meet this threshold.

In short, while the architects were active in Toronto's early 20th-century building scene, this particular property does not represent a rare or outstanding example of their work. To suggest otherwise inflates its significance and misapplies the designation criteria.

## **8. Financial Burden to Owner**

The City's heritage report asserts that designation has “no financial impact.” This statement is misleading and does not reflect the true circumstances of this property. In reality, the financial burden on the homeowner is overwhelming:

**Extraordinary Cost of Repairs:** The property suffers from repeated flooding, a leaking and cracked foundation, and contamination from a buried oil tank. Based on a written quotation from a licensed contractor, remediation and structural stabilization are estimated at **\$812,000.00 (HST inclusive)**. This figure covers:

- Full excavation and disposal of contaminated soils,
- Waterproofing and reconstruction of the basement foundation, and
- Structural stabilization.

This cost is extraordinary and cannot be categorized as “ordinary maintenance.” By contrast, the City's Heritage Property Grant Program provides only limited assistance (typically capped at \$50,000), which is grossly inadequate in these circumstances.

**Designation Restricts Options:** Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act compounds this burden by imposing restrictions on alteration or redevelopment. Instead of allowing the owner to pursue more cost-effective solutions (such as replacement with new construction), designation would compel investment into preserving a structure that is already unsafe, heavily altered, and environmentally compromised.

**Limited Grants and Assistance:** The City offers only very modest heritage grant programs that cover a small percentage of eligible conservation costs, often capped at tens of thousands of dollars. These programs are wholly inadequate in the face of an \$800,000 remediation bill. Unlike income-producing designated properties (such as commercial or institutional buildings), homeowners receive little meaningful financial support for designation.

**Impact on Financing and Market Value:** Designation also limits financing and refinancing options, as lenders may be reluctant to extend credit on properties subject to regulatory restrictions and extraordinary remediation liabilities. Moreover, contaminated properties with high repair costs and heritage restrictions often suffer from diminished market value, further penalizing the homeowner.

Ontario Regulation 9/06 requires municipalities to consider whether the property meets heritage value criteria; however, even if arguable value exists, Council retains discretion and should weigh whether designation is reasonable in the public interest. Imposing designation in circumstances where the property is environmentally hazardous, structurally compromised, and would cost nearly a million dollars to repair is unreasonable and inequitable.

**Conclusion on Financial Burden:** Far from having “no financial impact,” designation would trap the homeowner in an untenable position — required to preserve a structure that is unsafe, contaminated, and ruinously expensive to restore, with little to no meaningful assistance. In these circumstances, designation would not serve the public interest and should not proceed.

## **9. Procedural Fairness and Prioritization Concerns**

City heritage staff (Clint Robertson) has acknowledged that it is not possible to complete the designation process for all 4,000 listed heritage properties. This means the City must prioritize which properties are brought forward for designation. However, the criteria used for prioritization have not been publicly disclosed, nor does there appear to be a Council-approved policy governing these decisions.

This lack of transparency raises serious concerns:

**Arbitrary Selection:** My property has been singled out for designation ahead of 372 and 388 Old Yonge Street, which have been listed on the Heritage Register for a much longer period and retain stronger architectural integrity. Without clear criteria, this choice appears arbitrary.

**Absence of Public Oversight:** There is no evidence that Council debated or approved the prioritization sequence. This raises questions as to whether staff decisions are being made in a consistent and accountable manner.

**Risk of Bias or Improper Influence:** Where decisions are made without clear, published criteria or transparent oversight, there is a heightened risk of favoritism, bias, or even corruption. I do not allege misconduct, but the absence of transparent rules creates the perception that decisions may not be based solely on heritage merit. The credibility of the entire designation program is undermined if property owners cannot see the fair and consistent application of policy.

**Institutional Fairness:** The Ontario Heritage Act entrusts municipalities with balancing private property rights and public heritage interests. To do so legitimately, the process must be reasonable, fair, and impartial. Where prioritization decisions are opaque, the designation risks being procedurally unfair and vulnerable to challenge.

Conclusion on Procedural Fairness: Unless the City can produce a publicly approved, transparent framework explaining why my property was chosen ahead of others with longer listing histories and stronger heritage credentials, the process cannot be seen as fair. This undermines the legitimacy of the Notice of Intention to Designate and raises concerns about accountability, institutional integrity, and the possibility of improper influence in heritage decision-making.

## **10. Group Heritage Value Cannot Be Preserved by Designating One Property**

The City's designation report asserts that my property is significant as one of the "seven original mansions" constructed in the 1930s along Old Yonge Street. This argument relies heavily on the group or ensemble value of these houses as a cluster of "grand residences" that once defined the character of the area.

However, the City's current approach contradicts its own rationale:

**Fragmented Protection:** Of the original seven mansions, three have already been demolished. Of the four that survive, my property has been singled out for designation while others, including 372 and 388 Old Yonge Street, remain listed but undesignated — despite being on the Heritage Register for a much longer time and possessing greater integrity.

**Loss of Contextual Value:** Under Ontario Regulation 9/06, contextual value requires that a property be important in "defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area." This inherently implies collective significance. Protecting only one house from a group undermines the very contextual argument the City advances. A single designation cannot meaningfully conserve the "ensemble value" that the City itself identifies.

