

DECISION AND ORDER

Decision Issue Date Friday, October 20, 2017

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 45 (1) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended (the "Act")

Appellant(s): JOHNNY CHOWDHURY, WOOD BULL LLP

Applicant: CARLOS SALAZAR

Subject(s): 45(1)

Property Address/Description: 598 SOUDAN AVE

Committee of Adjustment Case File Number: 17 105715 STE 22 MV (A0048/17TEY)
TLAB Case File Number: **17 168128 S45 22 TLAB**

Hearing date: Friday, September 15, 2017

DECISION DELIVERED BY G. Burton

APPEARANCES

Parties

Johnny Chowdhury
City of Toronto

Representative

Raj Kehar*
D. Elmadany*
Laura Bisset*
(*counsel)

Participants

Andy Gort, SERRA
Andrea Elliott
Suzanne Chung

INTRODUCTION

This is an appeal from a decision of the Committee of Adjustment ("COA") decision dated May 10, 2017 that denied the applicants' request for alterations to approved building permit plans for a two storey detached dwelling. They wished to add a rear second floor addition, a rear deck and a front porch, as well as a flat roof design. The appellants had requested 11 variances, 7 from By-law 569-2013 (the "new By-law") and 4 from By-law 438-86 (the former "Toronto by-law").

The applicants subsequently revised the plans that had already been filed with the TLAB on July 4, 2017 as required for the appeal. In later discussions with the Zoning Examiner, they obtained a revised zoning certificate based on the revised plans. The new certificate or ZCC was dated July 14, 2017. The result is that there are revisions now sought to the variances as refused by the COA.

BACKGROUND

The property is located at the northwest corner of Soudan Avenue and Mann Avenue, in the Davisville Village neighbourhood. It is zoned R (d0.6)(x930) under the new By-law, and R2 Z0.6 under the Toronto By-law. The dwelling was constructed of brick in about 1939, with a rear garage (to be retained.) The factual background of this appeal is complicated by the fact that after an initial October 24, 2016 building permit was granted, construction began under it. Then applications were made to COA to approve amendments to the plans as they evolved.

Considerable construction of the addition has already occurred legitimately under the permit (Exhibit 4, Applicant's TLAB presentation, p. 17). This point should be recalled by the objectors. At some point the concept changed, resulting in the application to the COA for variances. The original permit was for additions to the first storey at the rear, and a partial second storey. This may be seen in the revised plans filed with TLAB on July 6. These illustrate the present proposed construction as well (Exhibit 4.) The original concept did not include the complete extension of the second storey to the rear of the structure as presently contemplated, and before the TLAB in this appeal. As mentioned, application had been made Jan. 17, 2017 to the COA for variances to permit an extension. The COA refused to grant the variances.

This decision was then appealed to the Toronto Local Appeal Body ("TLAB") under s. 45(12) of the *Planning Act* (the "Act") by the Applicants Mr. Johnny Chowdhury and Ms. Mariya Kordonska. The City of Toronto gave notice of the intention to seek Party status under TLAB Rule 12.2 and became a party to the appeal. The South Eglinton Ratepayers' and Residents' Association ("SERRA"), and three neighbours gave notice of an intention to become Participants to this appeal, as permitted by the TLAB's Rule 14.2. In the end, Ms. Andrea Elliott (5 Hoyle Ave.) and Ms. Suzanne Chung (592 Soudan) attended, but only Ms. Elliott could stay to testify. Mr. Andy Gort gave evidence on behalf of SERRA, of which he is a former president, also in opposition to the application.

Following discussions with neighbours and the City, the applicants have further revised the requested variances. The revisions had been reviewed by the Zoning Examiner prior to the ZCC issued on July 4, 2017, then further discussed with them following the discovery of a discrepancy in the dimensions related to the building depth. A final ZCC issued on July 14, indicating the required variances as outlined below and shown on the plans.

The present "high level" description of the proposal, as given in the testimony of the planning witness Mr. Tyler Grinyer, is: to permit a rear second storey addition over the present first storey addition (already built to the permit issued), with a flat roof rather than the mansard shown previously in the plans. The existing front yard setback, and the side yard setbacks for the present structure would be largely maintained for a short distance, although minor variances are technically needed for that distance.

