

SWANSEA MATTERS — FORENSIC ANALYSIS

Forensic Analysis — Why the Committee’s Questions Were Not Honestly Answered

Planning and Housing Committee, Item PH28.2 — February 26, 2026 — March 2026

CORE FINDING

Not one question in the post-deputation Q&A received an answer that engaged honestly and completely with what the deputants had actually placed before the committee. The session functioned as damage control, not deliberation. The argument is not that staff lied. It is that each answer was carefully architected to avoid disclosing what was most inconvenient: that the consultation process did not meet its own legal standard; that the city’s own studies documented serious environmental risks that have not been resolved; that the primary planning document was inaccessible to the public during the review period; that a publicly available alternative design was known to both the Ward Councillor and TCHC and withheld from every consultation session; and that the committee was deciding on a foundation of missing reports that Council itself had directed to be completed before this stage.

Part One: Why the Answers Were Structurally Incapable of Being Honest

Before examining each question and answer individually, it is necessary to establish three structural facts about the context within which the Q&A took place. These facts explain why the answers given were not merely inadequate — they were predictably, structurally incapable of being truthful.

1.1 The Decision Had Already Been Made Before the Public Meeting

The Initial Development Proposal (IDP) approved by Council in April 2025 (Item PH20.8) established a density range of 700–850 units in a tower form before the formal OPA/ZBA community consultation process began. By the time the in-person meeting at the local school was held in November 2025, the built form framework was fixed. Multiple deputants — including Penny Fischer and Stephanie Melagana, independently of each other — confirmed that when residents asked whether any changes to the scale or form were possible at the November 2025 meeting, they were told flatly: no.

This means that every staff answer about the consultation process was answering a question about a process whose outcome had already been predetermined. Staff were describing consultation that was legally required to be “meaningful” — to give residents the opportunity to shape built form outcomes — but that had, by their own account and by the confirmed testimony of two independent attendees, been informing residents of a decision already made, not inviting them to make one.

IMPLICATION: Any answer describing the consultation as adequate was structurally incapable of being truthful, because the consultation did not meet the Official Plan’s definition of meaningful engagement — and staff knew it.

1.2 The Stage 2 Actions Report Council Required Was Never Tabled

City Council’s April 2025 decision (PH20.8, Clause 7) required both a Stage 2 Actions Report and a Planning Report to be tabled together in Q4 2025. The Actions Report was to contain the project budget, financing strategy, delivery model options analysis (including formal comparison of TCHC-only development against alternatives), procurement plan, and partnership framework. Only the Planning Report arrived. The Actions Report has never been tabled.

This means the committee was asked to approve planning instruments — locking in development form, density, and use mix — without having reviewed the documents Council itself directed as prerequisites to this stage. Staff answers implying the process was complete and orderly were being given in the shadow of a missing foundational document that Committee members were not told about, and that no member raised.

IMPLICATION: Staff answers defending the process as properly sequenced were not truthful. Council’s own stage-gate framework had been breached. No member knew this because no member asked, and no staff member volunteered it.

1.3 An Alternative Proposal Was Known and Withheld

The Swansea Park Housing Proposal — prepared independently by architect David Peterson, a 20-year Swansea resident and former TCHC employee — had been known to both Councillor Perks and TCHC since at least Fall 2024. It proposes 14 mid-rise buildings of 6, 8, and 10 storeys with a naturalized central park, mass timber construction, 80% open/landscape space, and an RFP-based procurement model that opens cooperative housing tenure options unavailable under TCHC-only delivery. It is publicly available at swanseapark.ca.

It was never shown to the 108 displaced former tenants at any Open House, consultation session, or statutory public meeting. It was never placed before the Planning and Housing Committee. When Councillor Matlow asked whether “no consultation took place on alternative designs,” the answer he received described how the TCHC tower design had been adjusted — not that a materially different design existed and had been suppressed from the public record.

IMPLICATION: Every answer about the adequacy of consultation was given while staff and the Chair possessed knowledge of an alternative proposal that the community being consulted had never seen. This constitutes a breach of the standard that consultations be inclusive and provide participants with the information they need to meaningfully engage. A question about alternative designs could not be answered honestly without disclosing it.

