



**Order under Section 30 / 69 / 88.2 / 89
Residential Tenancies Act, 2006**

Citation: Sun v Stevens, 2026 ONLTB 48121

Date: 2026-06-29

File Numbers: LTB-L-003712-24
LTB-T-068631-24

In the matter of: 2257 RIVERDALE PL
OAKVILLE ON L6M3X9

Between: Yan Sun Landlord

And

Jane Stevens Tenant

L2 Application:

Yan Sun (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Jane Stevens (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;
- the Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Tenant permitted in the residential complex has wilfully or negligently caused damage to the premises

The Landlord also claimed compensation for each day the Tenant remained in the unit after the termination date.

The Landlord also applied for an order requiring the Tenant to pay the Landlord's reasonable out-of-pocket expenses that are the result of the Tenant's failure to pay utility costs they were required to pay under the terms of the tenancy agreement.

The Landlord also applied for an order requiring the Tenant to pay the Landlord's reasonable out-of-pocket costs the Landlord has incurred or will incur to repair or replace undue damage to property. The damage was caused wilfully or negligently by the Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Tenant permitted in the residential complex.

T6 Application:

The Tenant applied for an order determining that 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.

These applications were heard by videoconference on May 27, 2026.

The Landlord, the Landlord's legal representative, Xiangyu Luo ('XL'), the Tenant, and the Tenant's legal representative, Sarah Vaz ('SV'), attended the hearing.

Determinations:

Preliminary Issues: T6 Application

Request to Amend the Application

1. The Tenant delivered a request to amend the T6 application on April 27, 2026. SV submitted that the amended application does not change the allegations made in the application, and is only an update relative to what has happened since the application was filed.
2. XL said the Landlord does not oppose the request to amend.
3. I accept that the request to amend was made in good faith, it was made in a timely manner in the circumstances, it was not cause delay or prejudice to the Landlord, and it is therefore granted (see DOC-7844700).

Limitation Period and Jurisdiction

4. The T6 application was filed pursuant to ss. 29(1)1 of the Act. Subsection 29(2) of the Act prescribes a one-year limitation period relative to this type of application. The LTB does not have jurisdiction to order a remedy relative to allegations about disrepair that occurred more than one year before the application was filed: s. 29, *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006*; *Vlahovich v. Toronto Community Housing Corporation*, 2010 ONSC 1686.
5. The allegations in the T6 application about the stove in the rental unit occurred entirely outside of this limitation period, and the application is therefore dismissed as it relates to the allegations about the stove. Some of the other allegations about disrepair occurred outside the limitation period, but the disrepair is alleged to have continued into the limitation period. A remedy is only available for the period beginning one year before the application was filed on August 25, 2024.
6. The T6 application, filed under ss. 29(1)1, is grounded in the allegation that the Landlord breached an obligation under ss. 20(1) of the Act, which states:

20 (1) A landlord is responsible for providing and maintaining a residential complex, including the rental units in it, in a good state of repair and fit for

habitation and for complying with health, safety, housing and maintenance standards. 2006, c. 17, s. 20 (1).

7. The T6 application includes numerous allegations about the Landlord's conduct, including, for example, allegations of harassment or a substantial interference with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex. These types of allegations are not properly before me on a T6 application.
8. The Act provides for a different, specific type of application for allegations about landlord conduct that may amount to harassment or a substantial interference with reasonable enjoyment (T2 application): see ss. 29(1)3 & 4, *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006*. Where an issue raised in an application falls under a specific and applicable section of the Act, the issue should be determined in accordance with that specific and applicable provision: see, for example, *Lise v. CLV Group Inc.*, 2022 CanLII 49901 (ON LTB), paras 12-13.
9. The T6 application is dismissed relative to the allegations made in the application that are not about the Landlord's alleged failure to maintain the rental unit in a state of good repair, fit for habitation, and in compliance with health, safety, housing, and maintenance standards.

Preliminary Issues: L2 Application:

10. The Landlord's claim for compensation for undue damage to the rental unit or residential complex was withdrawn at a previous appearance before the LTB (see interim order LTB-L-003712-24-IN, issued September 23, 2024).
11. The Landlord is not seeking termination of the tenancy in accordance with the N5 notice of termination. The Landlord only seeks compensation for unpaid utilities on the L2 application.

