

SWANSEA MATTERS — COMMUNITY ACCOUNT
November 20 Open House — What Actually Happened
21 Windermere Avenue (Swansea Mews) — Compiled March 8, 2026

Event	Application Information Centre — Drop-In Open House
Date / Time	Thursday, November 20, 2025 6:30–8:30 PM
Location	Swansea Junior and Senior Public School — basement level, 123 Elm Street, Toronto
Notice period	Flyer hand-delivered to properties within 120 metres of site — Canada Post timelines could not be met
Compiled by	Swansea Neighbourhood and SwanseaMatters.com community participants
Purpose	Contemporaneous community account of the event, its format, and its conduct

FINDING

The November 20, 2025 Open House failed to meet the procedural and substantive requirements of a meaningful community consultation. The venue was unsuitable, the notice inadequate, the format precluded recorded proceedings, and the Councillor’s conduct at the event is directly relevant to the complaint before the Integrity Commissioner. The event was organized to meet an internally driven milestone — not to provide genuine community input into the planning process.

1. Context: Why This Event Was Held

The November 20, 2025 Open House was the second community consultation event for the Swansea Mews revitalization, following the September 22, 2025 Zoom webinar. Under the City of Toronto’s consultation framework, an Application Information Centre (AIC) is the standard pre-application event at which the community is formally presented with the proposal before the planning application is submitted. This was that event.

The timeline for this event was not driven by community readiness or consultation quality. It was driven by an internally set approval milestone: the project needed to pass through AIC in November 2025 to enable submission of the planning application, Committee consideration in January–February 2026, and a Council vote in time for a federal funding deadline. The local federal Member of Parliament’s office subsequently confirmed that no such federal deadline existed — requests for housing funding from the federal government are open-ended and ongoing. The deadline was fabricated.

The result was an event organized with five business days’ notice, in a venue obtained by default, with no recorded proceedings, and a format that precluded the kind of substantive exchange the community had explicitly requested at the September 22 meeting.

2. Venue and Physical Conditions

The event was held in the basement of Swansea Junior and Senior Public School. This was not the intended venue. The room originally booked inside the school was found to be locked when the development team arrived to set up. The basement — a children’s play area and coat-changing corridor — was the only space available.

Physical conditions observed by community members who attended:

- The basement is a combination of a children’s play area and a rectangular hallway corridor used for removing winter garments. Toys and children’s signage were present throughout the space during the Open House.
- Fifteen information panels were mounted on easels in the space.
- There was no exterior signage identifying the event. Attendees arriving at the school could not determine from outside where the Open House was being held. Multiple people searched the exterior of the building.
- There was no wheelchair accessibility. Several potential attendees arrived and were unable to enter. They departed without participating. This was not a minor inconvenience — it was a denial of access.
- The elevator in the school was not working.
- The space had no amplification. Given the layout — narrow corridor, multiple simultaneous conversations at information panels — community members could not hear questions being asked or answers being given from any distance.
- The permit window was 6:30–8:30 PM. The format was Drop-In — attendees could arrive at any point, view panels, and speak with project team members individually. There was no formal presentation and no moderated question-and-answer session.

The Swansea Community Recreation Centre — the natural venue for a neighbourhood event of this scale — had been booked months in advance and was unavailable. Swansea Town Hall was not available. No other accessible venue in the neighbourhood was secured. The school basement was what remained.

3. Notice and Outreach

The November 7, 2025 Community Consultation Strategy Report described future engagement activities. Consistent with that report’s failure to commit to specific notice standards, the November 20 event was announced to neighbouring properties within 120 metres of the site by hand-delivered flyer, because Canada Post timelines could not be met with five business days’ notice.

Former Swansea Mews residents — the 108 households with a right to return — are not living within 120 metres of the site. They were displaced across the city in May 2022. There is no

evidence in the consultation record that they received proactive individual notice of the November 20 event. Several former residents who attended did so because they learned about it through community networks, not through any formal notification from TCHC or the Councillor's office.

4. Format and Conduct

The November 20 Open House format was described in the flyer as: 'Join us at the community consultation meeting where you can view information panels, provide comments, ask questions, and speak with the project team.' The format did not include:

- A formal presentation by TCHC, Bousfields, or City Planning
- A moderated question-and-answer session in which questions could be heard and responded to by the room
- A recorded proceedings record — no audio, no transcript, no formal notes distributed to participants
- Any mechanism for ensuring that questions raised by one participant were visible to others
- Any presentation or acknowledgment of the Swansea Park alternative proposal, despite community members having specifically requested it at the September 22 meeting

The absence of a moderated Q&A session is not a minor procedural choice. It is the mechanism by which the Open House format systematically prevents the creation of a consultation record. When the same question is raised by different attendees in separate conversations with project team members, no record is created, no response is locked, and no follow-up obligation is created. The format serves the applicant. It does not serve the community.