Part Two: Question by Question — The Dishonesty Documented

Councillor Crisanti — Five Questions

Question C1 — The Consultation Process

Councillor Crisanti: *“Can you please describe the consultation process? How many consultations took place, over what period of time, and to what extent were notices distributed in the community?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: Staff listed the meetings: one pre-application online meeting, one in-person meeting at the school, one online follow-up, one City Planning tenant meeting. Notices delivered at the “minimum 120 metres or beyond... in compliance with standard practice.”

[EVASIVE] The answer described the form of consultation without engaging with its substance or legality. It listed events without establishing what they produced, what the community was told, whether documents were accessible, or whether the process met the Official Plan standard at section 3.1.1.

[MISLEADING] Describing notice delivery at “the minimum 120 metres” as compliance with “standard practice” reframes the statutory floor as though it were a mark of quality. For a development placing 1,558 people on 5.24 acres — a site density of 73,500 people per square kilometre, 16.6 times the city average — the 120-metre radius means hundreds of directly affected households received no formal notification.

[MISLEADING] Staff said “substantial consultation” was conducted. The planning justification document — the primary document explaining why 35-storey towers were proposed — was not properly linked on the Application Information Centre during the public review period. Residents were expected to evaluate the application without the document explaining it. Staff confirmed this error during the meeting. No member asked how long it had been inaccessible.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** A truthful answer required disclosure of: (a) the confirmed fact that the November 2025 meeting told residents no changes were possible; (b) the fact that the primary planning justification document was inaccessible during the community review period; (c) the fact that the September 22 meeting notes were never distributed to or verified by attendees; and (d) the fact that the 120-metre notice radius excluded the majority of households whose quality of life will be materially affected. None of these were disclosed.

Question C2 — Attendance

Councillor Crisanti: *“Did you get good attendance at these consultation meetings?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: “Very good attendance” — over 80 at the in-person meeting; 10–12 at the follow-up meeting. Staff “could not speak to” the TCHC tenant meeting.

[MISLEADING] Attendance of 80 people at the in-person meeting was presented as evidence of quality. Multiple deputants — including Stephanie Melagana and Fischer — described that same meeting as physically overcrowded, inaccessible to disabled

residents, and conducted in an atmosphere that a federal government official present independently described as “negligent.” The 80 people present were not there because the consultation was working well. Many were there in opposition.

[EVASIVE] Staff “could not speak to” the City Planning tenant meeting — the one meeting specifically about the displaced tenants who are the primary stakeholders in this revitalization. That is not an answer. It is an admission of ignorance about the most important consultation meeting in the entire process.

[EVASIVE] Penny Fischer, a member of the Tenant Leadership Committee speaking on behalf of the displaced tenant community, stated on the record that the majority of tenants oppose the current plan. This directly contradicts the picture of engaged, supportive tenant consultation. No member asked staff to reconcile Fischer’s testimony with TCHC’s characterisation of tenant engagement.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** A truthful answer required: acknowledgment of the conditions described at the November meeting; acknowledgment of the accessibility failure; and, critically, acknowledgment that a member of the displaced tenant leadership had testified — on the public record, that day — that the majority of tenants oppose the plan.

Question C3 — Structural Failure

Councillor Crisanti: *“In 2022 there was a structural failure. How many blocks are there? How did the failure in one unit lead to everyone being evacuated?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: Nine blocks existing. Failure was in one unit; testing found the same concern in other blocks, causing the displacement.

[ADEQUATE] This answer was factually accurate and responsive to the question asked. It is the only question in the entire Q&A session that received a direct, complete, and honest answer. Note: while the answer about the structural failure itself was adequate, the question should logically have led to a follow-up about building management accountability — which Fischer described as the community’s most urgent concern. No member made that connection.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** N/A — this question was answered adequately on its own terms.

Question C4 — Density Justification

Councillor Crisanti: *“Why the leap from 150 units up to almost 700 units? How did this level of density come about?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: “That’s been working with development review and planning to see what would be appropriate for the area. We’re also in a housing crisis. Our intention is to try and increase the amount of housing provided on city-owned lands.”

[DEFLECTION] This is a non-answer framed as an answer. The question asked for a specific account of how the density was arrived at. The answer provided is a policy

statement: housing crisis, city-owned land, maximise density. This is rationale for a direction; it is not an answer to how the specific number was derived.