T6 Application:

12. The Tenant alleges in the T6 that the Landlord breached her maintenance obligations under section 20 of the Act relative to the following issues with the hot water, dishwasher, and pool.
13. The Court of Appeal for Ontario has rejected the proposition that this provision ought to be interpreted such that a landlord is in breach of their maintenance obligations as soon as a maintenance issue arises. Rather, a contextual approach, including consideration of the "entirety of the factual situation", must be applied to determine whether a landlord has breached their maintenance obligations under the Act: *Onyskiw v. CJM Property Management Ltd.*, 2016 ONCA 477, paras 58-60, 84-86; *TST-98783-18 (Re)*, 2019 CanLII 87665 (ON LTB).
14. Generally, landlords are not held liable for maintenance issues that arise if the landlord addresses the issue of disrepair in a timely and effective manner once they become aware, or ought to have become aware, of the issue: *TST-67067-16 (Re)*, 2016 CanLII 72234 (ON LTB), para 33; *LTB Interpretation Guideline #5: Breach of Maintenance Obligations*.

Hot Water

15. The Tenant emailed the Landlord on April 24, 2025 informing the Landlord that there had been no hot water in the unit since the previous day. The Tenant also informed the Landlord that she had contacted Reliance, who had already sent a technician to the unit, but that they had determined the hot water heater could not be repaired and required replacement. The Tenant asked that the Landlord send someone to the unit to confirm if the hot water heater could be repaired or if it needed to be replaced (DOC-7844709, p. 8). On the same day the Tenant sent the Landlord a text message stating that she had sent the Landlord an email because the unit had no hot water. The Landlord replied to the text message on April 25, 2025, stating “[i]n the U.S. and will be back next week”. The Tenant then replied to the Landlord’s message by writing that she cannot go without hot water for a week, and asks the Landlord to either send someone, or allow the Tenant to call Reliance to replace the hot water heater (DOC-7844709, p. 21).
16. By April 28, 2025 the Tenant had not received a substantive response from the Landlord, so she sent an email to the provincial Rental Housing Enforcement Unit (‘RHEU’) (DOC-7844709, pp. 9-10). Then, on April 29, the Landlord sent the Tenant a text message, asking the Tenant to get a quote for the cost of installation of a new rented water heater. The Tenant arranged for Reliance to attend that afternoon, and asked the Landlord to be available to receive and consider the quote while the technician was present.
17. Some alteration to duct work was determined to be needed for Reliance to install a new hot water heater, which required the Landlord’s consent. The Landlord was not responsive to communications from the Tenant or Reliance. Eventually, the technician found a “workaround” to replace the hot water heater without making any alterations. The hot water tank was replaced on April 30, 2025.
18. The Tenant was without hot water in the rental unit for 7 days (April 23 to April 30, 2025). A Landlord cannot be expected to remedy a maintenance issue they are not aware of. In this case, the Landlord was informed of the issue on April 24, 2025, and it was repaired in an effective manner 6 days later.
19. The issue was addressed in an effective manner by the Reliance technician on April 30, 2025, but I find that the Landlord failed to address the issue in a timely manner in the circumstances.
20. The issue was addressed at this time because of the Tenant’s diligence in contacting and coordinating with Reliance. The Landlord did not take reasonable steps to discharge her maintenance obligation by coordinating the repair or replacement of the hot water heater herself. Although the issue remained outstanding for only 6 days after the Landlord was made aware of the issue, this was not a minor or merely aesthetic issue. Hot water is a defined “vital service” under the Act: ss. 2(1), *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006*.
21. This issue ought to have been dealt with expeditiously by the Landlord. Instead, the Tenant was left to coordinate repairs herself, while at the same time having to actively seek the Landlord’s approval/consent for the repair.