JURISDICTION

On an appeal, the TLAB must be satisfied that each of the variances sought meets the tests in subsection 45(1) of the Act. This involves a reconsideration of all the variances considered by

the Committee, in the physical and planning context. The subsection requires a conclusion that each of the variances, individually and cumulatively:

- is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure;
- maintains the general intent and purpose of the official plan;
- maintains the general intent and purpose of the zoning by-law; and
- is minor.

These are usually expressed as the “four tests”, and all must be satisfied for each variance. In addition, TLAB must have regard to matters of provincial interest as set out in section 2 of the Act, the variances must be consistent with provincial policy statements and conform with provincial plans, as set out in s. 3 of the Act. A decision of the TLAB must therefore be consistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (‘PPS’) and conform to (or not conflict with) any provincial plan such as the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (‘Growth Plan’) for the subject area.

Under s. 2.1 (1) of the Planning Act, TLAB is also to have regard for the earlier Committee decision and the materials that were before that body.

To the extent that the variances requested differ from those before the COA, I accept that the Applicants’ proposed revisions are reductions from the original application. As such, I find that no further notice is required pursuant to s. 45 (18.1.1) of the Act, and the revisions can be considered.

MATTERS IN ISSUE

The first storey rear extension as permitted by the 2016 permit has been constructed. The side yard setbacks relate only to the second storey extension as of now, and not the existing side yards as built. Thus it is relatively easier for the objectors and the TLAB to assess the impact that the requested variances relating to the extension, as well as a balcony at the rear of it, might have on the neighbourhood and the abutting streets. Impact must be assessed as part of the section 45(1) tests.

There were preliminary objections to late filing by participants of their intent to attend, and of an arborist’s report, as not upholding the TLAB’s rules on early disclosure. The participants’ statements appeared similar and thus were permitted to be filed late, with a warning that there be no repetition in giving their evidence. The City objected to the late filing of the arborist report on the grounds that there had been no opportunity to counter with a Forestry report or a witness, or to cross examine the arborist. The report was accepted only for the purpose of challenging the participants’ evidence.

EVIDENCE

The Applicants retained Mr. Tyler Grinyer to provide professional land use planning evidence in support of the application. Mr. Grinyer was qualified to give expert testimony, based on his extensive experience. He has studied all the various permutations of the applications and the applicable planning documents, including the Yonge Eglinton Secondary Plan. He prepared both a lot study area and a lot data chart, and perused minor variance approvals in the area.

For his lot study area (“LSA”) for evaluating the proposal, he chose a narrower area than Davisville Village, as can be seen in blue in Exhibit 3 and at p. 15 of his Report (Ex. 4 – LSA chosen is on p. 58). He decided on about 1 block in each direction, excluding major streets. The neighbourhood is characterized by narrow frontages and deep lots. It includes primarily

older detached and semi-detached homes, and many new builds. There are many roof styles – mansard, pitched and flat. He found six flat rooves nearby – 657 and 665 Soudan, 28 Mann, 40 and 55 Hoyle and 337 Cleveland Ave – there are photos in his study (Exhibit 4, pp. 19-22.) He stated that the new By-law does not prohibit a flat roof, merely limits its height via the height limit for exterior main walls – so that no home could be built at three storeys with a flat roof. He prepared a drawing showing the minimal height difference between a flat roof at 7 m, versus a pitched roof at the 9 m maximum height permitted (Ex. 4, Built Form Comparison, p. 52).

Mr. Grinyer pointed out that as a result of the revised architectural plans filed with TLAB on July 6th and the subsequent ZCC of July 14, the number of variances has been reduced from 11 to 7. There are 4 variances required from the new By-law and 3 variances from the Toronto By-law:

Zoning By-law 569-2013.

1. To permit the height of all side exterior main walls facing a side lot line to be 7.70 metres, whereas the maximum permitted height of all side exterior side walls facing a side lot line is 7.0m
2. To permit a building depth of 17.28 metres, whereas the maximum permitted building depth is 17.0 metres.
3. To permit a floor space index equal to 0.82 times the area of the lot whereas the maximum permitted floor space index is 0.6 times the area of the lot.
4. To permit a side yard setback of 0.60 metres from the east side lot line, whereas the minimum side yard setback is 0.9 metres.

