

Toronto Local Appeal Body

40 Orchard View Blvd, Suite 211 Toronto, Ontario M4R 1B9 Telephone: 416-392-4697 Fax: 416-696-4307 Email: <u>tlab@toronto.ca</u> Website: <u>www.toronto.ca/tlab</u>

DECISION AND ORDER

Decision Issue Date Friday, November 09, 2018

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER section 45(12), subsection 45(1) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended (the "Act")

Appellant(s): CITY OF TORONTO

Applicant: GOLDBERG GROUP

Property Address/Description: 51 ELMWOOD AVE

Committee of Adjustment Case File Number: 18 140481 NNY 23 MV

TLAB Case File Number: 18 181844 S45 23 TLAB

Hearing date: Wednesday, October 10, 2018

DECISION DELIVERED BY S. GOPIKRISHNA

APPEARANCES

Name	Role	Representative
Goldberg Group	Applicant	
Henry Chiang	Owner/Party	Marisa Keating
City of Toronto	Appellant	Aderinsola Abimbola
Michelle Charkow	Expert Witness	

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Henry Chiang is the owner of 51 Elmwood Street, located in Willowdale, and the Applicant in this matter. In 2013, he received permission from the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to facilitate the construction of the existing, 2-storey, detached dwelling with an integral, at-grade garage. During the process of building the new dwelling, he elected to convert the unexcavated area beneath the rear deck into a small basement room which included a second kitchen. The Applicants state that the rear deck remains

identical to what was approved by the OMB, except the basement now extends beneath the deck and includes a room.

On April 19, 2017, the Applicants received an Order to Comply notice from the City. The addition of this habitable space beneath the rear deck prompted the need for a second minor variance application, which was submitted to the COA on April 9, 2018, and approved on 31 May, 2018.

The City of Toronto appealed the COA Decision to the TLAB, which scheduled a hearing for 10 October, 2018. On 3 August, 2018, I was informed that the Parties had reached a Settlement, which would be presented to the TLAB at the time of the scheduled hearing on 10 October, 2018. While there were no changes to the proposed variances under By Law 569-2013, a proposed variance under By Law 7625 (former North York by-law) was removed because of redundancy as a result of the OMB Decision released on 1 March, 2018. While the City was no longer in opposition to the application, it asked for imposition of conditions, (discussed later in this Decision) as part of the Settlement reached with the Applicants.

MATTERS IN ISSUE

By-law 569-2013:

Chapter 10.20.30.40.(1)
The permitted maximum lot coverage is 30% of the lot area.
WHEREAS the proposed lot coverage is 38.86% of the lot area.
Chapter 10.20.40.20.(1)
The permitted maximum building length for a detached house is 17.0 m.
WHEREAS the proposed building length is 20.42 m.
Chapter 10.20.40.30.(1)

The permitted maximum building depth for a detached house is 19.0 m. WHEREAS the proposed building depth is 20.72 m

JURISDICTION

Minor Variance – S. 45(1)

In considering the applications for variances form the Zoning By-laws, the TLAB Panel must be satisfied that the applications meet all of the four tests under s. 45(1) of the Act. The tests are whether the variances:

- maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan;
- maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-laws;
- are desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land; and
- are minor.

EVIDENCE

As per the narrative in the Introduction and Background Section, the City and the Applicants arrived at a Settlement, which was presented to the TLAB on 10 October, 2018. At this hearing, the Applicants were represented by Ms. Marisa Keating, a lawyer and Ms. Michelle Charkow, a land use planner. The City of Toronto was represented by Ms. Aderinsola Abimbola, lawyer.

The only matter that came up in the pre-hearing was the substitution of Mr. Michael Goldberg, the Expert Witness who had authored the original Statement, with his colleague, Ms. Michelle Charkow. I noted the fact that while the Settlement between the Parties precluded any assertion of prejudice as a result of the substitution of the Expert Witness, I needed to know the details of what Ms. Charkow had done in order to adopt Mr. Goldberg's evidence, so that I could satisfy myself that the obligations of the Expert Witness were being satisfied.

Ms. Charkow said that she completed a site tour, read the witness statement and relevant policies, and zoning before agreeing with Mr. Goldberg's conclusions. I was satisfied that the obligations had been met, and allowed the proceeding to go forward.

In her opening statement, Ms. Keating provided a brief account behind the Application and Appeal, which by way of editorial comment, is consistent with the application history as discussed in the "Introduction and Background" Section. On behalf of the City (the Appellants), Ms. Abimbola indicated that she would not be calling any witnesses, and stated that the City would support the Application as long as an approval would be subject to its requested conditions.

Ms. Keating reviewed Ms. Charkow's CV and work experience and asked that the latter be recognized as an expert in the field of land use planning. There were no questions nor objections from Ms. Abimbola in regards to Ms. Charkow's expertise as a land use planner. I then recognized Ms. Charkow as an expert in the area of land use planning.

Ms. Charkow discussed the area context first, and stated that the subject site was located in the broader Willowdale Neighbourhood, and was immediately across the street from the high density, mixed use Downtown area of North York Centre. Referring to the vintage dwellings in the area, Ms. Charkow indicated that there were original 1940s and 1950s bungalows, 1 1/2 storey and 2 storey dwellings mixed with the considerable quantity of replacement dwellings on all streets in the neighbourhood of the Site. She added that reinvestment was occurring in the form of large rear yard additions and replacement dwellings in the range of 250 sq. m (2700 sq. ft.) to 500 sq. m (5400 sq. ft.). The subject site is a corner lot, currently occupied by the new 2-storey detached dwelling with an integral garage, and a rear deck accessed from the ground floor kitchen at the rear of the dwelling

Ms. Charkow then discussed the compatibility with higher level Provincial Policies. In her opinion, this application was a local planning matter which does not have significant Provincial policy implications. She however, noted that the proposal would permit

modest intensification within the built up area, resulting in an efficient and compact use of an existing site and infrastructure, which was broadly consistent with the Provincial objective of "Intensification". Based on the proposal's emphasis on intensification, Ms. Charkow concluded that the proposal is consistent with the PPS 2014 and conforms to the Growth Plan 2017

She then discussed the compatibility between the proposal and the Official Plan (OP). Ms. Charkow noted that the property is in the area denoted "Neighbourhoods" by the Official Plan, and proceeded to discuss the relevant policies. She began by discussing "Policy 2.3: Stable But Not Static", and referenced the "eclectic" nature of the neighbourhood, including its being home to low rise apartments, a high school, commercial shops and other uses. She then discussed how the community had been continuously evolving, without any serious impact on the overall stability.