**Best Practice in Heritage Planning:** The appropriate tool for conserving a group of related properties is a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. HCDs allow municipalities to protect and manage the character of an area as a whole, ensuring fairness and consistency among property owners and preventing selective



treatment. By contrast, designating only one property isolates it, imposes disproportionate burdens on a single homeowner, and fails to secure the intended heritage value.

**Unfair Burden on One Owner:** If the heritage significance truly lies in the group, then requiring one homeowner to bear the cost and restrictions of designation while neighbouring properties with equal or greater significance remain undesignated is fundamentally inequitable. This selective approach imposes obligations on one property that are not shared across the ensemble, despite the City's claim that the value resides in the group.

**Conclusion on Group Value:** If the heritage importance of the Old Yonge mansions is to be recognized, the City should evaluate and designate the surviving properties together through a Heritage Conservation District, or not at all. Singling out my house alone is inconsistent with both the stated rationale of group value and accepted best practices in heritage planning.

## **Conclusion and Homeowner's Intentions**

For the reasons outlined in this objection, the proposed designation of 324 Old Yonge Street under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act should not proceed. The property suffers from extensive structural damage, environmental contamination, financial burdens, and a lack of consistent historical or architectural integrity. The City's selective and inconsistent approach to designation, coupled with procedural defects and fairness concerns, further undermines the legitimacy of this process.

Importantly, I wish to make it clear that I have no intention to demolish the house. My goal is not to erase the building, but to find a practical and balanced solution that respects both heritage considerations and the realities of the property's condition. Specifically, I am planning to relocate the existing house to the north side of the lot with the assistance of a professional house-moving company. **(Refer to attachment 5)**

This relocation would:

**Preserve the heritage building** in its entirety, without damage, by using specialized structural relocation methods.

**Maintain the cultural heritage value**, since the building itself (form, style, materials, and architectural details) is fully retained.

**Allow efficient land use**, enabling the lot to be severed into two parcels for future residential development.

**Ensure compatibility with the surrounding streetscape**, as the relocated house would remain visible along Old Yonge Street while freeing southern frontage for additional housing.

**Avoid environmental risks**, as relocation can occur after remediation of soil conditions (e.g., sump pump oil contamination).

This approach demonstrates that I am acting in good faith and am committed to a solution that balances heritage conservation with safety, environmental, and financial realities. By pursuing relocation rather than demolition, I am preserving the building in a way that is structurally feasible and aligned with the broader goals of the Ontario Heritage Act, while also ensuring that the property can be put to responsible and productive use.

In the context of the **current housing crisis**, preserving a dilapidated private mansion does not serve the public interest. Designating this property as a “unique example of a residence for an affluent owner” runs counter to the objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement, which requires a balanced approach between heritage conservation and other public policy goals such as housing and land use.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge City Council to withdraw the current Notice of Intention to Designate and instead engage with me in a constructive dialogue on how best to balance heritage considerations with practical solutions for this property.

Sincerely,

Biao Liu -----Owner, 324 Old Yonge Street

Contact info:

Cell: 647-713-8878

Email: [343964611@qq.com](mailto:343964611@qq.com)

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1---Oil contamination from sump pump

Attachment 2---Water and structure damage

Attachment 3---372 Old Yonge with stronger heritage value and well mainta

Attachment 4---MPAC report

Attachment 5---Proposed relocation of the house

## ATTACHMENT 1





## ATTACHMENT 2







### ATTACHMENT 3











## ATTACHMENT 4



### REALTOR® Residential Detail Report

Emily Moon  
ON  
(416) 647-8770  
info@emilymoon.ca



Property Address	324 OLD YONGE ST
Municipality	CITY OF TORONTO
Roll Number	190808242104100
Property Code & Description	301 - Single-family detached (not on water)

#### Services

Hydro	Private Water	Private Sanitary
Hydro available	-	-

#### Lot Details

Frontage (ft)	Depth (ft)	Site Area (A)	Site Access	Site Variance
164.79	205.06	0.78	Year Round Road Access	Irregular

On-Site Variables	Abuts Variables	Proximity Variables	Waterfront Variables
MAJOR TRANSIT STATION AREA	ABUTS MULTI-RESIDENTIAL		
OFFICIAL PLAN DESIGNATED - RESIDENTIAL			

#### Permit Details

Currently, MPAC'S records indicate that there are no building permits for this property.

## Primary Structures

Structure Description	SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED
Year Built	1935
Total Floor Area (Above Grade sqft)	5,454
Total Floor Area Range	5,000+
First Floor Area (sqft)	2,427
Second Floor Area (sqft)	2,427
Third Floor Area (sqft)	600
Basement Total Area (sqft)	2,361
Basement Finished Area (sqft)	-
Heating	Hot Water (boiler)
Air Conditioning	Y
Full Storeys	2
Partial Storeys	3/4 storey
Bedrooms	5
Full Bathrooms	4
Half Bathrooms	0
Renovation Year	-
Renovation Code	-
Addition Year	-
Addition Area (sqft)	-
Split Level	No Split
Structure Condition	Average
Fireplace Total	2
Structure Design Type	NOT DEFINED
Structure Variables	-
Condo Floor Level	-
Condo Parking Spaces	-
Condo Standard Lockers	-
Condo Oversize Lockers	-
Condo Indoor Parking	-

## Garage Structures

Structure Description	DETACHED GARAGE
Year Built	1956
Total Area (sqft)	776
Garage Spaces	0

ATTACHMENT 5