22. Considering the context and the entire factual situation, I find that the Landlord was in breach of her maintenance obligations under section 20 of the Act relative to the hot water heater. The Tenant is entitled to a rent abatement for the period April 24, 2025 to April 30, 2025.
23. A rent abatement is, in substance, a contractual remedy, based on the premise that if a tenant pays 100% of the rent, they ought to receive 100% of the value of what they have paid for. A rent abatement is intended to account for the proportion of the value that the Tenant did not receive because of the Landlord's breach of the Act.
24. Given that hot water is a vital service and the impact of the lack of hot water on the Tenant, I find that a reasonable rent abatement is 15% of the rent for these days. The monthly rent at the time was \$3,590.00. This amounts to an abatement of \$106.23 [15% x (\$3,590.00 x 12 months, divided by 365 days x 6 days)].

Dishwasher

25. On May 6, 2025 the Tenant emailed the Landlord to inform her that the dishwasher was not draining properly, and has started leaking and caused water damage to surrounding cupboards and flooring in the basement bedroom, beneath the kitchen. Photos of the dishwasher and damaged cupboards were presented as evidence by the Tenant (DOC-7844709, 13-19).
26. The Tenant's uncontradicted evidence was that the dishwasher was eventually replaced about 7 weeks later.
27. On cross-examination, it was put to the Tenant that the dishwasher stopped working because of a "lack of maintenance", according to the Landlord's handyman. The suggestion was that it was a lack of ordinary cleanliness that caused damage to the dishwasher. The Tenant denied that this was the case, and there was no cogent evidence presented to support this assertion.
28. The Landlord's handyman was not present to give evidence, but regardless, a "lack of maintenance" is not the same as ordinary cleanliness. If the dishwasher failed because of a "lack of maintenance" over time, it was the Landlord obliged to "maintain" the dishwasher. The Tenant's obligation is to keep the unit in a state of ordinary cleanliness. Even the alleged words of the handyman that were put to the Tenant were not that a lack of ordinary cleanliness caused damage to the dishwasher.
29. In the absence of any evidence from the Landlord explaining this delay, I find that the broken dishwasher was not effectively addressed in a timely manner. The Tenant is entitled to a rent abatement for 7 weeks relative to the dishwasher.
30. Being without a dishwasher for 7 weeks was surely frustrating for the Tenant, and I find that a 5% rent abatement is appropriate relative to this issue. It would have caused inconvenience for the Tenant to have to wash dishes by hand without the use of a dishwasher for this period. This amounts to a rent abatement of \$289.17 [5% x (\$3,590.00 x 12 months, divided by 365 x 49 days)].

Pool

31. The tenancy agreement between the parties contains the following provision relative to the pool:

“Tenant agrees to provide general maintenance for the swimming pool located on the premises, including cleaning, use of chemicals, opening and winterizing the pool. The Landlord shall be responsible for the upkeep of the equipment, including both chattels and fixtures associated with the operation of the pool.”
(DOC-7989499, p. 7)

32. I find that cleaning and adding chemicals to a pool would fall within the Tenant’s responsibility to maintain the unit in a state of ordinary cleanliness: s. 33, *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006*. The same may not be the case for winterizing and opening the pool, which may fall under the Landlord’s maintenance obligations under section 20 of the Act. For the reasons that follow, whether this provision requiring the Tenant to winterize and open the pool is valid, or alternatively if it is void because it is inconsistent with the Act, given the Court of Appeal’s decisions in *Crete v. Ottawa Community Housing Corporation*, 2024 ONCA 459 (CanLII) and *Montgomery v. Van*, 2009 ONCA 808 (CanLII), is not an issue I must determine on this application.
33. The Tenant said that a new pool heater was installed in 2018, but said it stopped working in 2021. The Tenant said that in July 2023, she sent a video to the Landlord showing that the pool heater was leaking water. The Tenant said she had a pool technician present at the time, and that it was an ongoing issue, but that the Landlord denied that the issue existed. I find that issues with disrepair of the pool heater, including a water leak from the pool heater, are responsibilities of the Landlord pursuant to the Act, and pursuant to the above-referenced clause in the tenancy agreement.
34. The Tenant said that she has not been able to use the pool at all in the years 2023, 2024, or 2025. The Tenant said that the Landlord attended the unit in December 2023, but it was cold and frozen outside, so the leak could not have been inspected at that time, nor could the state of repair of the pool heater have been reasonably inspected. She said the Landlord returned in May 2024 but did not look at the issue of the pool heater leak. The Tenant said that she had the leak repaired by a plumber in late 2024, for which she paid \$186.45 (DOC-8029708, p. 2). The Tenant’s evidence was that the pool heater is still not working.
35. The Landlord said that she was not given evidence from the Tenant that there was a water leak, although the Tenant complains of a leak or a potential leak in several text message exchanges that were presented by the Landlord (DOC-7989499, pp. 72-78).
36. The Landlord said that she attended the unit in December 2023 with a handyman, and found a leak in the bathroom.
37. The Landlord said that she did not have this bathroom leak fixed because the Tenant would not let her in the basement, and the Tenant said she would repair it herself. The Tenant said the bathroom leak was minor and she had it repaired in December 2023.