Ms. Charkow then discussed Section 3.1.2.1, Built Form, which discusses various factors, that need to be considered to ensure that the proposed development will fit into the existing built context, without disturbing the former or causing negative impacts. After reviewing the various policies, Ms. Charkow pointed out how the policy focused on the visibility of the facade of the building, and the visual impact of the construction, as seen from the street. She then discussed the lack of relevance of these policies to the proposal, which by virtue of being underground wasn't visible from the street. Likewise, Policy 3.1.2.2, focusing on Parking, was found by Ms. Charkow to be not relevant, because of the underground nature of the project, which would not impact parking in any form. Ms. Charkow then reviewed Section 4.1.5 – Built Form policies, and then discussed the project's ability to fulfill this Policy. Many of the subsections of the Policy were not applicable, because all of the requested variances related to the portion that was below ground, and did not disturb the prevailing building type, with the only perceptible impact being restricted to a small visual change, restricted to the portion of the basement above ground. Likewise, there were no changes to massing or height, given the underground nature of the proposed development. Emphasizing that the setbacks were not being altered. Ms. Charkow concluded that the proposed variances complied with Section 4.1.5, by virtue of the fact that the Section was not relevant to the below-the-ground nature of the requested variances.

Based on this discussion, Ms. Charkow concluded that the proposal was consistent with the intention of the Official Policy.

The compatibility of the variances with the Zoning Plan, was discussed next.

She then discussed the compatibility between the proposal and the zoning by-law. She noted that under By-Law 569-2013, the property was zoned RD(x5) which permits single detached dwellings. She discussed the generic principles to determine compatibility with the zoning by-law, namely: the Identification of permitted uses, which together with performance standards, when applied to a building or property, will result in a development which:

• Implements the Official Plan;

• Will not give rise to adverse planning impacts on the immediate or broader neighbourhood; and

• Results in a building compatible with the subject land and neighbouring developments

Specifically referring to the request in increase for GFA, Ms. Charkow pointed out that there was no impact in real terms, because the area relevant to the sought variance already existed, even if not used for GFA calculations. After discussing the differences in the measurement of the building length and depth, Ms. Charkow pointed out that neither variances had an impact, because they existed at the ground level, at the back of the house. Given that the changes don't manifest themselves above grade, and their alignment with performance standards. Ms. Charkow concluded that the proposal was consistent with the intention of the Zoning By-law 569-2013.

Discussing the test of being minor, Ms. Charkow said that order of magnitude of the variances being requested was numerically minor. She emphasized that variances both individually and cumulatively do not give rise to adverse planning impacts. Based on this, she concluded that the proposal is minor.

Lastly, speaking to desirability, Ms. Charkow pointed out that reinvestment on this property is tantamount to better utilizing the zoning permissions and capability of the site. She said that the size, scale and standards applied to this proposal are appropriate and such reinvestment is compatible and fitting with the neighbourhood, and will contribute to the ongoing stability of this neighbourhood. She concluded that together with the minor variances both individually and cumulatively, I am satisfied that the application is desirable and appropriate for development of the land and building.

She then spoke to the conditions that were agreed upon with the City, and recommended that the approval be tied to the conditions.

Ms. Abimbola, representing the City, spoke briefly to the proposed conditions to be imposed on the approval of the application. There was a condition which required the Applicant to build in substantial compliance with the Subject Site Plan and Elevations, dated 30 January, 2018. Further, the condition requested by the City specifically referenced various pages of the submitted drawings, including the Basement and Ground Floor Plans, Second Floor and Roof Plans, Front, East, North and South Elevations. The City also highlighted its request for a condition which ensured that the existing rear deck would not be enclosed, nor would the width, length, height of the existing rear deck/terrace be extended through expansion of the existing structure, nor would future decks be added.

Ms. Keating stated that the conditions requested by the City were acceptable to her client, and requested approval of the project, given the uncontroverted evidence from the Expert Witness. She reiterated in closing, that they did not have an issue with any of

the conditions requested by the City of Toronto, and supported the imposition of the discussed conditions.

ANALYSIS, FINDINGS, REASONS

This proposal is unusual in a number of ways, starting with the history. The owners' decision to enclose the space beneath the deck approved through an earlier OMB decision, resulted in a work order, the resulting application to the COA and the TLAB Appeal. Different aspects of the project in question have been looked at by the COA on two different occasions, and once each by the TLAB and the OMB. It would have been ideal for the Applicant to get approvals for the construction of the kitchen, before commencing construction.

The other interesting feature of this proposal is the lack of impact of the variances under consideration because the improvements are not visible from the ground or street level. The proposal is compliant by virtue of the framework not being applicable, due to the latter's emphasis on what is visible, and is above ground.

The uncontroverted evidence of the Expert Witness, Ms. Charkow, is accepted, and the proposal is found to fulfill all the 4 tests listed under Section 45(1). The conditions, requested by the City, embody the standard condition of building in substantial compliance with the submitted Plans and Elevations, and expand on them to explicitly ensure that there be no further identified construction, which as stated earlier, seems a reasonable precaution.

The Appeal is therefore considered to be granted in part, with conditions imposed as per the request of the City of Toronto.

DECISION AND ORDER

.1. The Appeal is allowed in part, and the Decision of the Committee of Adjustment dated 31 May, 2018, is confirmed, subject to the altered variances and conditions below identified:

2. The following variances are approved under By- Law 569-2013:

Chapter 10.20.30.40.(1)

• The permitted maximum lot coverage is 30% of the lot area. WHEREAS the proposed lot coverage is 38.86% of the lot area.

□Chapter 10.20.40.20.(1)

• The permitted maximum building length for a detached house is 17.0 m.

WHEREAS the proposed building length is 20.42 m. **Chapter 10.20.40.30.(1)**

• The permitted maximum building depth for a detached house is 19.0 m.

WHEREAS the proposed building depth is 20.72 m.

3. The following conditions are imposed on the approval:

a) The basement room, including a small kitchen, built below the deck needs to be in substantial accordance with the following drawings prepared by Lorne Rose Architect, dated January 30, 2018, with specific reference to:

- o Drawing No. A1 Construction Notes, Site Plan, Statistics
- o Drawing No. A2 Basement Floor Plan
- o Drawing No. A3 Ground Floor Plan
- o Drawing No. A4 Second Floor & Roof Plans
- o Drawing No. A5 Front & East Elevations
- o Drawing No. A6 North & South Elevations

b). The owner shall not enclose the existing rear deck/terrace.

c). The owner shall not extend the width, length and/or height of the existing rear deck/terrace through expansion of the existing structure or the addition of any new platforms or decks.