Community members who attended described the event as: disorganized; the result of bad planning; an atmosphere where you could feel the tension; not proper dialogue; a sense of negligence.

5. Councillor Perks' Conduct at the Event

Councillor Perks attended the November 20 Open House. Several exchanges are directly relevant to the Integrity Commissioner complaint.

5.1 Conflict of Interest Claim

Councillor Perks was asked directly about his conflict of interest — specifically, his concurrent roles as Ward Councillor for the affected community, Chair of the Planning and Housing Committee that would approve the application, and member of the TCHC Board whose application it was. He responded that the Integrity Commissioner had reviewed 'such circumstances in the past' and had provided clearance.

This response was inaccurate in a material respect. What attendees were raising was the specific conflict created by Perks's concurrent roles in relation to this specific application. A general historical review by the Integrity Commissioner of 'such circumstances' — meaning TCHC Board membership as a class — is not the same thing as a review of whether Perks could chair a committee hearing on a TCHC application in his own ward while sitting on the TCHC Board. That distinction is central to the complaint.

5.2 Density Claim — Factual Error

At one point during the Open House, Councillor Perks remarked that he was 'amazed to find out' that the density of the Swansea neighbourhood is less than the City average. This statement is factually incorrect. The population within 1 km of 21 Windermere Avenue was 10,498 in the 2021 Census — already approaching triple the City's average density. City Planning Senior Planner Doris Ho confirmed in writing on March 3, 2026 that the 1 km population is already projected at 11,693–11,736 with developments approved since 2021, before the Swansea Mews application adds anything.

The insertion of incorrect density comparisons by the Councillor at a community consultation event — where attendees had no immediate ability to verify or contest the claim — is consistent with the pattern of conduct documented throughout the complaint.

5.3 Who He Was Representing

When asked which of his three roles he was representing, Councillor Perks said he represented those who elected him. A community member then noted that given he was hearing loudly and clearly that the proposal was unsuitable and unsupported, and given that he was saying the City wanted it to move forward, did he not see the conflict. The Councillor pointed to the City Planning West Section Manager in attendance as an objective presence who would ensure the process was managed according to legal requirements. The community was unconvinced.

6. Atmosphere and Community Response

The atmosphere at the event was described consistently by those who attended as one of accumulated tension and distrust. The event had been organized hastily, in an inaccessible venue, with inadequate notice, and in a format that prevented the structured dialogue the community had requested.

A former resident who attended said: 'He was supposed to be working with us, not against us.' This sentiment, expressed by a person who had been displaced from their home since May 2022 and who had attended the event hoping to be heard, captures the central failure of the consultation process at this stage.

At one moment of heightened tension, a young attendee — a former resident — suggested pulling the fire alarm, out of concern that their family members were feeling intimidated. The suggestion was not acted on. It is recorded here because it illustrates the degree to which the November 20

event was experienced not as a genuine consultation but as a confrontation managed by the applicant.

Some attendees who had attended the September 22 Zoom meeting asked about the meeting notes from that session. They were told to consult the City website. The documents — approximately 50 in number — had begun appearing on November 7, 2025. None of the attendees who asked about their specific questions from the September meeting were able to identify answers to those questions in the documents provided.

7. The Fabricated Federal Deadline

The urgency that produced the November 20 event — the compressed timeline, the five-day notice, the basement venue — was justified internally on the basis that a federal funding deadline required the application to be submitted, considered by Committee, and approved by Council before a specific date. Specifically, the community was told: the Councillor had a full calendar requiring the meeting to be on this date; the December 2, 2025 former tenant meeting had to be incorporated into the milestone sequence; the application had to reach Committee in January 2026 to meet an early February Council meeting; and that Council meeting was required to meet a pending federal funding deadline.

The local federal Member of Parliament's office confirmed that no such deadline exists. Federal requests for housing funding are open-ended and ongoing. The deadline was not a federal requirement. It was an internal milestone sequence constructed to accelerate a process that had not yet secured genuine community input.

The November 20, 2025 Open House was not a genuine consultation event. It was an administrative milestone organized under a fabricated time constraint, in a format designed to prevent the creation of a recorded proceedings document, in a venue that denied access to wheelchair users, with notice that could not reach displaced tenants or Canada Post-dependent neighbours. The Councillor's conduct at the event — including a factually incorrect density claim and an inaccurate account of his Integrity Commissioner clearance — is consistent with the pattern of conduct documented in the formal complaint.