38. The Landlord said she then checked the pool heater for a leak on May 23, 2024, when she attended again with a handyman. The Landlord said no issue was found with the pool, and the Tenant would not allow her in the house to check on the bathroom leak. The Landlord said the Tenant told her that the bathroom leak had been repaired. The Tenant denied refusing entry to the Landlord, and said she only told the Landlord not to enter the bedrooms where children were sleeping.
39. The Tenant's account of this is supported by a contemporaneous text message exchange presented by the Landlord (DOC-7989499, p. 62). The Tenant also said that since tension was high, she had phoned the non-emergency police line to request an officer's assistance for the Landlord's entry. The Tenant said she was concerned that the Landlord would not comply with her request to stay out of the bedrooms. She said that the Landlord left before the officer arrived.
40. The Tenant said that the company she contracted to discharge her obligations in the lease relative to the pool initially found the pool heater leak. She said this leak was substantial and the cause of the excessive water consumption. The Landlord presented an email from her pool contractor, however, this email was about leaves in the pool and potential issues that could be caused by that, and the chemical levels at the relevant time. The email does not address the water heater or the water heater leak (see DOC-7989499, pp 82-83).
41. The Tenant presented a summary of her water bill history from 2019 to present. The Tenant's evidence was that the household water usage did not change in any meaningful way during this period, however, the amount she was billed for water fluctuated significantly. According to this document, between 2019 and 2021 the Tenant was billed between approximately \$3,000.00 and \$3,800.00 annually for water. In 2022, the water bill increased slightly, to just over \$4,000.00. In 2023 and 2024, the water bills increased substantially to \$6,220.67 and \$7,623.97 respectively. In 2025, after the Tenant had the water leak repaired, the bill returned to "normal", at \$3,555.56. This is consistent with the Tenant's evidence that there was a water leak from the pool heater, which appears to have become progressively worse until it was repaired in November 2024, causing excessive water usage and bills (see DOC-8029708, p. 1). This is also consistent with the position that the excessive water consumption was not caused by the bathroom leak, because the water bills remained elevated after it was repaired.
42. In her application, the Tenant also claimed that the pool's salt and sand filter was not in a state of good repair, but the Tenant did not present sufficient clear, convincing, and cogent evidence to prove her allegations relative to this issue.
43. I am satisfied that the Tenant proved on a balance of probabilities that the pool heater has not worked since 2022. The Tenant's evidence on this point was clear, cogent, and consistent. The Tenant also proved on a balance of probabilities that there was a leak in the pool heater until November 2024 when the Tenant had the leak repaired. This is consistent with the Tenant's evidence about water consumption, and with the Landlord's evidence about water consumption (see below).
44. Repair of the pool heater leak is the Landlord's responsibility under the Act and the lease. While the Tenant ought to be entitled to recover any amounts she had to pay for excessive water use caused by this leak, this amount ought to be set off against the amounts added

to the Landlord's property tax bills relative to water bill arrears (see below under L2 Application).

45. The pool heater not working is also the Landlord's responsibility under the Act and the lease. The Tenant is entitled to a rent abatement as a result of the pool heater not working for the period August 25, 2023 (one year before the filing date) to present. I recognize that the pool heater not working may diminish enjoyment of the pool, but it is unclear from the evidence before me why the pool was not usable at all during the relevant period. An unheated pool can still be used.
46. I find that a 3% rent abatement for the months of September 2024, June to September 2025, and June 2026 is reasonable for the issue of the pool heater not working. This is a total of 151 days, and amounts to a rent abatement of \$534.68 [3% x (\$3,590.00 x 12 months, divided by 365 x 151 days)].
47. The Landlord is also ordered to inspect and ensure the pool heater is operational and in a good state of repair, including repairing or replacing the pool heater, if necessary, by July 31, 2026.