So orders the Toronto Local Appeal Body

110 X

S. Gopikrishna Panel Chair, Toronto Local Appeal Body

ROOFS SLOPED CONSTRUCTION		
ASPHALT SHINGLES ON 15 LB BLDG. PAPER ON PLY SHEATHING ON ROOF TRUSSES OR RAFTERS A NOTED. (HOLD DOWN CLIPS AS REQUIRED & SLIDI	S 🦳 GAF	RAGE SLAB CONSTRUCTION
CLIPS AT INT. PARTINS FOR TRUSSES) PROVIDE M DRIP EDGE AT START OF ROOF AND APPROVED EA PROTECTION TO MIN. 36" BEYOND INNER FACE OF	TAL SHO /ES THE	ULD BE SLOPED @ 1.5% TO DRAIN TO OUTSIDE USING 5" REINFORCED CONC. B (REFER TO STRUCTURAL DWG)
WALL, MIN. R-50 (R 31 FOR CATHEDRAL CEILINGS BATT INSULT W/ 6 MIL POLY VAPOUR BARRIER (WA SIDE) W/ 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD (NOT FASTENED TO	465 RM WITH	50 PSI CONC W/ 5%-8% AIR ENTRAINMENT 1 6X6X6/6 WWM IN CENTER OF SLAB ON OF 4" GRANULAR FILL (ALL FILL OTHER
TRUSSES WITHIN I 8" OF INT. PART'NS & FASTENEI INT. PART'NS WITH CLIPS FOR TRUSSES) ,TAPED, SANDED & READY TO PAINT,PROVIDE MIN. I SQ. F	TO THA BEN	N COURSE CLEAN MATERIAL PLACED EATH CONC. SLAB SHALL BE COMPACTED PROVIDE UNIFORM SUPPORT.) PROVIDE
ROOF VENT AREA PER 300 SQ. FT OF INSULATED CEILING EVENLY DISTRIBUTED W/ MIN. 50% @ EA PRE FINISHED METAL FLASHING PROVIDE STEP	6 M	IL V.B. @ U/S OF SLAB. SLAB TO BE LED.
THRUWALL FLASHINGS AT SLOPING INTERFACE(S) REQUIRED. COLOUR AS DESIGNER. USE PREFORMRED BAFFLES TO ALLOW 1 AIRSPA		SEMENT SLAB CONSTRUCTION REINFORCED CONC.SLAB (REFER TO
BETWEEN INSULATION AND U/S OF PLYWOOD SHEATHING ON ALL CATHEDRAL CEILINGS. (USE 2 CLEARANCE ON ALL OTHER ROOFS.	I/2" (ALL MAT	UCTURAL DWG) ON 4 ^{II} CRUSHED STONE, . FILL OTHER THAN COURSE CLEAN ERIAL PLACED BENEATH CONC. SLAB
2 LOW SLOPE ROOF CONSTRUCTION BUILT UP ROOF ON 3/4" PLYWOOD SHEATHING OF I X3 CROSS STRAPPING SLOPED TO DRAIN ON	SUP @ L	.LL BE COMPACTED TO PROVIDE UNIFORM PORT.) PROVIDE 6 MIL VAPOUR BARRIER I/S OF SLAB. SLAB TO BE SEALED.
JOISTS/ TRUSSES AS NOTED . ABOVE HEATED SPACES: PROVIDE R-50 BATT INSULATION ON 6 MIL POLY VAPOUR BARRIER (R31 FOR CATHEDRA	$\frac{FLOORS}{14}$	DOR CONSTRUCTION
CEILINGS) ON 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD TAPED, SANDED & READY TO PAINT.PROVIDE VENTING I : 1 50 OF ROOF AREA.		SHED FLOOR ON 3/4" T&G PLYWOOD FLOOR ON WD FLOOR JOIST (GLUED & EWED) JOIST BRIDGED W/ CONTINUOUS
STANDING SEAM COPPER ROOF ON 15 LB BLDG. F	OR S	STRAPPING OR 2X2 CROSS BRIDGING SOLID BLOCKING @ 6'-1 1 " O.C. CONT. DER JOIST W/ R-27 BATT INSUL., EXTEND
ON 3/8" PLY SHEATHING ON ROOF TRUSSES OR RA AS NOTED. (HOLD DOWN CLIPS AS REQUIRED & SL CLIPS AT INT. PARTINS FOR TRUSSES) PROVIDE	DING SUE PAR	VAPOUR BARRIER & SEAL TO JOIST & FLOOR. DOUBLE JOISTS UNDERSIDE TITION WALLS PARALLEL TO JOISTS.
APPROVED EAVES PROTECTION TO MIN. 12" BEYON INNER FACE OF EXT. WALL. MIN. R-40 (R30 FOR CATHEDRAL CEILINGS) BATT INSULT W/ 6 MIL POLY	$\left(\begin{array}{c} 15 \\ \text{SAM} \end{array} \right)$	E FLOOR CONSTRUCTION IE AS NOTE 1.4. EXCEPT CERAMIC/ GRANITE/
VAPOUR BARRIER (WARM SIDE) W/ 5/8" GYPSUM BU (NOT FASTENED TO TRUSSES WITHIN 18" OF INT. PA & FASTENED TO INT. PART'NS WITH CLIPS FOR TRUS ,TAPED, SANDED & READY TO PAINT. PROVIDE MIN	RT'NS CON BES) MID-	RBLE TILE ON GROUT SETTING BED ON I-1/2" IC. TOPPING (WITH WIRE MESH REINFORCING DEPTH) CO-ORDINATE SILL PLATE HEIGHT &
FT OF ROOF VENT AREA PER 300 SQ. FT OF INSUL CEILING EVENLY DISTRIBUTED W/ MIN. 50% @ EAV	TED CRC S. LEV	LITY WITH TYP. FLOOR CONSTRUCTION. USE 2X4 ISS STRAPPING IN LIEU OF CONC. TOPPING TO EL FLOOR FINISH WHEN TILE/ HARDWOOD ISTRUCTION OCCURS OVER SAME JOISTS.
PRE FINISHED METAL FLASHING PROVIDE STEP THE FLASHINGS AT SLOPING INTERFACE(S) AS REQUIRED COLOUR AS DESIGNER.		LIGHT
$\frac{\text{WALLS}}{4} \xrightarrow{\text{STONE VENEER CONSTRUCTION}}$		RB-MOUNTED DOUBLE-GLAZED SKYLIGHT BY <u>VELU</u> APPROVED EQUAL. PROVIDE INSIDE CURB
