



Order under Section 69 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Raza v Young, 2026 ONLTB 13744

Date: 2026-02-11

File Number: LTB-L-081296-25

In the matter of: 1, 143 Queen Street East
Cambridge ON N3C2B3

Between: Amaan Raza Landlords
Sheetal Dekondwar

And

Katherine Young Tenant

Amaan Raza and Sheetal Dekondwar (the 'Landlords') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Katherine Young (the 'Tenant') because:

- the Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Tenant permitted in the residential complex has substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment or lawful right, privilege or interest of the Landlord or another tenant

This application was heard by videoconference on January 22, 2026.

The Landlords, the Tenant's Agent, Lori Young and the Tenant attended the hearing.

Preliminary Issues:

1. The Tenant's Legal Representative brought up a preliminary issue regarding the Landlord's N5 notice of termination which included vague allegations, no specific details or pictures and referenced only one date. Further she stated that these allegations did not meet the threshold of "substantial interference" and that the application should be dismissed.
2. Section 64(1) of the *Residential Tenancies Act*, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") states that "A landlord may give a tenant notice of termination of the tenancy if the conduct of the tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or a person permitted in the residential complex by the tenant is such that it substantially interferes with the reasonable enjoyment of the residential complex for all usual purposes by the landlord or another tenant or

substantially interferes with another lawful right, privilege or interest of the landlord or another tenant.” (Emphasis is mine.)

3. The Landlord stated that the Tenant’s storing of personal items in the basement electrical room could cause fire and he stated that the basement stairs are required to be closed by the City of Cambridge. The Landlord stated that for this reason, the matter must be heard urgently.
4. Based on the concerns mentioned above, I decided that I would hear only the portion of the N5 related to the storage in the basement electrical room as that could be considered substantial interference.

Determinations

5. Prior to hearing the evidence from the parties, I asked the Tenant’s Legal Representative and the Landlord to provide submissions on the Tenant’s historical access to the basement storage area.
6. The Tenant’s Legal Representative submitted that the Tenant has had direct access to the basement storage area since September 1, 2007 when she moved into the apartment. She stated that the Tenant has an entry door in her apartment that leads down the stairs and into the basement.
7. The Tenant’s Legal Representative also submitted that the Tenant’s T2/T6 application, LTB-T-016184-24 was heard by the Board, reviewed by the Tenant successfully and is now to be heard de novo. Ms. Mahmoudi-Pruyn submitted that this application deals specifically with the Landlord’s attempts to block the Tenant’s access to the basement and other concerns.
8. Lastly, the Tenant’s Legal Representative submitted that the City of Cambridge has ordered the Landlord to repair the basement stairs and the Landlord continues to be in breach of that municipal order.
9. The Landlord agreed that there was an upcoming T2/T6 hearing but it dealt with different things and he submitted that the municipal order is forcing him to close access to the basement stairs.
10. I heard evidence from the Landlord and reviewed the Landlord’s documents which included the lease between the parties. I heard evidence from the Tenant and reviewed the Tenant’s documents. I briefly reviewed the upcoming T2/T6 application and it appears as though the Tenant’s access to the basement storage area is central to the Tenant’s application.
11. After reviewing the lease between the parties, I see no specific storage areas that are not allowed to be used by the Tenant. In fact, the lease is silent regarding storage areas. There is nothing in the lease to suggest that the Tenant does not have access to the basement and further, the Tenant has direct access to the door to the basement in her own rental unit.

12. The Landlord's allegation is that the Tenant is causing him substantial interference by storing items in the basement storage area that is directly accessible through her rental unit.
13. I find that the Tenant has had access to the basement storage unit since 2007 and she continues to have access to same. As such, no substantial interference has occurred and the Landlord's application shall be dismissed.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlord's application is dismissed.

February 11, 2026
Date Issued

Carrie Bertrand
Member, Landlord and Tenant Board

15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2G6

If you have any questions about this order, call 416-645-8080 or toll free at 1-888-332-3234.