[FALSE PREMISE] The answer omits the most important fact about density derivation: the IDP approved in April 2025 set a range of 700–850 units before community consultation began. The density was not arrived at through a process that weighed community input. It was set in a Council chamber and then presented to the community for feedback within that fixed envelope. To answer “how did we get here” without mentioning the IDP approval is to fundamentally misrepresent the sequence of events.

[EVASIVE] The Community Submission documents the quantified implication of that density: 1,558 people on 5.24 acres, at a site density of approximately 73,500 people per square kilometre — 3 times the density of the Bay Street Corridor, 15 times the surrounding neighbourhood. The committee was not given these figures.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** A truthful answer required: disclosure of the IDP approval timeline and its predetermined density envelope; the financial modelling that drove the unit count; and the quantified site density figures that allow the committee to actually understand what “almost 700 units” means on a 5.24-acre site.

Question C5 — School Capacity

Councillor Crisanti: *“Schools are at capacity. Have you looked at this? What do families with kids do?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: “Some of the schools in the area are in fact at capacity and school boards have recommended that signs be posted... advising future residents that residents might not be accommodated at local schools. That will be further fleshed out at the site plan control stage.”

[FALSE PREMISE] The answer confirmed the concern but proposed signage as the solution — which is not a solution at all, but a disclosure. The committee accepted this without objection. This is a governance failure, not merely an inadequate answer.

[EVASIVE] The most important facts were not provided: Swansea Junior and Senior Public School sits directly adjacent to the site with approximately 950 students. Standard Toronto planning estimates project 138 to 198 additional children in its catchment — a 15–21 percent increase from one adjacent development. The Toronto District School Board has 84.1% of its buildings below state of good repair. Class size caps were removed in 2025–26 under provincial supervision. None of this was disclosed.

[EVASIVE] The community had specifically asked in the September 22, 2025 Zoom meeting whether the TDSB and TCDSB would review school capacity. The December 2025 Q&A does not answer this question. The February 2026 Decision Report contains no reference to a school board capacity review.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** A truthful answer required: the quantified projected school-age children from 649 units, the current enrolment and state-of-repair data for Swansea PS, confirmation of whether a formal school board capacity review was commissioned and what it found, and — critically — an honest statement that deferring

this to site plan stage is not an acceptable response to a question about whether the neighbourhood can physically accommodate the children who will live in this development.

Councillor Nunziata — Four Questions

Question N1 — TCHC Waiting List

Councillor Nunziata: *“What is the waiting list right now for people trying to get housing?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: “The wait list for rent-geared-to-income housing is approximately 100,000 households.”

[ADEQUATE] The answer was factually accurate. However, the question itself functioned politically — it was asked to establish the housing need imperative, not to probe the adequacy of the proposal. The existence of 100,000 households waiting for housing does not validate any particular development proposal. That is the rhetorical leap the question was designed to establish, and staff’s accurate answer enabled it.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** N/A — factually accurate, though the political framing of the question was not challenged.

Question N2 — Rationale for Density

Councillor Nunziata: *“Am I fair to say the reason for the density is because of the huge waiting list — you want to house a lot more tenants rather than have them be on a waiting list for 20 years?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: “You are correct, Councillor — and that’s the reason for the high-rise and that’s the reason for the density.”

[FALSE PREMISE] This question is a leading question with a built-in political conclusion — and it received the confirmation it was designed to get. The implied logic is: waiting list of 100,000 → therefore high-rise towers → therefore this proposal is justified. But none of those logical steps follows necessarily. The Swansea Park alternative would also house people. Medium-rise development on city-owned land would also reduce the waiting list. The density of this specific proposal is dictated by financial modelling that has not been disclosed in open session.

[POLITICAL] Neither Nunziata nor staff acknowledged the core tension in the record: if the goal is to house as many people as possible, the missing Stage 2 Actions Report was supposed to contain a delivery model options analysis including alternative procurement paths. That report was never tabled.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** An honest answer would have said: “The density is also driven by a financial model that requires a certain number of market units to cross-subsidise the RGI replacement units — and that financial model has not been disclosed in open session. We are not able to confirm that the specific density of this proposal is necessary to meet the housing need without that analysis, which Council directed and which has not been provided.”