L2 Application

48. While the Tenant claimed compensation for excessive water bills paid because of the water leak, the Landlord claimed compensation relative to costs incurred by the Landlord because the Tenant failed to pay the water bills she was required to pay under the tenancy agreement.
49. There was no dispute that the Tenant is responsible to pay the water bills under the tenancy agreement.
50. In the application, the Landlord claimed that the Tenant owes \$9,008.64 for water bills that she failed to pay for the period November 23, 2021 to January 14, 2025.
51. The Landlord presented as evidence a letter from the Town of Oakville dated May 10, 2022. The letter states that \$672.76 would be added to the property tax bill for the property for outstanding water arrears and an administrative fee of \$80.00 (DOC-4024959, p. 27).
52. The Landlord also presented numerous other letters that she received from the Town of Oakville and the Region of Halton relative to the water bills (DOC-4024959, pp. 28-37). These letters are dated from September 15, 2022 to August 23, 2024. Each of these letters identifies that there are outstanding water arrears. Some state that the owner is responsible to pay the arrears, even if they relate to a tenant's water use. Some state that the outstanding amounts would be added to the Landlord's property tax bill.
53. The total amount set out in letters from the Town of Oakville that would be added to the Landlord's property tax bills is \$5,366.09. The letters from Halton Region do not provide specific amounts. Rather, they inform the Landlord that there are water arrears in excess of \$500.00, and the Landlord is encouraged to contact Oakville Hydro to pay the arrears. The exception to this is that the August 23, 2024 letter from Halton Region specifies \$995.00 in water arrears. It is not clear from these documents on their face if the amounts referred to in the Halton Region letters are the same amounts referred to in the Town of

Oakville letters. The overlapping dates, and the fact that the letters from Halton Region state that if the amounts are not paid they would be added to the property tax bills by the Town of Oakville, suggest these are in fact the same amounts.

54. The Landlord also presented a Statement of Tax Arrears from the Town of Oakville, dated October 16, 2024. The statement identifies tax arrears totalling \$8,609.87 for the year 2024, including \$634.43 for penalties/interest. This statement does not identify what, if any, portion of this amount is by water arrears added to the property tax bill (DOC-7989499, p.36).
55. The Landlord also presented a copy of an interim property tax bill for the property, dated January 14, 2025. In addition to the interim 2025 taxes due, the bill shows a previous balance outstanding of \$9,008.64 (DOC-7989499, p. 37). This appears to be where the number that the Landlord based the amount claimed in the application on came from, however, the bill does not identify whether all or a portion of the \$9,008.64 previously owing are from water arrears, or if it is from previous unpaid property taxes. The Landlord was not able to provide a cogent explanation about this when asked on cross-examination.
56. Without any specificity or supporting documentary evidence, the Landlord claimed that the Tenant now owes over \$10,000.00 in water arrears. Later, the Landlord presented a copy of an arrears statement from the Town of Oakville (DOC-7995052). The Landlord claims that entire "Balance Forward" amount shown of \$14,246.92 is from water arrears. This is not specified on the bill, and the Landlord only claimed \$9,008.64 in the application.
57. The Landlord then presented an email from Halton Region showing that a total of \$6,669.52 was transferred to the Landlord's property tax bill because of water arrears relative to billing dates from November 23, 2021 to July 24, 2024. This same document also says that \$658.16 of the amount transferred had been paid by the Tenant. This means that a total of \$6,011.36 was transferred to the Landlord's property tax bills, and was not paid by the Tenant for the period ending May 8, 2024 (DOC-7989499, p. 44).
58. The Landlord claimed that the Tenant has not paid her water bill since 2020, and that since the Landlord was made aware of the non-payment in 2022, she has told the Tenant to pay. The Landlord presented as evidence a text message exchange from April 19, 2023 where the Landlord sent the Tenant a copy of a notice from the Town of Oakville about water arrears, and told the Tenant to pay the amount outstanding. In her response, the Tenant said she sometimes has to prioritize rent over utility bills, but that it would be paid. In this text message, the Tenant also wrote that there might be a water leak, as the bill was very high (DOC-7989499, p. 72). Several other similar text message exchanges during the relevant period were also presented by the Landlord (DOC-7989499, pp. 74-77).
59. After claiming that the Tenant had not paid any of the water bills, the Landlord later acknowledged on cross-examination that she does not know what the Tenant paid, she can only see what was not paid. The Tenant said she has always paid water bills, but when the bills started increasing, she struggled to keep up and was not able to pay the full amounts due. She said that the amount claimed in the T2 application is the amount that she thinks she overpaid.
60. The Landlord did not prove that the full amount claimed was added to her property tax bills. The Landlord only presented sufficient clear, convincing, and cogent evidence to