4" STONE FACE, I" AIR SPACE, <u>TYVECK HOUSE W</u> (LAYERS TO OVERLAP, JOINTS TAPED & SEALED) I/2" PLYWOOD SHEATHING ON 2X6 @ I 6" O.C. S	MAP W/1 NN MAN PR. SUF	ENSIONS AS INDICATED ON DWG. CO-ORDINATE MANUFACTURER. INSTALL AS PER NUFACTURER'S GUIDE. DOUBLE FRAME RROUNDING SKYLIGHT.
STUD WALLS W/ R22 BATT INSUL. , DOUBLE TOP & SINGLE SOLE PLATE. 6 MIL POLY VAPOUR BAR (WARM SIDE) 1/2" GYPSUM TAPED, FILLED, SAND	IER (17) BAY	WINDOW SOFFIT JL, MIN R-27 & 6 MIL, POLY V.B, (WARM SIDE)
READY FOR PAINT. (≩ HR. RATED WALL WITH 5%" TYPI GYPSUM BOARD WHERE SIDE YARD SETBACK IS OR LESS, FOR O.6M OR LESS PROVIDE NON -	.2м 🥌 ЕХП	IL. MIN R-27 & 6 MIL. POLY V.B. (WARM SIDE) ERIOR TYPE SOFFIT. ITED ALUMINUM/WOOD SOFFIT
COMBUSTIBLE CLADDING). PROVIDE 0.03 THICK X 7/8" WIDE GALVANIZED M VENEER TIES @ 16" 0.C. HORIZ. & 32" 0.C. VER		EFINISHED ALUMINUM EAVESTROUGH I " x 6" WOOD FASCIA.
FASTENED W/ CORROSION RESISTANT O. I 25" DIA SCREWS OR SPIRAL NAILS WHICH PENETRATE @ LEAST I -3/I 6" INTO STUD.		EFINISHED RAINWATER LEADER (RWL) DUR TO MATCH EAVESTROUGH. INSTALL PRE-
AT FOUNDATION WALL, PROVIDE 20 MIL POLY FLASHING MIN. 6" UP BEHIND SHEATHING PAPER WEEP HOLES, MIN. 2'-7" APART @ BOTTOM COUF	PER	SHED CONDUCTOR HEADS ON FRONT ELEV. AS DWG. DOWNSPOUTS NOT CONNECTED TO RM SEWER SHALL HAVE EXTENSIONS TO CARRY
5 VENEER AND ABOVE ALL OPENINGS. BRICK VENEER CONSTRUCTION SIMILAR TO NOTE 4		ER AWAY FROM BLDG, & PROVISIONS SHOULD MADE TO PREVENT SOIL EROSION.
		TAL CAP FLASHING FINISHED METAL CAP FLASHING ON 3/4" EXT. WOOD BACKING ON FRAMING AS NOTED. SLOPE
WRAP (JOINTS TAPED & SEALED) ON 1/2" PLYWC SHEATHING ON 2X6 @ 16" O.C. SPR. STUD WAL R-20 BATT INSUL. 2X6 WD GIRT @ MID HEIGHT,	БD ТО [₩/ —	ECAST CONCRETE/CUT LIMESTONE
DOUBLE TOP PLATE @ SINGLE SOLE PLATE, 6 MI POLY V.B (WARMSIDE) 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD TAPE FILLED & SANDED.		ENSION AS PER DETAIL DRAWINGS VIDE SHOP DRAWINGS
$\overline{2}$ 3 coat stucco finish on prep. Coat with fibe		CORATIVE WOOD/CANAMOULD TRIM ENSION AS PER DETAIL DRAWINGS WIDE SHOP DRAWINGS
MESH EMBEDDED ON 2" GROOVED STYROFOAM O TYVECK HOME WRAP (STUCCO WRAP PREFERRED JOINTS TAPED & SEALED, ON 1/2" DENSGLASS G	24 WO	OD/CANAMOULD CORNICE PER DETAIL DWG- PRIMED W/ MOOREWHITE-100
SHEATHING ON 2X6 @ 16" O.C. SPR. STUD WALI R-22 BATT INSUL. 2X6 WD GIRT @ MID HEIGHT, DOUBLE TOP PLATE @ SINGLE SOLE PLATE, 6 MI	W/ ALK	TO WOOD PRIMER. PAINT W/ 3 COATS- <u>BENJAMIN</u> RE LOW LUSTRE EXT. PAINT <u>MOOREGUARD 103</u>
POLY V.B (WARMSIDE) 1/2" GYPSUM BOARD TAPE FILLED & SANDED. (%" TYPE "X" GYPSUM BOARD WHERE SIDE YARD SETBACK IS 0.6M OR	$\frac{1}{25} \frac{\text{DEC}}{\text{AS F}}$	CORATIVE WOOD PORTICO PER DETAIL DRAWING - PRIMED W/
LESS-NON-COMBUSTIBLE CONSTRUCTION - USE "DUROCK" BRAND STCCO FOR NON-COMBUSTIBLE CONSTRUCTION.)	3 C	WHITE-100 ALKYD WOOD PRIMER PAINT W/ DATS OF BENJAMIN MOORE LOW LUSTRE PAINT MOORGARD 103
8 GAS-PROOF WALLS AND CEILING ATTACHED GARAGES MUST BE COMPLETELY SEALED		EN CLOSET N CLOSET 5 SHELVES MIN. I 4" MIN. DEEP
TO PREVENT THE INFILTRATION OF CARBON MON- OXIDE & GASOLINE FUMES INTO THE DWELLING. I. PROVIDE I LAYER OF 5/8" GYPSUM W/ MIN		N CEUSER S SHEEVES MIN. 14 MIN. DEEP
2 COATS OF JOINT COMPOUND @ ALL WALL ADJACENT TO DWELLING 2. CAULK BET. GYPSUM BOARD & OTHER SURFACES W/ ACOUSTIC SEALANT	(2/) -	DKE ALARM 10KE ALARM SHALL BE PERMANETLY
 CAULK ALL PENETRATIONS SUCH AS HOSE BIBS W/ ACOUSTIC SEALANT DOORS BETWEEN GARAGE & DWELLING 	MOU CON	NTED ON HALL CEILINGS AND IN ALL BEDROOMS NECTED TO THE BUILDING TRICAL SUPPLY W/O DISCONECT WALL
SHALL BE TIGHT FITTING AND WEATHER- STRIPPED & PROVIDED W/ A SELF-CLOSING DEVICE, DOORS MUST NOT OPEN DIRECTLY	SWIT	CH & HAVING A CIRCUIT NOT INTER- NECTED TO ANY WALL OUTLET
INTO A ROOM INTENDED FOR SLEEPING. 5. PROVIDE 1/2" PLYWOOD ON THE INTERIOR FACE OF GARAGE WALLS.		RBON MONOXIDE ALARM JNTED ON HALL CEILING OR WALL