Zoning By-law 438-86

5. To permit a residential gross floor area equal to 0.82 times the area of the lot whereas the maximum permitted gross floor area is 0.60 times the area of the lot.
6. To permit the dwelling to be located 0.60 metres from the flanking street (east lot line) whereas the minimum required setback from a flanking street is 4.98 metres.
7. To permit a side lot line setback of 0.6 metres from the east side lot line and 0.47 metres from the west side lot line for the portion of the building which exceeds 17.0 metres, whereas the minimum required side lot line setback for the portion of a building exceeding 17.0 metres in depth is 7.5 metres.

This includes duplicate floor space index (“FSI”) variances (3 and 5) and east yard setback variances (4 and 7.)

Variance 1 - Height of EMW - He highlighted that variance 1 was only a 70 cm increase in the permitted height of the external main walls (“EMW” - those holding up the structure), and not an increase in the overall height (7.7 m vs. 7 m). 665 Soudan, for example, was granted an EMW variance of 9.97 m., much greater than the 7.7 m sought here. Similarly, 40 Hoyle was approved at 8.5 m.

Variance 2 - Depth would be only a 28 cm increase (17.28 m vs. 17 m), made necessary only by an error in application of the measurement following the new By-law (as explained below.) Following construction of the neighbouring dwelling at 506 Soudan, the required front setback would be only 6.11 m, and 598 would then be in compliance with the ZBL.

Variations 3 and 5 - FSI would increase from the permitted 0.6 times the lot area to 0.82 times. The October building permit had allowed the present exemption in the Toronto by-law of an FSI of 0.69 times the lot area for dwellings constructed prior to 1953 (this was built in 1939.) Thus in effect the variance would be from 0.69 to .0.82, equaling 0.13, or 33 square metres. To further study the comparable FSIs in the area, he consulted the Property Data Index for the area of his LSA (Ex. 4, p. 59.)

Variations 4, 6 and 7 - The east yard setback would be an extension of an existing condition. The present distance is 0.6 m, although the Toronto By-law required 4.98 m from a flanking street. The new By-law would require only 0.9 m. Variance 7 sets out the reduced side yard setbacks for the portion deeper than 17 m – the depth of the extension is .47 m on the west, and 1.19 m (28 cm, plus .91 m because of the balcony – a balcony can project under the new By-law, but not the Toronto By-law.)

The property next door at 596 Soudan was recently approved by the COA (July 12, 2017) at two storeys with integral garage at approximately 0.72 FSI, with no neighbourhood objections. The property to the north at 16 Mann is a 2 ½ storey home.

From the Property Data Index (Ex. 4, p. 59) he summarized for his chosen LSA: 34 properties are at FSI greater than 0.6, 15 at over 0.7, and 6 are at or greater than 0.8 FSI.

Mr. Grinyer then provided the reasons for his opinion that the proposal is consistent with and conforms to provincial and City policies as well as the ZBL.

The Provincial Policy Statement (the “PPS” – Ex. 4, p. 7), directs growth to existing settlement areas with required infrastructure, and policies address regeneration of existing structures within the character and scale of their surroundings – 1.1.3, and 1.4.1. Policies no. 1.2.1 and 2.2.1 of the Growth Plan of the Greater Golden Horseshoe for the subject area (‘Growth Plan’) support a mixture of options for all sizes of structure and incomes. He sees support for this proposal in the focus on renovations that are compatible with what is generally existing in the neighbourhood.

Respecting the Official Plan (OP)’s focus in Chapter 2 on neighbourhoods being stable but not static, Mr. Grinyer said that this sets the tone for limited changes to neighbourhoods. The commentary of 2.3.1 highlights that neighbourhoods are not frozen, that additions that respect and reinforce the existing physical character and contribute to the stability will be allowed. Similarly, the policies for the Neighbourhoods designation in 4.1 stress the need for gradual physical change that fits within the physical character of the area. Policy 4.1 (5) c) respecting height, mass, scale, types, is met here, as there is no overall height variance – 9 m is permitted, and the EMW is consistent with other such heights in the area. There is a mix of storeys and roof types; the scale is appropriate as the lot is narrow and deep and can accommodate the rear addition, with no rear yard setback required.