Question N3 — Tenant Consultation

Councillor Nunziata: *“You did have community consultation with the displaced tenants on the proposal, correct?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: Correct. City Planning held a tenant meeting, 10–24 tenants attended. TCHC has an advisory group of 20–24 tenant leaders meeting ongoing. Survey on TCHC website received 80+ responses. Tenant priorities include green space, food access, child play areas.

[MISLEADING] The answer conflates tenant leaders with displaced tenants. The advisory group of 20–24 “tenant leaders” is not the same as the 108 displaced households waiting to return home. Leaders are self-selected; their views may not represent the majority. Fischer testified — on the record, that day — that the majority of tenants oppose the current plan. This directly contradicts the picture of engaged, supportive tenant consultation.

[EVASIVE] The consultation record for the tenant meetings is the same as for the community meetings: September 22 meeting notes were never distributed or verified; the December Q&A cannot be traced to specific questions asked. The “tenant consultation” presented as thorough rests on an unverified evidentiary foundation.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** An honest answer required acknowledgment of Fischer’s testimony and an attempt to reconcile it with TCHC’s characterisation. Either the majority of tenants oppose the current plan — in which case the consultation did not produce consent — or they do not — in which case Fischer’s credibility on this point needs to be engaged, not simply ignored.

Question N4 — Where Are the Tenants Now

Councillor Nunziata: *“Where are these tenants now?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: “TCHC tenants are currently in relocation units across the city within the TCHC portfolio primarily.”

[EVASIVE] This answer does not tell the committee anything meaningful about the conditions those families are living in. They have been displaced since May 2022 — nearly four years. “Relocation units across the city” tells the committee nothing about whether those units are appropriate to household size, whether children are still accessing their schools, or whether the displacement has caused the hardship that the Community Submission documents.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** An honest answer would have quantified the displacement: how many households, what proportion are in units appropriate to their household size, what is the estimated duration of displacement under the current timeline, and what accountability mechanism exists to ensure right-to-return.

Councillor Matlow — Five Questions

Question M1 — Contamination and Health Safety

Councillor Matlow: *“One or more deputants claimed the property might be contaminated and there could be health concerns. Could somebody speak to that concern?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: (Toronto Building): An RSC is typically required when use changes from more hazardous to less hazardous. On this site the existing use is already residential, so an RSC would not necessarily be required.

[EVASIVE] The answer addressed only the regulatory threshold question — whether an RSC is legally required — without engaging with the substance of the concern: that the city’s own hydrogeological study documented contaminated soil and water on site, and that no remediation is planned. An RSC is a floor, not a ceiling.

[FALSE PREMISE] The RSC framework is designed for use-change scenarios. What deputants raised is different: an independent hydrogeological assessment already in the planning file that found contaminated soil and water; a plan to build on top of contamination, on a sand plain, over a highly vulnerable aquifer. The answer used the RSC question to avoid the contamination question.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** An honest answer to Matlow’s follow-up required a direct statement: “No — we cannot say that conclusively at this stage because the environmental assessment has not been completed. We are asking the committee to approve rezoning before knowing whether the site is safe to build on at the proposed scale.” That is what the answer implied — but said in terms designed to obscure rather than clarify it.

Question M2 — Water Table

Councillor Matlow: *“There’s been a suggestion there’s a problem with the water table. Is the building going to be into the water table or above it?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: (Acting Director, Engineering Review): Water level varies from 2.84m to 5m below surface. The building design does not reach the water level — it will be above the water table.

[ADEQUATE] On the narrow question asked — will the building reach the water table — this is a direct, technically specific answer and is accurate as far as it goes.

[EVASIVE] The narrow framing produced a narrow answer that missed the actual concern. The Community Submission and deputants documented that deep excavation and aggressive dewatering can permanently lower the water table, mobilizing contaminants through groundwater, affecting neighbouring foundations across a wide radius. The concern was not whether the building’s foundations would be in the water; it was what the construction process would do to the water table and the contaminated soils surrounding it.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** A complete answer required engagement with the dewatering risk during construction: what volume of groundwater will be extracted, where will it be discharged, whether the dewatering plan has been reviewed against the aquifer

vulnerability classification, and whether neighbouring foundation risk from groundwater drawdown has been assessed.