9 INTERIOR STUD PARTITION 1/2" GYPSUM BOARD ON BOTH SIDES OF WOO		PER MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS & NFORMING TO CAN/CGA-6.19 OR UL2O34
STUD @ 16 [®] DOUBLE PLATE AT TOP, SINGLE PLATE AT BOTTOM, 2x6 WD GIRT @ MID-HE	GHT. 🔼	SHROOM TO BE MECHANICALLY VENTED DVIDE MIN. I AIR CHANGE PER HOUR YER/COOKTOP FAN
PROVIDE 2X6 STUD COLUMNS TO MATCH EAG BEAM MEMBER, I.E. FULL BEARING AT ALL W BEAMS. (PROVIDE 2X4 WHERE NOTED) PROVID SOUND ATTENUATION INSUL IN BATHROOM WA		TER/COOKTOP TO BE VENTED DIRECTLY TO TSIDE THROUGH WALL.
SOUND ATTENUATION INSUL. IN BATHROOM WA WHERE INDICATED ON PLAN.	(31) AT PR	TIC ACCESS HATCH OVIDE ATTIC ACCESS MIN. 22" X 35" W/
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}\\ \end{array}\\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\$	INS FIREPLAC	SULATION & WEATHER-STRIPPING \underline{ES}
A DRAINAGE LAYER IS REQUIRED FOR FDN. WALLS WHERE THE INT. INSUL. EXTENDS MOR THAN 2-11 " BELOW EXT. GRADE.		O CLEARANCE GAS FIREPLACE ER TO ATTACHED DETAIL DWG
2. 2 COATS BITUMINOUS DAMPPROOFING ON MIN. I/4" PARGING ON I 0" BLOCK (OR AS NOTED) WITH TYPE "S" MORTAR w/ 3/1		SONRY WOOD BURNING FIREPLACE ER TO ATTACHED DETAIL DWG
BLOCK LOCK @ 16" O.C.VERT. 32" HORIZ. 3. PROVIDE 1/4" PARGING COVED OVER POURED CONCRETE FOOTING.		MNEYS AND FLUES INEYS & FLUES SHALL BE 2'-0" ABOVE THE IEST POINT AT WHICH IT COMES IN CONTACT
 FOUNDATION WALLS SHALL BE BRACED OR H FLOOR JOISTS INSTALLED BEFORE BACKFILLI I 5 LB. BLDG PAPER OVER FDN WALL (INSIDE 	VE W/R IG. IO'-(OOF SURFACE & WI/ HORIZ. DISTANCE OF D" FROM CHIMNEY & 36" ABOVE FLAT ROOFS.
I/2" AIRSPACE, 2X3 WOOD STRAPPING @ 16" O.C. R-14 BATT INSUL W/ 6 MIL POLY VAPOUR BARRIER FULL HEIGHT. 1/2" GYPSUM		<u>& DECKS</u> ICRETE PORCH
BOARD TAPED, SANDED, AND READY TO PAIN 6. PROVIDE SOLID TOP COURSE BLOCK OR FILL TOP BLOCK COURSE W/ MORTAR OR CON		ALLOW 4" BEARING FOR CONC. SLAB. PROVIDE DEEP POCKETS TO SUPPORT CONC.
 PROVIDE 2" SOLID MASONRY OR CONT. I-1/2" PLATE UNDER ALL ROOF & FLOOR FRAMING MEMBERS AS WELL AS 7-1/2" SOLID MASONDY UNDER BEAMS 7-COLUMNE 	F 2. V	CLAB BY REMOVING EVERY 2ND PAIR OF FACE BRICK WHEN BRICK FACING IS USED WHEN BRICK FACING IS USED ABOVE GRADE EVEL PROVIDE 3/16 [®] DIAM. CORROSION
SOLID MASONRY UNDER BEAMS & COLUMNS 8. FOUNDATION WALL TO EXTEND MIN 5-7/8" ABOVE FIN. GRADE. 9. CONT 2X6 WOOD SILL PLATE FASTENED W/ J	З. _М	RESISTANT MTL TIES @ 36" HORIZ., 8" VERT. MIN 3/4" CLEAR CONC. TO COVER RE-BARS. STAIRS & HANDRAILS TO CONFORM TO NOTES
9. CONT. 2X6 WOOD SILL PLATE FASTENED W/ I DIA. X I 2" LONG ANCHOR BOLTS EMBEDDED IN CONC @ 6'-0" O.C. MAX & PROVIDE A FLEX	5" <u> </u>	STAIRS & HANDRAILS TO CONFORM TO NOTES 37 & 38 DD DECK
SILL GASKET BET. PLATE & FOUNDATION. FOOTINGS ALL NEW FOOTINGS SHALL BEAR ON UNDISTURBED NATURAL SOIL MIN.2200 PSI		PECK IS NOT PERMITTED TO SUPPORT ON RICK VENEER. ROVIDE 8" DIA. SONO TUBE FOR POURED
ONDISTURBED NATURAL SOLE MIN.2200 PSI POURED CONC. AT LEAST 48" BELOW FIN. GRADE W/ ASSUMED BEARING CAPACITY OF 4000 PSF (VERIFY W/ SOLL REPORT)	C	SONCE DIA: SONO TOBE FOR FOURED SONC. PIERS MIN 4'-O" BELOW GRADE SEARING ON UNDISTURBED SOIL. SE SPR #2 OR BETTER WOOD POSTS MIN.
NON-FROST SUSCEPTIBLE BACKFILL. PROVIDE FROST-PROTECTION FOR ALL FOOTIN STEPPED FOOTINGS	S. S	SE SPR #2 OR BEITER WOOD POSIS MIN. IX4 (SOLID) USE CORROSION RESISTENT IPIRAL NAILS OR SCREWS IOUBLE 2X6 LEDGER BOLTED TO FDN WALL
WHEN REQUIRED SHALL HAVE A MAX RISE OF 2'-0" (1'-4" IF SAND OR GRAVEL) AND A MAX. RUN OF 2'-0"	V S	V/ I/2" DIA. BOLTS @ 32" O.C. MIN INTO OLID MASONRY OR CONC. ROVIDE HANDRAIL IF MORE THAN 3 RISERS
DRAINAGE 4 [®] DIAM. WEEPING TILE COVERED W/ 6 [®] GRANULAR MATERIAL & FILTER CLOTH. WEEPIN	5. s	TAIR & HANDRAIL TO CONFORM TO NOTES 7 & 38
TILES SHOULD DRAIN TO STORM SEWER, DRAINAGE DITCH, DRY WALL OR SUMP PUMP.		

