

Ontario Municipal Board
Commission des affaires municipales
de l'Ontario



ISSUE DATE: February 07, 2017

CASE NO(S): PL130592

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 34(19) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant(s): Multiple Appellants
Subject: By-law No. 569-2013
Municipality: City of Toronto
OMB Case No.: PL130592
OMB File No.: PL130592
OMB Case Name: Bahardoust v. Toronto (City)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 34(31) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended

Requested by: City of Toronto
Request for: An order to bring partial approval of Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 into force and effect

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 34(31) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, section 37 of the *Ontario Municipal Board Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28, as amended, and Rule 33 of the Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure

Request by: City of Toronto
Request for: An order to bring approval of the Transitional Clause of the Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 into force and effect

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER section 37 of the *Ontario Municipal Board Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28, as amended, and Rule 33 of the Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure

Request by: City of Toronto
Appellant(s): W. J. Holdings Limited
Service Corporation International (Canada)
Request for: An order to amend By-law No. 569-2013, on consent (Settlement Motions)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER section 37 of the *Ontario Municipal Board Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28, as amended, and Rule 33 of the Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure

Requested by: Oxford Properties Group Inc. (Appeal No. 106)
 120 and 130 Adelaide Street West, 12
 Properties: Sheppard Street, and 85 and 111 Richmond
 Street
 Requested for: Request for an Order to be excluded from the
 application of By-law No. 569-2013

Heard: October 4, 2016 in Toronto, Ontario

APPEARANCES:

Parties

Counsel*/Representative

See Attached Attendance List

DECISION DELIVERED BY C. CONTI AND M. A. SILLS AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

INTRODUCTION

[1] This is the decision from a Pre-hearing Conference ("PHC") for multiple appeals filed against the new City of Toronto ("City") Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 ("By-law"). The By-law is intended to bring together in one instrument the zoning provisions for the amalgamated City, replacing the existing Zoning By-laws which applied to the former municipalities which now comprise Toronto.

[2] A number of motions were considered at the PHC as well as the scheduling of appeals related to portions of the By-law.

MOTIONS

[3] The Board considered three motions that had been filed according to the Board's *Rules of Practice and Procedure* ("Board's Rules").

[4] The first motion filed by the City settles the appeal by Bell Canada. The motion proposed adding wording to the conditions regarding public utilities in each zone of the By-law. The motion proposed adding the word “hydro” before the words “electrical transfer station” which clarifies the intent of the conditions. The City filed a motion record (Exhibit 80) which included an affidavit of Klaus Lehman, Manager of City Planning, which supported the motion. The motion record also included Minutes of Settlement and a draft order. Sean Gosnell attended on behalf of Bell Canada in support of the motion. The motion was not opposed.

[5] The second motion was filed by the City and proposed changes to the By-law to settle part of the appeal by Mondelez Canada Inc. The motion proposed amending wording in the By-law in the Employment – Industrial and Employment – Heavy Industrial Zones by replacing the words “Manufacturing Use, if it is not one of the following” with “Manufacturing Uses except”. The City submitted a motion record (Exhibit 83) that was accompanied by an affidavit of Mr. Lehman which supported the motion. Also included were Minutes of Settlement and a draft order. The proposed changes to the By-law will settle the Mondelez Canada Inc. appeal, except as related to specific properties. The motion was not opposed.

[6] The third motion was also filed by the City and it proposed approval of portions of the By-law that are not in dispute. This was similar to motions that had been approved by the Board at previous proceedings except it covers different provisions in the By-law. The Board heard that after the last PHC the City identified some additional regulations of the By-law that it considers not to be in dispute. The Board heard that approving those portions of the By-law that are not in dispute will help to eliminate the dual review process at the City where applications must be reviewed under both the old and new By-laws.

[7] The City filed a motion record (Exhibit 85) which was supported by an affidavit of Mr. Lehman. The City also filed a Supplemental Affidavit of Mr. Lehman (Exhibit 87) which included three amendments to the schedule of provisions proposed to be approved and corrected typographical errors. Through the submissions, the City has

requested that the Board, under s. 34(31) of the *Planning Act*, declare certain portions of the By-law to be in force and effect as identified in Mr. Lehman's affidavits.