Question M3 — Alternative Designs

Councillor Matlow: *“There was a suggestion that no consultation took place on alternative designs. My memory is that there was an initial design where we got feedback that too much density was near the neighbourhood, and the design was altered. Am I correct?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: (TCHC): The IDP approved in 2025 had a range of 700–850 total units. The application now proposes 649 — below the lower end of that range. This was intentional to balance financial viability with neighbourhood sensitivity. Design changes included moving density away from the north.

[MISLEADING] The answer described adjustments within a predetermined tower framework as though they constituted meaningful consultation on alternative designs. The question of whether there was consultation on alternatives was answered by describing tweaks to a single option. That is the exact consultation failure the deputants identified: the community was consulted within the tower envelope, not about whether the envelope itself was appropriate.

[FALSE PREMISE] Matlow’s own framing of the question was itself mistaken — he asked whether the design was altered based on feedback, implying this constitutes alternative design consultation. It does not. Moving density from one end of a 35-storey tower site to the other is not the same as presenting a materially different design concept.

[EVASIVE] Most critically: the answer described design adjustment within the TCHC proposal without any disclosure of the Swansea Park alternative — a completely different design for the same site, known to both TCHC and Councillor Perks, that was never shown to the community. Matlow’s question opened the door to that disclosure. The answer walked past it without acknowledgment.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** An honest answer to a question about whether alternative designs were considered required disclosure of the Swansea Park proposal. The answer should have been: “There is a publicly available alternative design for this site — 14 mid-rise buildings, naturalized central park, mass timber — that was prepared by a local architect and has been known to the Ward Councillor and TCHC since Fall 2024. It was not presented to the community at any consultation. The Council-directed Stage 2 Actions Report — which was to include a delivery model options analysis — has not been tabled.” That is the truthful answer.

Question M4 — Tenant Courtyard Feedback

Councillor Matlow: *“When tenants saw the initial design, they felt they wanted that courtyard feel they used to have. The submission was altered based on that feedback. Am I correct?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: Yes — there is an elevated courtyard and rooftop gardens. Ongoing engagement with tenants will further design those features.

[MISLEADING] This exchange presents courtyard and rooftop garden additions — amenity elements — as evidence that tenant feedback shaped the fundamental design. It did not. The community’s stated preference was for townhouse-oriented, ground-level, human-scale living. An elevated courtyard in a 35-storey tower is not a substantive response to a preference for townhouse form. Presenting it as the evidence that tenant voice was heard is misleading.

[EVASIVE] Matlow’s question invited confirmation of a positive narrative. A truthful answer would have noted that the Swansea Park proposal — which the tenants were never shown — directly addresses the townhouse preference with 14 mid-rise buildings, porches, and courtyards at every building, and a 60% landscape area.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** An honest answer would have said: “The courtyard and rooftop features were added — and we also need to be transparent that former tenants’ stated preference for ground-level community form finds a closer answer in the Swansea Park proposal, which was not presented to them. The rooftop garden is an accommodation within the tower model, not a structural response to the preference that generated it.”

Question M5 — Density Context

Councillor Matlow: *“When Swansea Mews was built in the mid-70s the population was 2.2 million. It’s now 3.3–3.4 million. We are approving more density than we were 50 years ago — is that fair? Did you look at adjacent developments?”*

ANSWER GIVEN: Yes, densities are significantly higher than when Swansea Mews was built. There are adjacent developments of similar height and density in the area.

[POLITICAL] This question was framed to produce a density-validation answer, and it succeeded. The claim that adjacent developments are “similar height and density” needs examination. A 35-storey tower is not consistent with the established neighbourhood fabric of low-rise residential streets immediately adjacent to the site.

[FALSE PREMISE] The population growth argument — the city grew by 50%, so we approve more density — does not validate any specific density figure on any specific site. Density distribution is the question, not density in aggregate. The proposed site density of 73,500 people per km² is three times the density of the Bay Street Corridor and 15 times the surrounding neighbourhood.

[EVASIVE] The shadow impacts of a 35-storey tower on the ecologically sensitive lands of High Park — including Catfish and Grenadier Ponds, identified natural heritage features — were raised by multiple deputants and were never addressed in this exchange or anywhere else in the committee record. No natural heritage impact study was done. No shadow study was disclosed.