CONSTRUCTION NOTES

	STAIRS/RAILS						
•	37	INTERIOR/EXTERIOR STAIRS					
	38	M M M M M M M M	IN. RISE AX. RISE IN. RUN AX. RUN IN. TREAD AX. TREAD AX. NOSING IN. WIDTH IN. HEADROOM	4 5 AS PER PART	$\begin{array}{c} = \ 4 - 7/8^{"} \\ = \ 7 - 7/8^{"} \\ = \ 8 - 1/4^{"} \\ = \ 1 4^{"} \\ = \ 1 4^{"} \\ = \ 1 4^{"} \\ = \ 1 4^{"} \\ = \ 1^{"} \\ = \ 2^{!} - 10^{"} \\ = \ 7^{!} - 0^{"} \\ \end{array}$		
					= 2'-1 1" = 3'-6"		
		IN	CTERIOR LAND TERIOR/EXTER AX. BETWEEN	IOR STAIRS	= 3-6 = 2'-11" = 4"		
		5	DECK TO GRA - I I OR LESS REATER THAN		= 2'-11" = 3'-6"		
		Ν	O MEMBER O	R ATTATCHMENT BI HIGH SHALL FACIL			
		Р	ROVIDE HAND	RAIL ON BOTH SIE			
				I 3'-5" IN WIDTH.			
•	(39)		PLANTER/RA	DSCAPE DRAWINGS	6 FOR DETA		
	DOOF	२ :	SCHEDULE	_			
	DOO	R	WIDTH	DESCF	IPTION		
	Θ		I ^I -O"				
	2		۱'-6"				
	3		2'-0"				
	(4)		2'-4"				
	5		2'-6"				
	6		2'-8"				
	\bigcirc		2'-10"				
,	8		3'-0"				
<u><</u>	9		2- 1 ¹ -6"				
	\odot		2- 2 ['] -0"				
	Ē		2- 2'-4"				
			2- 2'-6"				
			2- 2'-8"				
			2- 3'-0"				
			2'-0"	GLASS SHOWER DO	DOR		
	6		3'-0"	EXTERIOR FRENCH	DOOR		
	\bigcirc		2- 2'-6"	EXTERIOR FRENCH	DOOR		

ISULATED GARAGE DOOR W/ EATHER-PROOFED GASKET AND ELF-CLOSING DEVICE 3'-0**"** 3'-6" USTOM EXTERIOR DOOR 2- 3'-0" XTERIOR FRENCH DOOR з'-о" INSULATED HOLLOW METAL DOOR

EXTERIOR DOOR

XTERIOR DOOR

3'-0"

2- 2-6

- ARCHWAYS TO MATCH WINDOW AND DOOR HEIGHTS ON EACH FLOOR 2. ALL HEIGHTS TO BE CO-ORDINATED WITH ARCHITECT,
- SIGN CONSULTANTS & CONTRAC 3. CAULKING SHALL BE PROVIDED ON ALL DOORS AND ALKYD WOOD PRIMER PAINT W/ WINDOWS BETWEEN THE FRAME AND THE EXT. CLADDING 4. WEATHERSTRIPPING SHALL BE PROVIDED ON ALL DOORS TO THE EXTERIOR, EXCEPT DOORS FROM GARAGE TO EXTERIOR.

GENERAL NOTES:

THAN 17-3/4

- ALL DIMENSIONS GIVEN IN IMPERIAL (UNLESS OHERWISE NOTED).
- 2. ALL CONSTRUCTION TO COMPLY WITH ONTARIO BUILDING CODE 2012 EDITION.
- EVERY EXCAVATION SHALL BE UNDERTAKEN IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO PREVENT MOVEMENT WHICH WOULD CAUSE DAMAGE TO ADJACENT PROPERTY, EXISTING STRUCTURES, UTILITIES, ROADS AND SIDEWALKS AT ALL STAGES OF CONSTRUCTION. ENSURE THAT THE BOTTOM OF EXCAVATION FOR FOUNDATION ARE FREE OF ALL ORGANIC MATERIAL. IF TERMITES ARE KNOWN TO EXIST, ALL STUMPS, ROOTS AND WOOD DEBRIS SHALL BE REMOVED TO A MIN. DEPTH OF I I-3/4" IN EXCAVATED AREA. THE DISTANCE BETWEEN UNTREATED STRUCTURAL WOOD ELEMENTS AND GROUND SHOULD BE NO LESS
- 4. EXCAVATION AND/OR CONSTRUCTION ON ADJACENT PROPERTY REQUIRES THE CONSENT OF AFFECTED PROPERTY OWNERS.
- BACKFILL WITH IN 23-5/8" OF THE FOUNDATION WALLS SHALL BE FREE OF DELETERIOUS DEBRIS AND BOULDERS OVER 9-7/8" IN DIAM.
- 6. THE BUILDING SITE SHALL BE GRADED SO THAT SURFACE, SUMP & ROOF DRAINAGE WILL NOT ACCUMULATE AT OR NEAR THE BUILDING AND WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT ADJACENT PROPERTY
- 7. NO WORK TO ENCROACH ONTO ADJOINING PROPERTIES SURFACE DRAINAGE SHALL NOT BE DISCHARGED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY ONTO SIDEWALK, DRIVEWAY, STAIRWAY OR AN ADJOINING PROPERTY.
- 8. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO CHECK ELEVATIONS OF ALL CITY SERVICES AND ESTABLISH APPROPRIATE METHODS OF DEALING WITH THOSE SERVICES.
- ALL FRAMING LUMBER SHALL BE SPF# I KILN DRIED UNLESS NOTED. PROVIDE EXTERIOR GRADE PLYWOOD WHERE REQUIRED BY O.B.C. ALL BEAMS TO BE FLUSH UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- I.O. ALL DIMENSIONS AND EXISTING CONDITIONS SHALL BE VERIFIED BY THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR AT THE SITE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE TO NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE SITE CONDITIONS AND THE ASSUMED DESIGN CONDITIONS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION.
- I I. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, METHOD OF ERECTION AND INSTALLATION PROCEDURES OF THE STRUCTURAL MEMBERS INCLUDING THE ERECTION OF STEEL BEAMS. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION AND CARE DURING THE DEMOLITION PROCESS OF ANY EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MASONRY WALLS. BE SOLELY RESPONSIBLE TO SUPPORT ANY EXISTING STRUCTURE AND CALL THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FOR AN INSPECTION PRIOR TO CUTTING EXISTING MEMBERS OR REMOVING EXISTING WALLS.
- I 2. ALL EXTERIOR SIDE WALLS WITHIN 2'-O" OF PROPERTY LINES AND ALL PARTY WALLS TO HAVE 3/4 HR. FIRE RATING (I.E. TYPE X GYPSUM BOARD ON INTERIOR)