The depth variance is merely a technical one, as it is temporary until the neighbouring home at 596 is built. It is needed because of the requirement in the new By-law to measure the building depth from the neighbouring property’s front yard setback, to the rear wall. The resulting depth of 6.11 m is in keeping with the neighbourhood depths. The neighbour’s front yard setback will soon change when that home is built. Respecting e), building setbacks, there is no variance

required; and f) existing patterns are met, as the rear yard exceeds the setbacks. The existing side yard setbacks will remain, just be extended to accommodate the rear addition.

In his opinion, then, there will be no change that is out of keeping with the physical character of the neighbourhood. The proposal is compatible with Policy 4.1.8 respecting numerical performance standards in the zoning by-laws, as it meets their intent. It also conforms with the Built Form Policies in Chapter 3 of the OP, especially respecting those for a corner lot, in that it gives prominence to the corner, with a consistent front yard setback. He reviewed it in the light of all the policies in 3.1.2.1, concluding that it is a “fit” in every category, without causing undue light, view and privacy (“LVP”) concerns. A shadow study was performed (Ex. 2B), proving shadowing to 596 next door to the west to be minimal, and on 604 to the east after 6 p.m. only.

His conclusion is that the proposal meets the built form policies of the OP in form, scale and proportion. As a two-storey detached dwelling, within the height limits, it causes no Light, View and Privacy (LVP) concerns, it conforms to the Yonge Eglinton Secondary Plan (“YESP”) as well. In his view, it would contribute a revitalized, modern structure within the prevailing built forms in the neighbourhood. Thus it meets the first test in subsection 45(1), the intent and purpose of the OP. As well, since the variances requested are so close to the limitations in the zoning by-laws, the test requiring compliance with the intent and purpose of the zoning by-laws is also met. They are in his opinion so small numerically as to be minor, but are minor as well in impact. In his opinion they are desirable, as they make a positive contribution to this eclectic neighbourhood – they “fit” with the variety of sizes and styles.

Mr. Elmadany asked Mr. Grinyer, in cross examination, about the breadth of his LSA, and Mr. Grinyer pointed out that the area chosen included some 230 properties. Some of the FSI's recorded over 0.69 could indeed have been rear additions, and thus some could be within the 0.69 exemptions for pre-1959 dwellings. They would have the status of a non-conforming use following passage of the new By-law. Those listed in the Property Data Base have no explanation or source for the FSI shown.

Mr. Grinyer agreed with some of Mr. Elmadany's suggestions that of the examples cited of increased FSI granted by the COA, none are on a **corner** lot like the subject. And for the flat roof examples, 665 Soudan, for instance, though appearing as a flat roof, had the height of 9.97 for the EMW only and at the front of the property- not as the proposed, the full length of the building on a corner lot. The intent of the new EWH provision in the 2013 new By-law was as set out in Exhibit 8, p.19: over 90% of variances granted after it passed in 2013 were mere centimetres over the previous by-law's maximum height of 6.5 m. The new EWH therefore was fixed at 7.0 m, rather than 6.5 m, (or 2.5 m instead of 3 m) less than the maximum height permitted (Ex. 7, June 4, 2012 Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee, p. 19). As well, in the RD zone, 40% of the main wall along the side of a corner lot may extend beyond the height restriction, to permit more stylistic freedom (ibid., p. 20.) Mr. Elmadany reiterated that this was not the height proposed for this corner lot – it would be 100%. It is not similar to the other examples found, suggesting that the variances elsewhere were granted for overall height and not EMW height. In addition, he asserted, there should have been a comparable shadow study for an as-of-right structure, to enable a valid comparison.

Mr. Elmadany challenged Mr. Grinyer's conclusions on conformity with the Official Plan “Healthy Neighbourhoods” policies and prevailing building types. Mr. Grinyer resisted his suggestion that this property was not similar to the prevailing building type of single family dwellings in this area. He finds that even if some of the properties are legal non-conforming uses, they are indeed part of the neighbourhood context, for evaluation purposes. It was within the wording of the YESP as well, being within the existing built form, and compatible with other residential uses.

Mr. Grinyer was asked why there was no reference to an additional revised building permit granted on July 25, 2017 (Exhibit 10), and responded that it was not relevant to this minor variance appeal. The existing structure had been built in compliance with the existing permit granted in 2016. The purpose of the revised permit issued in July was as stated:

The extent of construction authorized under this permit is limited to the description contained herein as follows:
Rev 1- Revision to existing permit as per drawings. Flat roof, canopy and structural update.
Proposal for a new front porch, two storey rear addition, interior alterations, and underpinning with existing portion reconstructed.