[8] No responses to the motion were received within the two day period prior to the date of the PHC as required in the Board's Rules. The Board heard from Eileen Denny that she had difficulty filing a written response to the motion and that she had concerns that complex matters were being dealt with too quickly. She referred to the Board's Rules which indicate that dates can be scheduled to hear motions and she requested that the Board schedule separate motion hearings apart from the PHC's.

[9] Kelly Matsumoto indicated that Ms. Denny has computer issues and that the City has considered ways to assist her, but has not been able to determine a type of assistance that would be appropriate. She stated that the City cannot distribute Ms. Denny's materials to the other parties. The Board also indicated that it could not distribute materials on behalf of Ms. Denny or any other party.

[10] The Board acknowledges that separate dates could be scheduled to hear motions for approval of parts of the By-law that the City contends are not in dispute or for any other types of motions that are brought by the parties. However, as noted at the PHC, the intent of the pre-hearing process is to manage the appeals of the By-law so that the hearing process can be clarified, simplified and focused on those matters that are in dispute. It is standard procedure through the pre-hearing process to receive and allow motions that settle appeals and in some cases to approve those matters that have been resolved. This simply allows the hearing process to focus on those matters that are still at issue.

[11] It is in the interest of all parties that the Board manage the hearing process in an efficient manner. If the Board were made aware of substantive concerns for the sections of the By-law proposed to be approved through the motion that would require consideration through detailed submissions, it would schedule a separate date to hear the motion. However, that was not the case. Ms. Denny raised only general concerns about the process.

[12] Furthermore, in bringing forward its motions, the City has identified that the Regulations will be brought into force and effect only for those properties for which there is no outstanding appeal. Also, the City acknowledges that all area and site specific appeals remain in effect and appeals regarding specific issues will not be prejudiced by approval of the motions (Exhibit 85, Tab 1, para. 13-14). Potentially, some matters that Ms. Denny may want to raise could be related to those properties and issues that will not be included in approval of the motion.

[13] As noted earlier, neither the City nor the Board can assist Ms. Denny in distributing materials. The Board would be concerned about procedural fairness if it were seen to be assisting one of the parties in an appeal. At previous PHC's Ms. Denny has expressed her difficulty in receiving and sending large computer files or communicating with a large number of recipients. Perhaps, since she is representing the Teddington Park Resident's Association and the Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations in Toronto, she could partner with other individuals in those groups to assist in resolving this issue.

[14] No other party other than Ms. Denny raised any concerns at the PHC about the motion.

[15] Two other motions were discussed at the PHC, one by Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church which had not been filed in sufficient time to comply with the Board's Rules and the other on behalf of the Sakinah Foundation which was raised orally at the hearing without filing documents. While it appeared that these motions may be unopposed the Board wanted to ensure that proper notice had been provided and that they were filed according to the Board's Rules. In consideration that the motions may not be opposed, the Board agreed that they could be dealt with through a Telephone Conference Call ("TCC"). The Board directed the parties to ensure that documents had been filed according to the Board's Rules and to contact the Board Case Coordinator to schedule a TCC to hear the motions.

[16] The Board has considered the motions and the written and oral submissions of the parties. The City's motions related to Bell Canada and Mondelez Canada Inc. are unopposed and based upon the uncontested affidavit evidence, the Board allows the motions and approves the proposed revisions to the By-law. The City has provided draft orders for the motions which the Board adopts and attached to this decision.

[17] With regard to the City's motion to approve the portions of the By-law that it contends are not in dispute, no responses to the motion were filed according to the requirements of the Board's Rules. The expert planning opinion provided by Mr. Lehman in his affidavit states that the regulations that are the subject of the motion "...represent good planning, are consistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement, conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and are in conformity with the Official Plan for the City of Toronto" (Exhibit 85, Tab 2, para. 20). Ms. Denny's oral submissions did not raise any substantive concerns to question or refute the evidence provided in support of the motion. Therefore, the Board allows the motion and approves the portions of the By-law that are the subject of the motion. The City has provided a draft order which is attached to this decision.

[18] The Board's order is provided at the end of this decision.

SCHEDULING OF HEARING PHASES

[19] Ms. Matsumoto requested that the Board schedule one week hearing time for each of phase 1 and phase 2 of the appeals. Phase 1 is intended to consider Chapters 1, 2, 5 and 800 of the By-law which are the operational clauses. Phase 2 is intended to consider the residential provisions. The City also requested that a PHC be scheduled for a day prior to each phase to deal with any issues that might arise. Subsequent phases will be scheduled in the future to consider other zoning categories.