SCALE = 1:150

	FIRM NAME: LORNE ROSE ARCHITECT	INC.							
	I-II40 SHEPPARD AVE. WEST TORONTO, ONTARIO. M3K 2A2 (416)398-9300 LORNE ROSE								
	LOCATION: 5 I ELMWOOD AVE. NORTH YORK, ONTARIO								
ITEM	ONTARIO BUILDING CODE DATA MATRI	X PARTS 3 & 9			OBC F	REFER	RENC	E	
1	PROJECT NEW	D PART I I			ART 3	3		PART 9	Э
		. TO .4	ŀ	1.1.2	2 [A]			.2 [A] 9.10.1.	З.
2	MAJOR OCCUPANCIES: RESIDER			3.1.2	2.1.(1)	9.	0.2	
3	BUILD. AREA (m ²): EXIST.: 000.00M ² NEW: 2 I 4.73 M ²	D. AREA (M ²): EXIST.: 000.00M ²				1.4	1.1.2 (A)	
4	GROSS AREA (M ²): EXIST.: 000.0 M ² NEW: 375.7M ²	ТОТАL: 375.7 м ²		1.4.1.2 (A)		1.4	I.1.2 (A)	
5	NUMBER OF STORIES: ABOVE GRD. 2	BELOW GRD.	. I	Ⅰ.4.Ⅰ.2 (A) & 3.2.Ⅰ.Ⅰ.			I.I.2 (A ∋.I0.4)	
6	NUMBER OF STREETS/FIRE FIGHTER ACC	CESS: I		3.2.2.10. & 3.2.5.		9.	0.20.		
7	BUILDING CLASSIFICATION: SFD - SING	LE FAMILY DWELL	ING	3.2.2	.20	83	9.	10.2.	-
8	PERMIT CONST. COMBUSTIBLE N ACTUAL CONST. COMBUSTIBLE N	ON-COMBUSTIBLE		вотн вотн	3.2.2	2.20). - 80	3 9.IC).e
9	SPATIAL SEPARATION - CONST. OF EXT	ERIOR WALLS		3.2.3	3		Ø.	10.14	
	$EBF (M)^{2}$ (M) MAX. % OF	ROPOSED FFF % OF (HOUP OPENINGS	RS)	USE DESIGN DESCRIF	I OR	CON	MB NST.	NON-CC CONS	
	NORTH								
	SOUTH								
	EAST 112.89M ² 1.2M 7.0 %	7.0 %							
	WEST								
BU	ILDING CODE M	ATRIX							

SITE AREA: 6 504 S.F. (604.24 M2) GROSS FLOOR AREA: GROUND FLOOR AREA I 866 S.F. (173.4 M2) 2 178 S.F. (202.3 M2) SECOND FLOOR AREA 4 044 S.F (375.7 M2) TOTAL G.F.A. MAXIMUM PROPOSED COVERAGE: 2 527.5 S. $\sim \sim$ 30 % 38.86% PROPOSEI MINIMUM SETBACKS: FRONT 6.5 M 7.5 M_+ I.O M REAR 9.5 M 14.73 M 1.66 M WEST SIDE I.8 M EAST SIDE I.8 M I.22 M MAXIMUM PROPOSED LENGTH OF DWELLING: \sim 16.8 M 20.42 M \dots HEIGHT OF DWELLING MAXIMUN PROPOSEL 8.8 M 8.71 M FRONT YARD MINIMUM PROPOSED LANDSCAPING 59.3 M2 60% 62 % FRONT YARD PROPOSED MINIMUM SOFT LANDSCAPING: N/A 75% FRONT YARD=95.7 M2 DRIVEWAY=36.4 M2

STATISTICS

DWG.	DRAWING TITLE
AI	SITE PLAN, CONSTRUCTION NOTES
	AND STATISTICS
A2	BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN
AЗ	GROND FLOOR PLAN
A4	SECOND FLOOR & ROOF PLAN
A5	FRONT & EAST ELEVATIONS
A6	NORTH & SOUTH ELEVATIONS
Α7	BUILDING SECTION "A" - "A" & GRAB BAD DETAIL
A8	ENERGY EFFICIENCY CALCULATIONS
A9	STANDARD DETAILS
AIO	STANDARD DETAILS MASONRY DETAILS
ALI	TYPICAL DETAILS
<u>DWG.</u>	STRUCTURAL DRAWING TITLE
SI	FOUNDATION PLAN
S2	GROUND FLOOR FRAMING PLAN
S3	SECOND FLOOR FRAMING PLAN
S4	ROOF FRAMING PLAN
S5	TYPICAL DETAILS, NOTES AND TABLES
S6	DETAILS & SECTIONS
S7	DETAILS & SECTIONS
58 59	DETAILS & SECTIONS TYPICAL DETAILS & SECTIONS

LIST OF DRAWINGS

The Architect is not responsible for the accuracy of survey, structural, mechanical, electrical, etc. engineering information shown on the drawing. Refer to the appropriate engineering drawings before proceeding with work

Contractor shall check all dimensions on the work and report any discrepancies to the Architect before proceeding. Construction must conform to all applicable Codes, Requirements and By-laws of Authorities having jurisdiction.

This drawing is not to be scaled.

This drawing is not to be used for Construction unless signed by the Architect.

Issued for Construction:

Sianature

(C) 2018 Lorne Rose Architect Inc.





The Architect is not responsible for the accuracy of survey, structural, mechanical, electrical, etc. engineering information shown on the drawing. Refer to the appropriate engineering drawings before proceeding with work.

Contractor shall check all dimensions on the work and report any discrepancies to the Architect before proceeding. Construction must conform to all applicable Codes, Requirements and By-laws of Authorities having jurisdiction.

This drawing is not to be scaled.

This drawing is not to be used for Construction unless signed by the Architect.

Issued for Construction:

Signature:

Date:

© 2018 Lorne Rose Architect Inc.

No.	Revision	Date
	BASEMENT KITCHEN	30 JAN. 18

2	REVISION	9 JULY I 4
	ISSUED FOR PERMIT	II MAR 14
No.	Issued For	Date

Drawing Title

BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN

roiect

51 ELMWOOD AVE. NORTH YORK, ONTARIO





The Architect is not responsible for the accuracy of survey, structural, mechanical, electrical, etc. engineering information shown on the drawing. Refer to the appropriate engineering drawings before proceeding with work.