→ **What a Truthful Answer Required:** An honest answer to the broader density questions required the committee to hear the actual numbers: what site density in people per km² will result from this proposal; how that compares to specific comparable developments; and what the shadow impact on the High Park natural heritage system has been assessed to be.

Chair Perks — Closing Statement Analysis

Chair Perks did not ask questions of staff. He delivered a closing advocacy statement before moving the staff recommendations. Because this statement constitutes the Chair's summary characterisation of the process and its legitimacy — delivered from a position of institutional authority, before any other member had the opportunity to speak to the item — it requires analysis.

The Structural Failure and Historical Context

Perks correctly described the historical facts: the “bizarre construction technique” (concrete glued to concrete), the unprecedented nature of the failure, the Ontario Housing Company's responsibility, and the provincial downloading without adequate capital repair funding.

[POLITICAL] This accurate history was deployed rhetorically to make opposition to the specific density proposal appear callous toward displaced tenants. The history of how the buildings failed does not validate the specific density of the replacement. The Chair framing the decision as being “for the 140-odd households who lost their housing” positions community concerns about consultation adequacy as being against those households. This is not accurate.

“Ten Years From Now”

[POLITICAL] “This is something ten years from now, I think the city of Toronto is going to look back on and feel immensely proud of.” This is pure political advocacy, not governance. It is a prediction about future sentiment designed to pre-emptively delegitimise present concerns. It was made by the Chair — who also sits on the TCHC Board of Directors — a dual role that was raised as a potential conflict by deputant Keith Pardee and that Perks addressed only by referencing Integrity Commissioner advice he did not read into the record.

The Missing Disclosures

[EVASIVE] The Chair's closing statement contained no acknowledgment of: the missing Stage 2 Actions Report Council had directed; the Swansea Park alternative proposal known to him since Fall 2024; the fact that the primary planning justification document was inaccessible during the community review period; or the Integrity Commissioner complaint that had been or was being filed against him in connection with this process.

A closing statement consistent with the Chair's governance obligations would have acknowledged: (a) the Stage 2 Actions Report has not been tabled and Council directed it before this stage; (b) a publicly available alternative design exists and was not presented to the community; (c) the consultation record rests on meeting notes that were never distributed or verified; and (d) these questions warrant conditions on approval or deferral, not unconditional endorsement. None of this was said.

Part Three: What Must Happen — Required Follow-Up for Truthful Answers

The following is what truthful, fact-based answers to the committee's questions would have required — and what must therefore now occur before City Council ratifies the February 2026 approval.

3.1 On Consultation Adequacy (Crisanti Q1, Q2; Nunziata Q3)

1. The September 22, 2025 Community Consultation Milestone meeting notes must be distributed to all attendees for verification and correction before the consultation record can be relied upon as a basis for planning approval.
2. The Planning and Housing Committee — or City Council — must receive a formal response to the question of whether the consultation met Official Plan section 3.1.1, which requires that residents have the opportunity to shape built form outcomes. The IDP approval in April 2025 predetermined the tower framework. That sequence must be acknowledged and evaluated.
3. The notice radius for the OPA/ZBA application must be formally assessed against the scale of the proposal. The statutory minimum of 120 metres is not adequate for a development that increases the High Park-Swansea neighbourhood population by 5% from a single 5.24-acre site.
4. The conflict between TCHC's characterisation of tenant consultation and Penny Fischer's testimony — on the record, representing the Tenant Leadership Committee — that the majority of tenants oppose the current plan must be formally resolved.

3.2 On the Alternative Design (Matlow Q3; Fischer; Community Submission)

5. The Swansea Park Housing Proposal by architect David Peterson must be formally placed before City Council before any ratification of the February 2026 approval. Council cannot make an informed decision on a development that locks in form, density, and use mix without having been told that a materially different design for the same site exists, was publicly available throughout the process, and was known to the Ward Councillor and TCHC.
6. The Stage 2 Actions Report Council directed in April 2025 (PH20.8, Clause 7) — including the delivery model options analysis, financial model, procurement plan, and partnership framework — must be tabled before ratification. Council directed this report as a prerequisite. Its absence is a breach of the stage-gate framework Council itself adopted in 2019.
7. The delivery model options analysis must formally compare the TCHC proposal against the Swansea Park model and any other viable alternatives, including cooperative and non-profit delivery with RFP-based procurement, against financial and community outcome criteria.