establish that it is more likely than not that \$6,011.36 was added to her property tax bills during the relevant period (see email from Halton Region at DOC-7989499, p. 44). The Landlord did not present sufficient clear, convincing, and cogent evidence to prove it is more likely that not that more than this was added to her property tax bill because of water arrears, and was not paid by the Tenant. The Landlord's other evidence on this point was too vague and not sufficiently cogent.

61. As set out above in relation to the T6 application, the Tenant is not responsible to pay for the excess portion of the water bills that were caused by the pool heater leak for the period beginning one year before the T6 application was filed, being August 25, 2023 up to November 2024 when the Tenant had the leak repaired. This is a period of 16 months.
62. I do not accept the Landlord's position that the excess water consumption was caused by the Tenant's household's overuse of water. The Tenant's evidence, which I accept, was that there was no significant fluctuation in household water use during the relevant period. It is more likely than not that the excess consumption was caused by the pool heater water leak, given that the consumption was again reduced after the Tenant had the leak repaired.
63. In addition to the summary submitted by the Tenant of her escalating water bills for the years 2022 to 2024, the Landlord presented a water consumption report, showing consumption amounts in cubic meters together with billed amounts for each 60-day period from January 2019 to March 2026 (DOC-7989499, pp. 110-111). This report shows a clear and significant increase in consumption beginning with the bill dated July 21, 2022 up to the bill dated September 24, 2024, when consumption amounts were reduced significantly.
64. I find the Landlord's consumption report to be the most reliable data showing consumption and billed amounts because it is a document provided by Halton Region, whereas the Tenant's summary was a document that the Tenant created.
65. The average amount billed for water for each 60-day period from the bills dated January 18, 2019 to May 20, 2022 was \$173.20. For each 60-day period from the bills dated September 22, 2023 to November 25, 2024 were \$667.65. I find that it is reasonable to use these amounts to make a reasonable determination as to the amount that the Tenant was billed for excess water consumption caused by the leak. On average, the Tenant was billed an additional \$494.45 for each 60-day period for excess water consumption caused by the leak.
66. As noted above, the Tenant is not responsible for the portion of the water bills attributable to excess consumption caused by the water leak for a total of 16 months (or eight 60-day periods). This totals \$3,955.60.
67. The Tenant therefore owes the Landlord \$2,055.76 for excess water bills for period November 23, 2021 to January 14, 2025 [\$6,011.36 - \$3,955.60].
68. The Landlord owes the Tenant a rent abatement in the amount of \$930.08 with respect to the issues with the hot water (\$106.23), dishwasher (\$289.17), and pool (\$534.68), as set out above
69. The Tenant therefore owes the Landlord \$1,125.68 (\$2,055.76 - \$930.08).

It is ordered that:

1. The Tenant shall pay to the Landlord \$1,125.68 for the the reasonable out-of-pocket expenses the Landlord has incurred or will incur as a result of the unpaid utility costs.
2. The Landlord shall inspect the pool heater, and ensure it is operational and in a state of good repair, including by repairing or replacing the pool heater as necessary, by July 31, 2026
3. If the Tenant does not pay the Landlord the full amount owing on or before July 31, 2026, the Tenant will start to owe interest. This will be simple interest calculated from August 1, 2026 at 4.00% annually on the balance outstanding.

June 29, 2026

Date Issued

Mark Melchers

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.