[20] After hearing from the parties, the Board scheduled the following hearing events:

1. A one day PHC was scheduled for April 13, 2017 at 10 a.m. for appeals related to phase 1.

2. A one week hearing was scheduled commencing on May 8, 2017 at 10 a.m. for the phase 1 appeals.
3. A one day PHC was scheduled for June 6, 2017 at 10 a.m. for the appeals related to phase 2.
4. A one week hearing was scheduled commencing on June 26, 2017 at 10 a.m. for the phase 2 appeals.

[21] All of the above hearings will be held at the Board offices.

ORDER

[22] The Board orders that the motion by the City of Toronto regarding the appeal by Bell Canada is allowed in part, and By-law No. 569-2013 is amended as set out in Attachment 1 to this decision;

[23] The Board orders that the motion by the City of Toronto regarding the appeal of Mondelez Canada and the wording in the By-law related to Manufacturing uses is allowed in part, and By-law No. 569-2013 is amended as set out in Attachment 2;

[24] The Board orders that the motion by the City of Toronto regarding approval of parts of Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 that are not in dispute is allowed in part; the Board orders the matters included in Attachment 3 to this decision and Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 is amended as set out therein;

[25] No further notice is required.

[26] The Members are not seized.

[27] The above is the direction and Order of the Board.

"C. Conti"

C. CONTI
MEMBER

"M. A. Sills"

M. A. SILLS
MEMBER

If there is an attachment referred to in this document,
please visit www.elto.gov.on.ca to view the attachment in PDF format.

Ontario Municipal Board

A constituent tribunal of Environment and Land Tribunals Ontario
Website: www.elto.gov.on.ca Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

1. In accordance with section 34(26) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, By-law No. 569-2013 of City of Toronto is hereby amended as follows:
 - (a) the approval of By-law 569-2013, as amended, by amending the conditions related to "public utility" throughout By-law 569-2013 as follows [Appeal 81]:
 - (i) 10.10.20.100(11)
Public Utility
In the R zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the R zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
 - (ii) 10.20.20.100(11)
Public Utility
In the RD zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the RD zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
 - (iii) 10.40.20.100(11)
Public Utility
In the RS zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the RS zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
 - (iv) 10.60.20.100(11)
Public Utility
In the RT zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the RT zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.

- (v) 10.80.20.100(12)
Public Utility
In the RM zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the RM zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (vi) 15.10.20.100(11)
Public Utility
In the RA zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum **building** height for the RA zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (vii) 15.20.20.100(16)
Public Utility
In the RAC zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the RAC zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (viii) 30.20.20.100(18)
Public Utility
In the CL zone, a **public utility**, must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the CL zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (ix) 40.10.20.100(57)
Public Utility
In the CR zone, a **public utility**, must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the CR zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.

- (x) 50.10.20.100(44)
Public Utility
In the CRE zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setback** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the CRE zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (xi) 60.10.20.100(16)
Public Utility
In the EL zone, a **public utility**, must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building**, if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (xii) 60.20.20.100(29)
Public Utility
In the E zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building**, if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (xiii) 60.40.20.100(27)
Public Utility
In the EO zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building**:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or
(B) a natural gas regulator station.
- (xiv) 80.10.20.100(20)
Public Utility
In the I zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the I zone if it is:
(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or

(B) a natural gas regulator station.

(xv) 80.20.20.100(16)

Public Utility

In the IH zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the IH zone if it is:

(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or

(B) a natural gas regulator station.

(xvi) 80.30.20.100(18)

Public Utility

In the IE zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the IE zone if it is:

(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or

(B) a natural gas regulator station.

(xvii) 80.40.20.100(10)

Public Utility

In the IS zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the IS zone if it is:

(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or

(B) a natural gas regulator station.

(xviii) 80.50.20.100(12)

Public Utility

In the IPW zone, a **public utility** must be enclosed by walls and comply with the permitted maximum **lot coverage**, required minimum **building setbacks** and permitted maximum height for a **building** in the IPW zone if it is:

(A) a hydro electrical transformer station; or

(B) a natural gas regulator station.

2. In accordance with section 34(26) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, By-law 569-2013, as amended, of the City of Toronto is hereby amended by amending the conditions related to a "public utility".