3.3 On Environmental and Technical Safety (Matlow Q1, Q2)

8. A Natural Heritage Impact Study must be completed and disclosed before site plan approval is granted. The requirement for such a study under the Provincial Policy Statement — when development is proposed within or adjacent to identified natural heritage features — was cited by multiple deputants with specific reference to Catfish and Grenadier Ponds in High Park.
9. The contamination findings documented in the city's own hydrogeological study — contaminated soil and water, no remediation planned, building on a highly vulnerable aquifer — must be addressed before approval proceeds.
10. A geotechnical and dewatering risk assessment addressing the risk to neighbouring properties from construction-phase groundwater drawdown must be completed and disclosed before site plan approval. The January 2026 sinkhole on Windermere Avenue must be investigated and its relationship to site ground conditions formally assessed.

3.4 On Schools, Transit, and Infrastructure (Crisanti Q5)

11. A formal school board capacity review — from both TDSB and TCDSB — must be completed and its findings disclosed before ratification. Signage at a construction site advising future residents they may not get a local school is not a planning response to a school capacity problem.
12. A transit capacity analysis must be completed addressing the 501 Queensway streetcar and the Line 77 bus routes — specifically assessing whether approximately 528 transit-dependent households (at 0.19 parking spaces per unit, 649 units) can be absorbed by the existing TTC surface network without degrading service below acceptable levels.
13. A public amenity and community service capacity assessment must be completed and disclosed. 649 new households sharing parks, community centres, recreation programming, libraries, and health services that already serve an established neighbourhood require a formal capacity gap analysis.

3.5 On the Integrity of the Process

14. The Integrity Commissioner complaint filed in connection with this process must be disclosed to City Council before it votes on ratification. Council is entitled to know that a Code of Conduct investigation is active before it acts on the approval that investigation concerns.
15. An independently facilitated comparative session — presenting both the TCHC proposal and the Swansea Park proposal to former tenants with professional facilitation — must be held before Site Plan application is permitted to proceed. This is the minimum remediation of the withholding of the alternative design from every consultation the former tenants attended.

Conclusion

The questions asked by Councillors Crisanti, Nunziata, and Matlow were, individually, reasonable questions. In a context where the committee had just heard more than two hours of detailed, technical, and legally grounded testimony raising fundamental concerns about this application, those questions were also — with the exception of Matlow’s contamination questions — far too gentle.

The questions about consultation received answers about meetings held, without engaging with what those meetings produced, whether they were legally adequate, or whether they were built on an authenticated record. The questions about environmental concerns received answers about future processes, without disclosing what existing studies had already found. The questions about alternative designs received answers about design tweaks, without disclosing that a fundamentally different design for the same site had been withheld from the community throughout the entire process. The question about density received a political answer, without the quantified figures that would allow the committee to understand what that density actually means.

Chair Perks’ closing statement did not moderate this pattern. It entrenched it — framing unconditional approval as an act of moral clarity on behalf of displaced tenants, and implicitly framing the community’s documented, legally grounded concerns as obstacles to those tenants’ welfare.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

The questions asked were reasonable. The answers given were engineered. And the committee — reduced by two absences to the minimum quorum of four, with the Chair a declared advocate for the proposal — lacked the composition, the tools, and apparently the will to demand better. The record that emerged is not the record of a decision made with full information. It is the record of a decision made in spite of incomplete information — and presented to the public as though the information had been complete.

City Council, when it considers this item, has the opportunity to correct that record. The fifteen steps identified in Part Three are not procedural obstacles to housing. They are the conditions under which a decision of this permanence — locking in towers, density, and use mix on a 5.24-acre site, for the 108 families who lost their homes and for a neighbourhood that has no choice but to live with what is built — can honestly be said to have been made.

Prepared from the verbatim transcript of Planning and Housing Committee, February 26, 2026; the Community Submission (March 2026); the Deputations Record; the Procedural Analysis; and the Integrity Commissioner Complaint, March 2026.

Swansea Neighbours — SwanseaMatters.com — March 2026