Ms. Andrea Elliott lives at 5 Hoyle Ave., the street to the west of Mann Avenue. She opposes the proposal as she did at the COA, as it does not fit within the stable physical character of the neighbourhood. She included Ms. Chung's remarks as well (Ms. Chung is at 592 Soudan, three properties to the west of the subject) since she had to leave before testifying. They feel that the density, massing and setbacks are out of character with and proportion to the neighbourhood. They have concerns about possible damage to the two trees on the site. Ms. Chung also fears loss of privacy from the porch overlook, and dislikes that she will see a solid wall on the west of the new structure. Ms. Elliott very much objects to the sequential nature of the proposal and changes to it.

Mr. Kehar illustrated that Ms. Elliott's property (Exhibit 11) forms part of the neighbourhood as well, and is a large, modern design with a mansard roof, but seemingly flat for most of the depth. Her objection that some of the building on this site was illegal, or that stop work orders had been issued, came from other neighbours. She recognized that if built here with a peaked roof, as shown in Mr. Grinyer's drawing (Ex. 4, p. 52), the height could be slightly higher.

Mr. Andy Gort of SERRA set out the 52-year-long involvement of the organization in neighbourhood issues and preservation, especially with residential infill. In this south-east area of the Yonge Eglinton neighbourhood, the character elements can be quite localized, as the arterials are further to the south. He outlined a study area of only 60 m, the distance of the COA notification. In his statement (Exhibit 13) are photos of other corner lots in the neighbourhood, as there are few in the immediate area. None seemed comparable to him, as their side yards are much wider. There are only the three flat rooves within the LSA chosen by Mr. Grinyer, two on Soudan and one on Mann. He finds that the proposal does not meet the statutory test of desirability. The size of the FSI, the height, the setbacks, the overlook potential, but especially the solid side wall facing Mann, all make it a detriment to the streetscape. The character of this area is largely created by FSI's below 0.7, or even 0.6, which he knows as a result of the 34 OMB hearings in which SERRA has been involved. In his chart (Ex. 13, p. 15) there is only one decision nearby for 0.78 FSI; the rest do not exceed 0.69. He stated that it was the overwhelming view of SERRA that an FSI of 0.8 is not in accordance with the character of the neighbourhood. Thus it does not meet the OP requirement. Nor is it within the prevailing character, as the flat roof is not a prevailing or predominant design, it is a small minority only. The new build next door at 596 will mostly meet the by-law requirements, and is not objectionable. He is also concerned about damage to the tree within the east side yard. The side yard setback here is not sufficient.

Mr. Gort did not have objections to most of the variances individually, but kept to his opinion that the totality of the design was inappropriate for this site. The COA decision for 257 Manor Road (Ex. 12) which provided for a side yard setback distance of .39 m from a flanking street was not a good comparison, as there was a greater distance from the structure to the side lot line than for the subject. He admitted that he might have selected a wider study area, but stayed with his opinion that a flat roof design and the size of the structure are only a small minority in the area.

In his submissions, Mr. Kehar stressed that the appeal included only the “filling in of the box” at the second floor; that creating a flat roof rather than a peaked design improved what was proposed before. The building permit has been granted; he stated that today’s application is but a small expansion of this permit. The City had not provided a planning witness to counter Mr. Grinyer’s professional opinion on the merits.

He continued that EMW is only 70 cm over that required, and the increase would be imperceptible from the street. Flat roofs are found in the neighbourhood. The depth variance would become unnecessary as soon as 596 Soudan is built, and that many similar FSI’s could be found close by. The east side yard setback was just a continuation of the existing building’s distance from the property line. There would be no LVP issues.

He provided the OMB case of Weisz v Toronto, 16 OMBR 711; 2016 CanLII 60354, as authority for the proposition (para 27) that modern architectural design such as a flat roof does not offend the character of the neighbourhood, providing the context, proportions, size and scale is respected. Mr. Grinyer’s evidence supported a “fit”; and the nearest neighbour at 596 did not appeal.