3. The appeal filed by Bell Canada against the City of Toronto By-law 569-2013 (Appeal No. 81) is hereby allowed to the extent necessary to give effect to the terms of this Order.

4. This Settlement and Order is without prejudice to the right of Bell Canada to be a party to any appeal in this proceeding relating to the Public Utility definition in By-law 569-2013, as amended (Chapter 800 section 630).

i) **60.20.20.10 Permitted Use**(1) Use - E Zone

In the E zone, the following uses are permitted:

Ambulance Depot

Animal Shelter

Artist Studio

Automated Banking Machine

Bindery

Building Supply Yards

Carpenter's Shop

Cold Storage

Contractor's Establishment

Custom Workshop

Dry Cleaning or Laundry Plant

Financial Institution

Fire Hall

Industrial Sales and Service Use

Kennel

Laboratory

All **Manufacturing Uses** except:

1) Abattoir, Slaughterhouse or Rendering of Animals Factory;

2) Ammunition, Firearms or Fireworks Factory;

3) Asphalt Plant;

4) Cement Plant, or Concrete Batching Plant;

5) Crude Petroleum Oil or Coal Refinery;

6) Explosives Factory;

7) **Industrial Gas Manufacturing;**

8) Large Scale Smelting or Foundry Operations for the Primary Processing of Metals;

9) **Pesticide or Fertilizer Manufacturing;**

10) **Petrochemical Manufacturing;**

11) Primary Processing of Gypsum;

12) Primary Processing of Limestone;

13) Primary Processing of Oil-based Paints, Oil-based Coatings or Adhesives;

14) Pulp Mill, using pulpwood or other vegetable fibres;

15) **Resin, Natural or Synthetic Rubber Manufacturing;**

16) Tannery

Office

Park

Performing Arts Studio

Pet Services

Police Station
Printing Establishment
Production Studio
Public Works Yard
Service Shop
Software Development and Processing
Warehouse
Wholesaling Use

(ii) **60.30.20.10 Permitted Use**

(1) Use - EH Zone

In the EH zone, the following uses are permitted:

Ambulance Depot
Animal Shelter
Bindery
Building Supply Yards
Carpenter's Shop
Chemical Materials Storage
Cold Storage
Contractors Establishment
Custom Workshop
Dry Cleaning or Laundry Plant
Fire Hall
Fuel Storage
Industrial Sales and Service Use
Laboratory
All **Manufacturing Uses** except:
1) Ammunition, Firearms or Fireworks Factory;
2) Crude Petroleum Oil or Coal Refinery;
3) Explosives Factory;
4) Tannery
Police Station
Public Utility
Public Works Yard
Recovery Facility
Service Shop
Shipping Terminal
Vehicle Depot
Vehicle Repair Shop
Warehouse
Waste Transfer Station

2. The appeal filed by Mondelez Canada against the City of Toronto By-law 569-2013 (Appeal No. 272) is hereby allowed in part and to the extent necessary to give effect to the term of this Order.

**Ontario Municipal Board
Commission des affaires municipales de l'Ontario**

IN THE MATTER OF Section 34(19) and 34(31) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended.

Subject: By-Law No. 569-2013
Municipality: City of Toronto
OMB Case No.: PL130592
OMB File No.: PL130592

BEFORE:

)
)
) October 4, 2016

ORDER

THIS MATTER having come before the Board for a motion on October 4, 2016, and having heard submissions of the Parties,

AND WHEREAS the parties agree that issue-specific or site specific exceptions or modifications to By-law 569-2013 may deviate from what has been approved in Appendix 1 to this Order;

AND WHEREAS, the City has not conceded that any portions of By-law 569-2013 that have not come into effect are properly under appeal. The City reserves the right to bring motions or take any other action which it deems appropriate to have the breadth and scope of any appeal determined by the Board at a future date;

THE BOARD ORDERS that the Regulations of City of Toronto By-law 569-2013 set out in Appendix 1 to this Order are approved and are in full force and effect as of May 9, 2013, which is the date the By-law was passed, pursuant to Subsection 34(31) of the Planning Act, save and except to sites that are the subject of a site-specific or area-specific appeal identified in Appendix 2 of Attachment 3 of the Board's Memorandum of Oral Decision and Order dated September 13, 2016.