Contractor shall check all dimensions on the work and report any discrepancies to the Architect before proceeding. Construction must conform to all applicable Codes, Requirements and By-laws of Authorities having jurisdiction.

This drawing is not to be scaled.

This drawing is not to be used for Construction unless signed by the Architect.

Issued for Construction:

Signature:

Date:

	C) 2018 Lorne Rose	Architect In	IC.
No.	Revision BASEMENT KITCHEN	1	Date 30 JAN. 18
2	REVISION		9 JULY I 4
 	ISSUED FOR PERMIT	Г	I I MAR I 4 Date
Draw	ving Title		
	GRO	UND	
	FLOOR	PLAN	
Proje	ect		
	51 ELMWO NORTH YORK		
	LOR	NF	
	RO	SE	
	ARCH	ITECI	
	O Sheppard Avenue West, Unit phone: (416) 398-9300		TARIO M3K 2A2 5) 398-8956
	HINKE, 1410/ 380-8300		
		APRIO 1	ASSOCIAN TARAN MITECTS Z
		O ARC	
			E H. ROSE ICENCE 4882



A3

Drawn by: Checked by: File No. 12 44 Plotted: 30 JAN





GFA= 2 178 S.F.



	onsible for t	
accuracy of survey, struct electrical, etc. engineering on the drawing. Refer to engineering drawings be work.	ng information the approp	on shown riate
Contractor shall check a work and report any disc Architect before proceed conform to all applicable and By-laws of Authoritie	repancies to ling. Constr Codes, Reo	o the ruction must quirements
This drawing is not to be		
This drawing is not to be unless signed by the Arc		onstruction
Issued for Construction:		
Signature:		
Date: © 2018 Lorne Rose	Architect In	
No. Revision		Date
I BASEMENT KITCHEI	N	30 JAN. 18
2 REVISION I ISSUED FOR PERMI	T	9 JULY 14 11 MAR 14
	Т	
I ISSUED FOR PERMI	T	II MAR 14
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For		IIMARI4 Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMI No. Issued For)OR & R	IIMARI4 Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLC)OR & R	IIMARI4 Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLC)OR & R	IIMARI4 Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLC)OR & R	IIMARI4 Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLO PLA	OOR & R ANS	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLO PLA	OOR & R ANS OOD AVI	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINAL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLO SECOND FLO PLA Project 51 ELMWO	OOR & R ANS OOD AVI	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINANCE No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOR SECOND FLOOR PLA Project 51 ELMWO	OOR & R ANS OOD AVI	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLO PLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK	OOR & R NS OOD AVI 4, ONTAR	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINATION No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOUR SECOND FLOUR PLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK	OOR & R NS OOD AVI (, ONTAR	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLO PLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK	OOR & R NS OOD AVI (, ONTAR	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINATION No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOR SECOND FLOOR PLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK	OOR & R NS OOD AVI (, ONTAR	Date
I ISSUED FOR PERMINO. ISSUED FOR PERMINO. ISSUED FOR PERMINENT Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK	OOR & R NS OOD AVI 4, ONTAR	E.
I ISSUED FOR PERMINATION No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOR SECOND FLOOR PLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK	OOR & R NS OOD AVI (, ONTAR NE SE I T E C T	E.
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITED TO SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITE	OOR & R NS OOD AVI COD COD AVI COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD	E. RIO TARIO M3K 2A2 S) 398-8956
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITED TO SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITE	OOR & R NS OOD AVI COD COD AVI COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD	E. RIO TARIO M3K 2A2 S) 398-8956
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITED TO SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITE	OOR & R NS OOD AVI COD COD AVI COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD COD	E. RIO TARIO M3K 2A2 S) 398-8956
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITED TO SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITE	OOR & R NS OOD AVI C, ONTAR CNE SE I T E C T T I, TORONTO, ON FAX: (410)	E. COOF
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITED TO SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITE	OOR & R NS OOD AVI C, ONTAR CNE SE I T E C T T I, TORONTO, ON FAX: (410)	E. COOF
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITELEPHONE: (416) 398-9300	OOR & R NS OOD AVI COD AVI CONTAR	E. COOF
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITELEPHONE: (416) 398-9300 Scale: AS NOTED	OOR & R NS OOD AVI C, ONTAR CNE SE I T E C T T I, TORONTO, ON FAX: (410)	E. COOF
I ISSUED FOR PERMINOL No. Issued For Drawing Title SECOND FLOOPLA Project 51 ELMWO NORTH YORK NORTH YORK I 140 SHEPPARD AVENUE WEST, UNITELEPHONE: (416) 398-9300	OOR & R NS OOD AVI COD AVI CONTAR	E. COOF

Plotted: 30 JAN I 8



No.	Revision	Date
	BASEMENT KITCHEN	30 JAN. 18
2	REVISION	9 JULY I 4
I	ISSUED FOR PERMIT	II MAR 14
No.	Issued For	Date



´+21'-0" 179.36

3'-10¹/₂" [1.18] 0'-0" 173.21 172.03

> -10[']-6" -II-0 WALKOUT



	 accuracy of survey, structural, mechanical, electrical, etc. engineering information shown on the drawing. Refer to the appropriate engineering drawings before proceeding with work. Contractor shall check all dimensions on the work and report any discrepancies to the Architect before proceeding. Construction must conform to all applicable Codes, Requirements and By-laws of Authorities having jurisdiction. This drawing is not to be scaled. 		
	This drawing is not to be used for Construction unless signed by the Architect.		
	Issued for Construction:		
	Signature: Date:		
	© 2018 Lorne Rose Architect Inc.		
	No. Revision Date		
	I BASEMENT KITCHEN 30 JAN. 18		
12 16	2 REVISION 2 REVISION 1 ISSUED FOR PERMIT No. Issued For Drawing Title NORTH & SOUT ELEVATIONS Project	HEW PAL (WORKIN	
	51 ELMWOOD AV NORTH YORK, ONTA	/E. ARIO	
		AVENUE\122	
Line Constive WOD PANELS		ONTARIO M3K 2A2 11 6) 398-8956	
LIMESTONE BAND 172.57 CROWN OF ROAD 172.03	Õ AR	ASSOCIATION OF CHITECTS Z RNE H. ROSE LICENCE 4882	
SOUTH ELEVATION SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"	Scale:AS NOTEDDrawinDrawn by:SNChecked by:LRFile No.I 2 44Plotted:30 JAN I 8	WING NAME SON DROPP AWING FILE: 1244 -NEW PAL (WORKING AN 30, 2018 - 1:14PM	

The Architect is not responsible for the