Mr. Elmadany would distinguish the Weisz case on the facts, as in para. 24 it was evident that the property was originally a triplex, where a severance was involved, as well as a deep and wide lot. It was not a corner lot. In his submission none of the four tests for a variance approval are met by this proposal. He argued that any exemptions to the FSI limit, other than the as-of-right exemptions in the By-law, relate only to the properties for which they are granted, and cannot be used to prove what is existing or predominant in the area. Only three properties were granted FSI above 0.69, at 669 and 599 Soudan, and 51 Hoyle, and these do not therefore constitute prevailing character of the neighbourhood for purposes of the OP compliance test. None is a corner lot. In addition, the 2012 Report (Ex. 7) explains the rationale underlying the numerical standard of height in the new By-law, and should be considered.

CONCLUSIONS

I find it odd that there was another application for and permit amendment granted on July 25 this year, well after this appeal was launched, for virtually the same structure proposed in this appeal. Mr. Grinyer said that it was a backup plan, requested out of an excess of caution. Should the TLAB not approve this proposal in this appeal, he said that the permit grants a less desirable format of what the owners wish to see on the site. Therefore it was not mentioned as it is not relevant to the appeal before the TLAB. It is no wonder that the City and neighbours have expressed some confusion about and objections to what I see as a “rolling proposal” or moving target for this prominent site in Davisville Village.

However, the TLAB has no jurisdiction over the sequence of applications. An owner cannot be penalized for multiple applications; it is entitled to a change of mind. Neither can the TLAB unduly consider an owner’s conduct, in meeting obligations under building permits or otherwise. Thus this decision does not address or draw conclusions from the allegations of impropriety in developing the site to date.

I accept Mr. Elmadany’s submission that the existing predominant built form governs when determining the prevailing character of the neighbourhood, for application of the OP tests. I do not believe that the professional planning witness would disagree with this statement in general. However, Mr. Kehar expressed it a bit differently: what is planned and built in the study area illustrates what its character is. I do not agree with the inclusion of the word “planned” unless he

is referring to development permitted under a building permit. Overall I prefer Mr. Elmadany's characterization.

Respecting section 5.6.1 of the OP, Mr. Elmadany argues that it is not proper to cherry-pick policies that benefit a proposal. One must consider policies that provide a picture of what the character of the neighbourhood is in fact. However, I do not reject Mr. Grinyer's choice of neighbourhood for his lot study, even if doubt was cast on some statistics – it seemed a rational one, the few blocks surrounding the subject site. His emphasis on the approval of 596 next door seemed ill-placed as a comparison, as it is a traditional, mansard roof design with few variances required. Perhaps it achieved 0.69 FSI under the exemption for older structures, but it was granted 0.72, and not the much larger FSI of 0.82 as for the subject.

My determination on the merits does not depend on the history of the applications. However, I agree with Mr. Elmadany that the changes from the original permit would allow a very different structure. As this proposal was built and added to physically and conceptually, it began to fail to meet the tests of complying with the general intent and purpose of the official plan and the zoning by-laws. It becomes less desirable for the appropriate development of the narrow plot of land on which it sits. It loses the "fit" with the surrounding neighbourhood. This is one of the most basic conceptions of what the general intent of the Official Plan neighbourhood designation is, and perhaps the most subjective. Despite the fact that many of the variances sought may seem numerically minor, as Mr. Kehar argued, I agree with the City and the objectors that the proposal does not meet the test of maintaining the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan. Its projected size, especially the FSI, on this specific lot removes it from the category of predominant built form.

Even when considering such provincial policies as the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe ('Growth Plan') for the subject area, it does not meet the goals therein. One of these is that the proposed variances will facilitate the ongoing regeneration of homes in the surrounding neighbourhood, by permitting development of a new detached dwelling compatible with and reinforcing the general height and scale of other existing and approved homes in the surrounding neighbourhood. In my opinion the FSI increase is too great on this corner lot to permit this goal to be met.

I have not discussed the authorities submitted by Mr. Elmadany as I see no need to do so in light of my finding on the merits.

DECISION AND ORDER

For the reasons expressed, the TLAB orders that the appeal is refused and that the variances from the City of Toronto Zoning By-law No 569-2013, and the Toronto Zoning By-law 438-86 as set out above are not permitted.

X 

G. Burton
Chair, Toronto Local Appeal Body
Signed by: Gillian Burton