



Order under Section 30 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

File Number: LTB-T-000590-26

In the matter of: 507, 588 ALBERT ST W
SAULT STE. MARIE ON P6A1C5

Between: Jessica Boutros Tenant

And

Sault Ste Marie Housing Corporation Landlord

Jessica Boutros (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Sault Ste Marie Housing Corporation (the 'Landlord') failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act') or failed to comply with health, safety, housing or maintenance standards.

This application was heard by videoconference on February 12, 2026.

The Landlord's agent, Frank Caputo, and the Tenant attended the hearing. The Tenant declined the opportunity to speak with Tenant Duty Counsel on the hearing date.

Determinations:

1. As explained below, the Tenant did not prove on a balance of probabilities the allegations contained in the application. Therefore, the application is dismissed.
2. The application is amended to reflect the correct Landlord as Sault Ste Marie Housing Corporation.
3. Shortly after the Tenant moved in on February 17, 2025 I accept that the Tenant notified the Landlord of an issue with their main door lock. In response, on February 18, 2025 the Landlord had a locksmith attend the unit and at the time they replaced the lock. The Tenant did not approve of the repair. On February 20, 2025 the locksmith returned and fixed the door by patching up the chipped wood around the exterior of the door and installing a new lock.
4. I also accept that on December 8, 2025 the Tenant contacted the Landlord and informed them that their lock was broken. On December 10, 2025 the Tenant spoke with another one of the Landlord's agents in person about their issue with the door stating it was broken and that they do not consent to anyone entering the unit while they are out of town on December 17th to 19th. Despite this, on December 12, 2025 the Landlord's agent contacted the Tenant to inform her that a new door would be installed on December 15, 2025. There was no inspection on this date or the replacement of a new door.
5. On December 16, 2025 the Landlord's agents both came to inspect the door and determined that it was not broken and did not need to be replaced.

6. The only requested remedy from the Tenant is that the Landlord be ordered to replace the current wooden rental unit door to a brand-new steel door and to provide the Tenant a new key.
7. The Landlord's agent testified that on December 16, 2025 he went and inspected the door. He was able to easily lock and unlock the door. Previously in February when they installed the new lock they placed a metal plate on the inside of the door.
8. The Landlord submits that there is nothing wrong with the door aside from a small chip out of the door by the deadbolt, but that this does not make the door in need of replacement as this is a large cost to replace the door for a non-profit housing provider. The Landlord's agent also submits that on December 10, 2025 when the Tenant complained to them, they sent a contractor to look at the door. When the contractor refused to replace the door at that time, the Tenant refused the contractor to work on the door in this regard.
9. The Landlord has been gradually replacing doors in the residential complex as they require with new steel doors. This costs approximately \$1,800.00 for the Landlord to replace the wooden door with a metal door. The Landlord further submits that they have regular annual fire inspections and that there has never been an issue with the door for these inspections aside from an issue with the door closure which was addressed at the time the Tenant moved in.
10. At the hearing the Landlord's agent offered to send whatever contractor or locksmith the Tenant preferred to ensure the lock is functioning properly, but the Tenants only response was that the door needed to be replaced to a new steel door.
11. The Tenant was granted an expedited hearing on the basis that she was claiming that the door would not lock. However, based on the evidence at the hearing, it was more likely than not that the Tenant just sought to have a new metal door installed because it is her preference. Not because the locking mechanism does not work or that the door is broken and unable to close.
12. I am not satisfied that the Landlord failed to meet their obligations under subsection 20(1) of the Act to maintain the rental unit or residential complex. Nor do I find that the Landlord failed to comply with health, safety or other housing or maintenance standards.
13. For these reasons the application must be dismissed.

It is ordered that:

1. The Tenant's application is dismissed.

May 4, 2026
Date Issued

Terri van Huisstede
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.