

# Analysis of Councillor Perks' Four Newsletters — Swansea Mews

Prepared for submission to the Office of the Integrity Commissioner, City of Toronto | March 2026

---

Councillor Perks issued four newsletters about the Swansea Mews revitalization: September 25 and November 27, 2025, and February 19 and February 26, 2026. These were the primary channel through which ward residents received information about this process. Read against the documentary record, they share a consistent pattern: the language of collaboration and engagement is applied to events that were, on the evidence, adversarial, incomplete, and in key respects predetermined.

## **Newsletter 1 — September 25, 2025**

**"I was pleased to join former residents and neighbours... to envision the future of this site together."**

The September 22 Zoom was attended by approximately 83 community members who raised ten categories of questions. Meeting notes were never distributed to attendees for verification. Three months later, TCHC/Bousfields published a Q&A document that could not be traced to specific questions, timestamps, or verbatim dialogue. There is no authenticated evidentiary chain between what the community asked and what was later said to have been answered.

### **No mention of the Swansea Park alternative.**

The newsletter makes no mention of the Swansea Park Housing Proposal ([swanseapark.ca](http://swanseapark.ca)), a materially different development vision for the same site prepared by a Toronto architect in Fall 2024 and known to Councillor Perks throughout 2025. It contemplates 14 mid-rise buildings, a naturalized park, mass timber construction, and cooperative tenure eligible for the Federal Co-operative Housing Development Fund. Former tenants engaging with the TCHC proposal were never told another existed.

## **Newsletter 2 — November 27, 2025**

**Attendees "spoke passionately on the project."**

"Passion" is used to characterize what the contemporaneous record describes differently. A federal government staff member who attended as an independent observer described the session, without prompting, as *negligent*. Multiple witnesses confirmed that when residents asked whether any changes to scale or form were possible, they were told: no. A youth former resident, recorded on audio outside the venue, answered the question "how do you think your voice could be heard?" with: *"I don't think it can."*

### **No mention of access failures or format problems.**

The newsletter does not mention that: the venue had no wheelchair access; the elevator was not working; the original booked room was found locked and the meeting moved to a children's basement play area; there was no exterior signage; the Q&A was improvised with no public record; and, as City Planning confirmed in writing on January 30, 2026, the City had not yet commenced assembling its own meeting notes ten weeks after the event.

## **Newsletter 3 — February 19, 2026**

**The Decision Report "outlines staff's recommendations for addressing concerns."**

The Decision Report lists eleven concerns raised by the community. It provides no substantive response to any of them..

**"Meetings... with members of community associations" (plural)?**

City Planning confirmed in writing that the meetings referenced were held with a single organisation — the Swansea Area Ratepayers Association (Veronica Wynn) — not with the broader community. Swansea Matters members living within metres of the site were excluded. The plural "community associations" conveyed a breadth of consultation the record does not support.

**This newsletter was sent one day before the Councillor had privately settled his position.**

On February 20 — the day after this newsletter — Councillor Perks told a community representative in a private call: *"Cards on the table — I am going to be supporting a project that has this number of units, or give or take 5 or 10, on that site."* The newsletter presented the February 26 hearing as an open process. The Chair had determined his vote before it was held.

**Newsletter 4 — February 26, 2026 (sent the evening of the vote)**

**Thanks residents for "community engagement processes" — on the same day Penny Fischer testified to the contrary.**

Earlier that day, Penny Fischer — speaking on behalf of the Swansea Mews Tenant Leadership Committee — placed the following on the public record:

*"We respectfully ask that Council not approve this plan. The majority of the tenants are against it... We were not asked whether we wanted a 35-storey building or a 16-storey building or stacked townhouses with very limited green space. We were told what the plan would be."*

The newsletter, sent hours after this testimony, thanks ward residents for participating in "community engagement processes" with no acknowledgment that the representative of the displaced tenant community had just stated on the record that the majority oppose the plan and were not asked — they were told.

**Councillor Perks stated at Committee that tenants had "participated in designing this."**

In his closing advocacy statement before calling the vote, Councillor Perks characterised former tenants as having participated in designing the proposal. Fischer's testimony, heard minutes earlier, directly contradicts this on the public record. he contradiction.

**Fischer's substantive concerns are entirely absent.**

Fischer's deputation detailed: infrastructure failures on the Route 77 Runnymede corridor; Swansea Junior and Senior Public School at capacity with no school board review conducted; a single grocery store serving the entire High Park corridor; overcrowding research linking density without services to crime and mental health outcomes; and a 14-year history of maintenance failures in her own unit before the ceiling collapse. None of this appears in the newsletter sent to the ward that evening.

---

**Pattern across all four newsletters**

No newsletter mentions the Swansea Park alternative. Community concern is characterised as emotional engagement rather than unresolved substantive objection. Unanswered questions are described as addressed. The Open House is presented as a consultation event without disclosing that attendees were told no changes were possible, or that the City had no assembled record of it ten weeks later. The February 26 newsletter presents the outcome as collaborative on the same day tenant opposition was placed on the record. The Councillor's own words in the private February 20 call establish that the outcome was determined before the process concluded.