THE BOARD ORDERS that the coming into effect of the portions of By-law 569-2013 set out in Appendix 1 to this Order

- (a) shall be without prejudice to the rights of any party for their proposed exceptions or modifications to By-law 569-2013 in an issue-specific or site-specific appeal. For greater certainty and without limiting the foregoing, this Order shall not have any effect on the Board's authority to grant issue-specific, category-specific, organizational or site-specific exceptions or modifications to By-law 569-2013, regardless of whether the proposed exceptions or modifications deviate from, or result in the repeal or replacement of, portions of By-law 569-2013 that the Board has already approved;
- (b) shall not have the effect of limiting existing or future resolutions of any appellant's appeal;
- (c) shall not limit any party's right to seek to amend portions of By-law 569-2013;
- (d) does not limit the jurisdiction of the Board to consider and approve amendments to the By-law including the addition of permitted uses and building types, and site specific exceptions or modifications to By-law 569-2013 that may deviate from portions of the By-law that the Board has already approved; and
- (e) shall not apply to any portion of By-law 569-2013 that remains in issue in the appeal;

AND THE BOARD ORDERS that it may be spoken to in the event some matter should arise in connection with the implementation of this Order.

Appendix 1

By-law 569-2013 Regulations Brought Into Force

1.5.7.

1.20.2. (14)

2.1.2

5.10.1.10 (4)

5.10.20.1 (1) only as it applies to 1220 Wilson Avenue, 1222 Wilson Avenue, 287 Rushton Road and 2300 Lake Shore Boulevard West

5.10.30.20. (1)

5.10.40.70 (1)

5.10.40.70 (3)

5.10.40.70 (4)

5.10.40.70 (5)

10.5.80.10 (4)

10.5.80.10 (6)

10.10.20.100 (10)

10.10.30.10 (1)

10.10.30.20 (1)

10.10.40.1 (4)

10.10.40.70 (1)

10.10.40.70 (2)

10.10.40.70 (3)(A)

10.10.40.70 (3)(B)

10.10.40.70 (3)(C)(ii)

10.10.40.70 (3)(C)(iii)

10.10.40.70 (4)

10.20.20.100 (10)

10.40.20.100 (10)

10.60.20.100 (10)

10.80.20.100 (11)

15.10.20.100 (10)

15.10.20.100 (13)

15.20.20.100 (15)

30.20.20.100 (15)
40.5.40.10 (1)
40.5.40.10 (2)
40.5.40.10 (3)
40.5.40.10 (6)
40.5.40.40
40.10.20.100 (15)
40.10.20.100 (30)
40.10.20.100 (48)
40.10.20.100 (54)
40.10.40.10 (1)
40.10.40.10 (2)
40.10.40.10 (3)
40.10.40.50 (2)
40.10.50.10
40.10.90.1 (1)
40.10.90.10 (1)
50.10.20.100 (7)
50.10.20.100 (29)
50.10.40.60 (2)
50.10.40.60 (5)
50.10.40.70 (5)
50.10.40.80 (2)
50.10.40.80 (3)
60.5.40.40 (1)
60.5.40.41 (1)
60.5.75.1 (1)
60.5.80.10 (1)
60.5.80.10 (2)
60.5.100.1 (1)
60.5.100.10 (1)
60.5.100.10 (2)
60.5.100.10 (3)
60.10.20.100 (10)

60.10.20.100 (12)
60.10.20.100 (18)
60.20.20.1 (2)
60.20.20.100 (6)
60.20.20.100 (8)
60.20.20.100 (27)
60.20.30.20
60.20.40.10
60.20.40.70
60.20.50.10. (1)
60.20.60.1 (1)
60.20.80.20 (1)
60.20.90.10 (1)
60.20.90.41 (1)
60.20.90.41 (2)
60.30.20.100 (10)
60.30.60.1 (1)
60.40.20.1 (1)
60.40.20.100 (3)
60.40.20.100 (14)
60.40.20.100 (16)
60.40.20.100 (25)
60.40.50.10 (1)
80.10.20.100 (11)
80.10.20.100 (19)
80.10.90.11 (1)
80.20.20.100 (1)
80.20.20.100 (15)
80.30.20.100 (4)
80.30.20.100 (17)
150.94.30
800.50 (100)
800.50 (105)
800.50 (110)

800.50 (240)

800.50 (460)

800.50 (515)

800.50 (520)

800.50 (550)

800.50 (890)